

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 20 November 2014

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

Bills

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 October 2014.)

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (10:32): I rise today to support the brilliant bill that has been put forward by the member for Hartley. I recognise the fact that he is using this valuable time we have on a Thursday morning to bring to the house such small issues that are of import and can help to improve the running of the South Australian parliament. The bill seeks to provide greater incentive, to put it politely, for ministers to leave the process of freedom of information requests well alone and for the departments to be able to do their work free from interference.

Before I talk about some of my own experiences with freedom of information requests, of which I have had quite a number, I would like to refer to the Ombudsman's report, where he talked about some of the issues as he saw them, which are detailed in a press release that the member for Hartley put out. He talks about issues with the freedom of information process, and he stated in his report:

...evidence provided to the audit strongly suggests that ministerial or political influence is brought to bear on agencies' FOI officers, and that FOI officers may have been pressured to change their determinations in particular instances.

I would sincerely hope that this is not the case but, having said that, putting in place something that can create further incentive for proper behaviour is a very good thing.

When it comes to putting in FOI requests, I must admit that I have put in a number. I think I am somewhere over the 100 mark, but as a voracious learner I find it a fantastic way to be able to understand the workings of government outside the glossy brochures and documents we are given in this house. The response that I have been given and that my staff have been given is quite mixed. Some FOI officers are extremely helpful and realise that working together to narrow down the scope of requests to the information I am really looking for is a great way to shorten the time frame, shorten the process and create less work for freedom of information accredited officers.

Others, however, are quite obstructionist, and so often I get back the pro forma letter that says that 'the time for reviewing your application has expired and, because it's expired, it's deemed to have been refused'. In some cases, they do indeed refuse. In other cases, they say, 'Well, it doesn't stop me from giving you the information, so here it is.' I do find that quite an interesting process to go through but, nevertheless, I am appreciative of the information at whatever point in time it does come to me. The system, however, I have found to be clunky and protracted.

As a member of gen Y, I grant that I am used to technology, but it surprises me that, in this current generation, the government and FOI officers have only just woken up to the brilliant, world-changing invention that is the internet and, in particular, emails and have said, 'Well, member for Schubert, if you would like to receive your determinations and your FOI request answers back by email, we would be happy to do so.' I thought, 'This is absolutely fantastic.' Whilst it might not help the bottom line of Australia Post, I think that it really does help the bottom line of the South Australian government, and I applaud the government for it, long overdue though it is.

If we are to take ministerial accountability seriously, if we are to take government transparency seriously, and if we are to take open government seriously—and these are all claims that this state Labor government makes—this is a bill that needs to be supported. In fact, I can think

of not one logical reason for why this bill should not be supported. It is not enough to simply say, 'Our government is open, our government is transparent, our government is clean.' It is not enough to merely say it: we actually have to do it.

In this case, we have a bill before us that helps to strengthen the actual doing, that strengthens the reality of the process as opposed to the rhetoric of the process. Instead of the feeling that our government is hiding something, South Australians should feel the warmth and the fact that this government bathes in the open transparency and sunshine that come with open and honest dealings, that there is nothing to hide and, if they have nothing to hide, they have nothing to fear from this bill.

But unfortunately there are such dealings which have been made a bit more open in the public space which have called into question this government's credentials on this matter. Deals such as the land deal at Gillman, with significant questions around it and without an open and transparent process, have destabilised the population's trust in government. As a proud politician, some of the looks I get when people ask me, 'What do you do for a living?' Anything we can do to improve people's trust in politicians and the standing of politicians and the government process is a good thing, and that is why this bill needs to be supported.

I will commend the government on its proactive disclosure. It has been fantastic reading to go through and look at various government departments, various ministers, various CEOs and their spending. It does seem to me that CEOs have a propensity to want to visit the Apple Store. It seems that CEOs and various ministers can spend hundreds if not thousands of dollars buying various Apple products, sadly not manufactured in South Australia, but I do not think that there is a locally-manufactured tablet advice, so we will give ministers and CEOs the benefit of the doubt.

At least I am lucky enough to be able to readily access this information, to readily access some of the expenses that are put onto ministerial credit cards as a result of overseas trips, to see the expenses, the everyday coffee shop expenses, that ministers and CEOs incur, and for that I applaud the government, but I do not think that it goes far enough.

On this side of the house we are often wont to give helpful hints to the government on its conduct. There is no standard uniformity to the proactive disclosure websites and no standard template. Some things are presented in different formats, often more confusing formats. It is often quite hard to find the links to the individual departmental pro-active disclosure websites, and it is again something the government could improve in the spirit of open, honest, sunshine warmth embracing, transparent government.

In closing, I challenge members of the government to stand up here and be able to argue against open, honest and transparent government. I implore them to support this bill so we can help to go some small way to improving the standing and measure of politicians in this place.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (10:40): I rise to support the bill as moved by the honourable member. It is very important, but it is but a very small step towards what we should be doing with regard to freedom of information in this state. South Australia has become a very secretive place when it comes to our government—very secretive. This bill seeks to ensure that the executive government does not cross the line in its role with regard to the release of information, and I think that is a good thing, but it is only a very small step compared with where we should be going, I believe. Notwithstanding that, it is very worthwhile to support this, and I know that the member has some other ideas he wants to bring forward, and I am certainly working on some of my own. I believe the whole of the FOI law in South Australia should be rewritten, and I will come to that in a couple of minutes.

First, let me give an example of the way FOI currently works in South Australia. Back in August a series of events occurred in my electorate, and I sought to get a better understanding of what was behind those events. It involved the banning of school children from drinking rainwater from the tank in the schoolyard. I will have a lot more to say about this some time hence, but the area school at Lucindale has had the ban applied. Schools in Bordertown have had the ban applied, yet schools in other parts of my electorate have not had the ban applied. I am seeking to get some information as to how the department came to the position it did.

Back in August I put in a freedom of information request. I asked my office only in the last couple of weeks to follow up, because the request had gone well past the date where we should have got some sort of answer, whether it be the information we were seeking or some request for an extension. I had my office talk to the freedom of information officer in the relevant agency, just to point out to them that, if an extension was sought, it had to be done by a senior member of the agency and the person making the request had to be informed, neither of which has happened in this case. The freedom of information officer told my office, 'I don't know why you're getting grumpy, the information will get to you some time in the next few weeks.' That was probably two months after it should have been processed.

So that just points to the culture we have within the bureaucracy in South Australia. That culture is: so what! Well, it is a very important tool, particularly for members of the opposition, to try to get their head around what is going on and how and why decisions have been made. It is even worse than that in my opinion. I think a culture of secrecy has developed within the bureaucracy.

To inform myself further of how the world could be, I recently visited our cousins across the big ditch in New Zealand and met with the New Zealand Ombudsman to talk about their freedom of information laws, the Official Information Act, New Zealand. I was somewhat surprised to learn that they have a completely different system from us, and a much more open system. What they have in New Zealand is a presumption certainly that no documents are exempt from release, but that information may be exempted from release. Certain pieces of information contained within a document may be exempted but, just because that information is in the document, it does not exempt the whole of the document. That is one big difference.

The other big difference is that information is not withheld from the general public just because it might have some political implications. In reality, there is a presumption that all information should be available for release, and the Ombudsman in New Zealand told me the test she applies when matters come to her attention is: what harm would occur if the information was released? She was at pains to tell me that did not include political harm. It was if it would create harm to the interests of the nation or harm to some commercial operations.

There is no presumption in New Zealand that a cabinet document is automatically exempt. They talk about proactive disclosure. They are seeking to have ministers proactively place on their agencies' websites the recommendations and submissions that go before cabinet. That information is available by request, but they have a proactive disclosure regime encouraging ministers to proactively make that information available for everybody to read. So, the very information that underpins cabinet decisions is disclosed.

This notion we have here that anything that goes before cabinet should be secret is a nonsense. The convention is that cabinet deliberations are held in camera and should be kept undisclosed, but as to the information on which cabinet bases its decision, there is no reason why anybody else cannot and should not have access to that. That is what happens in New Zealand and it works very well. That is what I would like to see in South Australia, because it would make for much better decision-making.

Let me give an example: the decision to double the size of the desal plant, one of the costliest boggles in this state's recent history, was taken when I believe the cabinet knew there was no sound case to make that decision. The federal Attorney-General said as much. The federal Attorney-General, after the fact in his investigation, said that there was no business case. The reality is that, more recently, we have had organisations such as the CSIRO tell us that water could be produced in South Australia via other methods—methods that were being promoted by the opposition at the time—at about half the price. That information was available to me as the shadow minister at that stage, yet the government denied it. If we had decent access to government information, I believe the decision to double the size of the desal plant would never have been taken; that very costly blunder would never have occurred.

A more recent example is the activities on South Road. We all recall that the highest priority was down at Darlington. As soon as the then federal opposition said they would put funds into that particular project, the government said, 'No, no, no, our priority is further up: it is between Torrens and Torrens. That is our top priority. The cost-benefit analysis says that is where we should be

spending the money,' and they had a political argument in the run-up to the last federal election. Again, the public of South Australia have been kept in the dark. None of the information supporting those claims by this government has been released, yet hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money has been spent on that project and the community never has the opportunity to make an assessment about the wisdom of doing that.

Those are just a couple of the problems we have with freedom of information in South Australia. There is no such thing as freedom of information. We do have a culture that has developed within the bureaucracy. I think the flames of that culture have been fanned by a government that is intent on maintaining as much secrecy as they possibly can. That is the reality of where we are in South Australia.

The further reality is: that is why we have the abysmal level of decision-making in South Australia, because it is not subject to scrutiny by either the opposition or the general public. The information which would allow those outside of cabinet to apply some level to it is kept secret; that is the reality. It makes for bad government, and I would argue that it is high time that this parliament addressed this issue because it will make a huge difference to the way this state is governed.

I commend the member for bringing this matter to the house. As I have said, it is but a small step down the path that we need to take. Any step that will open up access to information is a good step, and I commend the motion to the house.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (10:50): I also rise to support the member for Hartley on his excellent bill. As a first-term member, I think it is most impressive that he has hit the ground running, and has identified what he sees as weaknesses in the way in which government is handled and the way in which information flow actually occurs to all members.

I want to take on one individual case about an FOI in my contribution. I have a variety of experiences, like most members in this chamber would have: some relatively quick responses, some rather slow, and some which are downright disgraceful—I think that is probably the best way of expressing it. In my case, I sought information on a bill that was before the house some time ago, the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island Bill introduced by minister Rau. In preparation for what a Liberal opposition position on that bill would be, I sought information from the Kangaroo Island Citizens' Jury, which had been established by minister Rau and the KI Futures Authority—

Mr Williams: Paid for by the taxpayer.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Paid for by the taxpayer—in the thought that, 'Okay, I want to see some of the background work on that.' I was not necessarily interested in the financial transaction, but for me it was on the work that it was intended to do and what the recommendations from it were. I lodged an FOI on 22 May. The bill had been introduced and it was long time before the debate was to occur, and a long time before I thought the bill would reach its conclusion in this place. We had to wait months for a response. It was on 3 September that my office forwarded through to a staff member within Department of the Premier and Cabinet who was involved in this, saying it had been 3½ months since we had lodge the request for information. The reply we received was:

That application has not yet been determined. I am, however, working on it at the moment and I hope to have a response to you shortly.

That was after 3½ months. By that time, I had already started a contribution on the bill. We had done that on the day before parliament rose for the winter break, late in the afternoon, and unfortunately after the member for Finniss, by prearrangement, was not in the chamber and was not here to be involved. We had another six weeks or so, so I thought, 'Okay, we still have the time and opportunity; we will get the information back before parliament recommences in early September,' and that is why we put the request through in the hope that the information came through.

We received a response on 3 September saying the response was a couple of weeks away. The amazing part was that it was not until 4 November that the information finally came through. There were 12 documents; nine of those were provided in full, and the other three were not in full as some individual components were removed, which I understood and accepted. But, that was after the bill had passed.

It intrigues me that on the basis of what I consider to be a relatively important bill—one on which the member for Finniss has basically defined himself in the last six months, and which is a very important bill for his local community—but the information that we required to ensure, from an opposition perspective, that we could have a worthwhile contribution to the debate; consider amendment requirements; put forward a strong case; ensure that we expressed the community's thoughts; and ensure that the work that had been done before the introduction of the bill, via the citizens' jury, was used as part of the debate, did not come through.

I found that extremely disappointing, and easily consider it to be a disgraceful situation and an absolute flaunting of where the situation should be. As I understand it, an agency has 30 days to determine a request. It took us 3½ months to find out that it was still a couple of weeks away, and it took another two months to come through. That emphasises to me more than anything that the member for Hartley, in introducing this bill, is just in his cause, and this parliament does need to ensure that we get an improvement. If we want to ensure that South Australians have confidence in the process of government, the availability of information is a key component of it. I hope that in this situation, where we are putting forward very valid concerns in support of a good bill, we actually get support from the house. I look forward to its passage.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (10:54): I also rise to support the member for Hartley's bill. As a follow-up to the member for Goyder, quite frankly I am disgusted with the amount of information that is unable to be obtained in this state. I believe that an evil culture pervades this state to the extent that information is hidden from those who seek it, whether they be MPs or whoever, and all sorts of obstructive things are put in place when people try to obtain that information. The member for Goyder raised a good point in relation to the citizens' jury on Kangaroo Island and the information that he tried to obtain. He of course obtained the information after everything was cut and dried and finished. That is the disgusting part. I also have no doubt that this was all contrived. A group of people on the island were completely conned about this from day one and were sold a pup. They were sold a pup. Nothing has changed my mind on that.

It was disappointing that the bill went through the upper house, and I have made a few comments about that. I have also put in freedom of information requests to the Kangaroo Island Futures Authority. That apparently sits under DPTI, yet whenever I put in applications they say there is no information available. If you go to the Attorney's department you also get back a nil response. Who is trying to hide this material? Why are they trying to hide it?

Mr Williams: They know they got the decision wrong.

Mr PENGILLY: Yes. Quite rightly, the member for MacKillop says that they got the decision wrong. Hear, hear to that! Why on earth do they try to delay, make excuses, not deliver the goods and continually frustrate members of parliament in their attempts to get information? It is freedom 'from' information—that is the word that should be there. It is despicable.

As I said, I am not sure why this had taken place. I have my suspicions. In relation to the applications that I have made for information from the Kangaroo Island Futures Authority, I am pretty sure that they have a fair bit to hide and they do not want to be caught out. I am going to take it further. I have every intention of pushing this to the nth degree, because things need to be outed properly. If necessary, those involved need to have the full weight of the law come down on them. It may take a while to achieve that but I am like a dog with a bone in this regard. I am not going away. The member for Hartley's bill is a useful exercise in achieving that.

I know there are some members in this parliament who put in copious freedom of information requests. They do not always get what they want, but occasionally something useful surfaces and outs something that needs to be outed. I wait with interest to see where the government goes on this: whether it wants to keep things secreted away and continue to play the game of withholding information from members of parliament who, by the very nature of being elected by the people of South Australia, have a right to much of this information. And I am not talking about confidential business arrangements that for obvious reasons need to be commercial in confidence.

I have made applications to local government authorities in my electorate and, once again let me say, some are much better than others. The Alexandrina Council is expert—it is very professional, it comes up with the goods, there is no beating around the bush—as is the Victor Harbor

council. However, let me tell you: trying to get information out of the Kangaroo Island Council is another thing entirely. I hope that may change with a newly elected body there and that there may not be some of the activities that have taken place. I look forward to seeing the debate come to a close on this bill and a positive vote being accorded.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (11:00): To begin:

Freedom of Information Act. Three harmless words. I look at those words as I write them, and feel like shaking my head 'til it drops off. You idiot. You naive, foolish, irresponsible nincompoop. There is really no description of stupidity, no matter how vivid, that is adequate. I quake at the imbecility of it.

Those were the words written in the memoirs by the Rt Hon. Tony Blair, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1997 to 2007, who, writing in these memoirs, has spoken of the introduction of the UK's Freedom of Information Act as being one of the greatest single mistakes he made as prime minister. Forget the Iraq war, forget the drunken spending that reduced the country to its knees when the global financial crisis struck; no, Tony Blair names the Freedom of Information Act as his most cataclysmic error. That is a shame, is it not? What a shame!

Governments go down the track of introducing legislation like freedom of information acts and, in doing so, surround themselves with words and rhetoric, such as 'accountability', 'openness and transparency'. They want to throw off the shackles of secrecy and be much more open, but often in reality governments seem to struggle with what that means. Tony Blair claims that the introduction of the Freedom of Information Act in the UK prevented his government from having frank and fearless advice from public servants and inhibited his ability to make proper decisions. Again, I say: is that not a great shame? I do not think it is.

I think the Freedom of Information Act is a very important act which aims to give people confidence in the way that public administration is carried out but, unfortunately, it seems to be doing exactly the opposite in South Australia because the negativity that surrounds so many freedom of information requests when they enter the public domain through the media or through this place, and the difficulty that both members of the public and members of parliament seem to be having in gaining information through the Freedom of Information Act, does quite a bit, I think, to undermine the credibility of politicians, the credibility of public administration and indeed the credibility of the way democracy works in South Australia.

We hear a huge amount from the state government on values. We have the values that were developed last year by Change@SouthAustralia and the Office for the Public Sector. We hear a lot of this rhetoric about how important it is and how the Premier wants to do government differently. Since the day he came to office in 2011, he has talked about his desire to do government differently, to open up government and to have a conversation with the community. You can hear all these words and metaphors ringing in your ears, but is that the reality confronting people when they want to get information out of government? I think not.

In reality, if government is working well, the freedom of information approach should not always be required. There should be situations when you can pick up the phone or write a letter directly to a minister or a senior public servant and ask for information. The confidence should exist between both sides of politics, and between members of the public and public administrators, that they can do that and actually get information.

Information should not need to be sought using Freedom of Information Act approaches; instead, it should be freely available, whether that is by a phone call or a letter, or equally just because information is placed in the public domain on the internet, etc., as a matter of routine course around particular projects, policies and government business. Again, as we know, that just does not seem to be the case, so people are pushed down this freedom of information route.

I had an example just a couple of weeks ago, a local government example, when I was approached by a member of my community who had gone to the City of Marion asking for some information about a local park being redeveloped. The council said to this person, 'The easiest way to get that document is through freedom of information from your local member of parliament.' So, instead of the council just serving up that piece of material, it was directed through my office and became a much more bureaucratic process. These sorts of things continually occur at both local and state tiers of government.

We saw recently the South Australian Ombudsman hand down his audit report into the way freedom of information rules were being adhered to by state government, and I think that was one of the catalysts for the member for Hartley's amendment to the Freedom of Information Act. The Ombudsman in South Australia drew to our attention a great number of instances where he had real concern about the way ministers and senior public servants were executing the Freedom of Information Act. He had a range of worries around the way that was happening, and that certainly was one of the reasons I felt compelled to support the member for Hartley in his introduction of this piece of legislation.

I think it comes down to a situation, shown up by the Ombudsman's report, that leads us to ask: can the government be trusted with adhering to the Freedom of Information Act, can they follow things through in the way they should, and can they actually deliver on the clauses and requirements of the act? From my own experience within the public sector, I would say that it is challenging for public servants sometimes when confronted with freedom of information requests. Not only is it very time consuming and takes you away from your day-to-day business as you do this, but I think it does, in the minds of many public servants, discourage them from putting things into writing that they might otherwise do.

That being the case, it should still not create a situation where public servants, senior bureaucrats and ministers feel that because this act is in place they cannot put things into writing. As part of good quality public administration and the provision of frank and fearless advice, it should be something that people are confident to do and should not worry about getting out into the public domain. If good decisions are being made by government, and those can be backed up with a good solid evidence base, it should not be something that governments should be fearful of. It does beg the question: what has the government got to hide by creating delays and being so apprehensive about releasing certain pieces of information through the freedom of information process?

In the United Kingdom, there appears to have been a move away from taking the freedom of information process away from government and putting it in the hands of an independent information commission. I am always very hesitant about suggesting the creation of further bureaucracies, but that might be something we need to look at in South Australia. Should freedom of information be controlled within departments, or should it be something that is taken out of the hands of departments and put into the hands of an independent information commission which can cut through the bureaucracy and has the independence and capacity to do so, to work with public servants to get the information that people are after and bring it out into the public domain?

It is something that seems to be working in the UK; it was obviously something that Tony Blair hated. Again, political leaders might not like these things, but it is part of democracy, it is part of an open and transparent state, and it gives people confidence in public administration. The member for Hartley's bill seeks to create further checks within the system to encourage people to treat the Freedom of Information Act accurately and effectively so that it can fulfil its aim of getting information into the hands of the public, open government to correct scrutiny and hold the government to account, as it should be and as it should be comfortable in being held to account as well. So, I commend the bill to the house and I sincerely hope that all members of this place support it.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:10): I too rise to support an excellent private members' bill put forward by the member for Hartley regarding the Freedom of Information Act. I think what it has highlighted on this side is that our newly elected members have a great capacity for a bill like this. I think all of them need to be commended. They are having an excellent input into debate, putting up bills and motions, and I think this is another fine one that typifies the new team that have entered parliament. So, not only congratulations to the member for Hartley but congratulations to all of the new members for their input. I think they are commonly known as the rat pack. Is that what it is, member for Finniss?

Mr Pengilly: Yes.

Mr WHETSTONE: Good. I completely agree that the current system needs to be changed for the betterment of those seeking access to information. All too often we have experienced the poor side to this process. The FOI Act is legislative recognition of the need for democracy to be supported

by a government guarantee that it will hold all information for the public's interest. The objects of the act are set out in section 3:

- (a) to promote openness in government and accountability of Ministers of the Crown and other government agencies and thereby to enhance respect for the law and further the good government of the State; and
- (b) to facilitate more effective participation by members of the public in the processes involved in the making and administration of laws and policies.

I note the annual report of the FOI shows that about \$10.8 million has been spent processing applications in the past year, so that cost is up by about 6 per cent. However, the number of applications processed has fallen by about 8 per cent. More than 40 per cent of FOI applications are rejected or only released in part, while fewer applications are being processed, but the cost to taxpayers to do it has increased. In May of this year, the South Australian Ombudsman tabled a report entitled, 'An audit of state government departments' implementation of the Freedom of Information Act 1991 (SA)'. This audit was of 12 government agencies during the preceding year and there were a number of interesting findings in the report that certainly raised some eyebrows and raised many questions.

The report provided 33 recommendations, and many include extra training and resources. We have heard the government's position on this, it is content to throw its hands in the air, but that is simply not good enough. The Ombudsman found in the audit that most of the agencies are not coping with the volume and complex nature of the recent FOI requests. Six of the 12 agencies failed to determine over 50 per cent of the access applications within the time frame required by the act. Most of the agencies do not understand how to apply the exemptions and the public interest test under the act, and the agencies' chief executives are not providing FOI or pro-information disclosure leadership. In nine out of the 12 agencies there is no directive at all from the chief executive, senior management or the minister about the operation or implementation of the act. Only one agency stated that it has ever released an exempt document, despite the discretion to do so under the act. The Ombudsman stated that:

There needs to be an integrated approach to information access in this state, which includes FOI and privacy; proactive release of information...and necessarily, records management.

Of most concern was that the Ombudsman found that it is commonplace to provide copies of FOI application determinations and documents to their minister to get the green light prior to the finalisation of the access requirements. He found that FOI officers may have been pressured into changing their determinations. That is something that really is concerning. This is certainly a major grey area. The Ombudsman said that if a ministerial decision or direction is involved it should be clearly set out in the agency's determinations.

Over the years, I have had some really good assistance from FOI officers, but I have also, too, encountered reluctance within the system. One example is a request that came back as having too many documents that fitted within the scope and obviously diverting an agency's resources unnecessarily. That scope was narrowed with assistance, but it was apparently narrowed so much that there were no documents available for that request. One minute we have a request that is way too open and wide, too many documents, so we narrow the request and all of a sudden there are no documents. Again, it is eyebrow raising and it raises questions about exactly what are we hiding, where is the transparency, and how can we go from too much to nothing with a similar request?

I fully support the amendments to the FOI Act 1991 proposed by the member for Hartley regarding a person giving improper direction or influence in respect of an agency's decision regarding the FOI application and to amend a record and have access to documents. The amendments will also make it an offence if an accredited FOI officer fails to report to the Office of Public Integrity a suspicion that such a direction has been given.

Another issue with the FOI process which I have experienced is the continual failure to meet deadlines within a time frame. What is the point of setting a time frame when you do not meet it? In many cases, there is no courtesy shown by that department, or that FOI officer, just making a simple phone call or pushing through a quick email to say they are having difficulty or that the time frame needs to be extended. There is always that application or that appeal that has to be put in, and it is creating headaches at both ends, that is, the request and the provision of the FOI. It is something

that an FOI officer is unable to do, is afraid to do or has been directed not to do. It then takes more paperwork and time to find out why the FOI determination is late. That could be avoided with simple contact between the officers.

In 2012-13, the percentage of applications not determined within the 30 days for DEWNR was 101.2, for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet 99.2, for the Department of Treasury and Finance 74.6, DMITRE 63.3 and DECD 61.6. Five of the agencies failed to determine over 50 per cent of their applications received in the 2012-13 financial year within that 30-day statutory time frame. That really does justify the member for Hartley's amendments to overhaul the FOI process.

According to the Ombudsman's report, the reasons identified by the agencies to the audit for failing to determine their applications within that time frame were: lack of resources—so obviously budgetary issues or staff issues; waiting to receive advice or documents from different sections of the department; negotiating with the applicant; seeking legal advice; seeking ministerial advice; and/or the 'other' box. Obviously, the 'other' box is quite large.

The other reasons submitted by the agencies included receiving multiple applications at the same time. I understand that many individual MPs put in applications when there is an issue of common concern. We are all busy, whether we are in government or in opposition. We are all busy; we do not have time to confer with every one of our colleagues that we are looking for a determination or looking for more information. People must understand the complexity, size and breadth of the application. As I have said, one minute it is too big, the next minute there is nothing there. These are some of the issues: consulting with third parties; and slow or delayed responses from a third party consulted.

Once again, I would like to put my support on record for the member for Hartley's bill regarding the FOI Act. We need to see some improvement in this area and some better transparency within the sector. The people of South Australia expect that Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition is holding the government to account. The government should be open and transparent with their decision-making, it should be open and transparent with what it is spending taxpayers' money on and it should be open and transparent with all decisions that are made for the people of South Australia.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (11:20): I rise today to also speak in support of the member for Hartley's freedom of information amendment bill. I take note that a number of the newer members of this place have spoken on this bill. I would like to say a number of the younger members of this place but, unfortunately, I cannot.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WINGARD: You're right, I don't quite fit into the younger brigade. But, some of the newer members are younger and they have spoken on this bill, and I can see why, Deputy Speaker, because there is a frustration that comes with FOIs.

The principle of an FOI is to allow individuals to see what information government holds about them and to seek correction of that information if they consider it wrong or misleading. FOI enhances the transparency of policy making, administrative decision-making and government service delivery, and a community is better informed when they can participate effectively in the nation's democratic processes. That is the intent of the FOI.

Yet, we hear today, and hear regularly, of people putting in for FOIs and finding frustrations with the information, or lack thereof, that is returned. I heard with interest the member for Chaffey speak before me and talk about requests that are made through FOI and the delays and procrastination with a lot of this information that is looking to be retrieved.

It has come to my attention in my short time in this place that, when you do make a request for some information, you have to be thinking of every which way someone might stifle you from having this information when you make your request, so the requests take an extra amount of time to collate and put together, an extra amount of time to submit and, because you have to make so many assertions and so many exceptions to how this question might be interpreted and/or the information returned, you potentially end up asking for copious more quantities of information than potentially you would need.

Again, as the member for Chaffey and those before me pointed out, that adds a great deal of cost to this process and it does make it very difficult. What is more, when the information comes back, time is wasted and procedures are wasted to go through the information and to try to find the answer to the question you are asking. That process in my short time here, as I mentioned, I have found frustrating, and I know others have found it so as well; and it really does inhibit what we are looking for here, and that is the transparency and also the clarity of information from the government.

I was interested to hear the member for Wright talk from the public sector's perspective when they do have this information to give and are asked to give this information to a fellow member of parliament, the media, or anyone seeking some information. It does get very complex and very confusing for the person digging out the information because they are concerned how it is going to be perceived and how it is going to be used and, if pressure is brought to bear from outside sources, that is very much, in my opinion, unacceptable.

I talked about the reason for freedom of information, and another is the greater recognition that information gathered by government is at public expense and it is a national (or, in our case, state) resource and should be available more widely to the public. This is information that has been gathered by the public sector, a sector paid for by the public, so, ideally, this information is for them to access and be able to use. That is something I think we are perhaps glossing over here.

I do also note at this time, looking back over the history of this place and in doing some research on the late Bob Such and the great work he did in this place, a quote that I quite like and, probably unfortunately for me, in my short time it is one that sits with me as well. Bob spoke not of the freedom of information but the freedom from information. Again, it is interesting that some newer members here are finding this frustrating, and older members, including the late Bob Such, found it equally as frustrating.

On that point I again concur with the member for Hartley and support his amendment bill. It is something that has happened in the past and it is something that is still happening today. To make this information more readily available and more easily available would be greatly appreciated by those from the past and, indeed, those present.

The FOI Act also promotes government accountability and transparency by providing a legal framework for individuals to request access to government documents; this includes documents containing personal and other information such as information about policy-making, administrative decision-making and government service delivery. Individuals can also request that ministers or agencies amend or annotate any information held about them.

I spoke about journalists previously, and in a past life I worked as a journalist. When I speak to my colleagues, some from my previous life but also now, they still talk about the frustration of freedom of information. I have spoken about the time wasted with MPs looking for information and requesting information and I know that same problem rolls over to journalists: anywhere they turn, anywhere they look they feel themselves being blocked. It does add scepticism to journalists, I suppose. I can see why that happens when they are, in their opinion, asking genuine legitimate questions and their perception is that, through FOIs, they are being denied this information that should be made freely and publicly available.

It is incredibly frustrating and, for what it is worth, I know that it does make journalists dig even harder to try to find the answers. I suppose there are those out there who think that if they can make it hard they might walk away and, potentially, some journalists might, but the good journalists I know when they feel they are coming up against a brick wall will work harder and dig harder to find information.

I must say again that I think the member for Hartley has done an outstanding job in what he is endeavouring to do here: to make it illegal for a government minister or their staff from giving improper directions or influence to a government agency that has been served with a freedom of information request. We can probably all stand here and say there is no way that would happen and it would be very disappointing and appalling if it were to happen. However, there has been too much evidence over time (and, as I said, in my recent time in this house) to not make you feel like that does happen on occasions. It is very disappointing to even think that way but the evidence is there to potentially point to those situations arising.

In a national comparison of freedom of information laws, South Australia has often been referred to as the most secretive state in the nation after 12 years of this Labor government. I find that incredibly disappointing. I have looked across a number of spectrums in this place and at a number of measurables for our state and how we have performed and how we rate. I have talked about the premiership table before in this house and about the things where we need to be sitting at the top but, unfortunately, South Australia has just slipped to the bottom of that table when we are talking about economic management and prosperity for this state.

We used to be in the top three, taking on New South Wales and Victoria but now, sadly, in a lot of those key economic indicators we have slipped down to the bottom of the table and we are fighting it out with Tasmania and some of the regions like Newcastle, Wollongong and even the Gold Coast. We are not stacking up all that well—and I say that is after 12 years of this Labor government. Yet again, here we are with another measurable where South Australia is deemed to be at the bottom of the table when it comes to freedom of information laws and potentially being one of the most secretive in the country, and that is incredibly disappointing.

A recent report tabled in parliament about South Australia's FOI laws by the state Ombudsman stated that:

...evidence provided to the audit strongly suggest that ministerial or political influence is brought to bear on agencies' FOI officers, and that FOI officers may have been pressured to change their determinations in particular instances.

To have the state Ombudsman, Richard Bingham, saying that is really an indictment on South Australia. I think it is something that we in this house should all be very disappointed about. We should be looking to make amends to that sort of assessment of the way we are going about our business. Again, that is why I support what the member for Hartley has done here with this freedom of information amendment bill.

In the past there has been no criminal penalty for ministers and their staff to unduly influence the release of important documents that are in the public interest—that is until now with these suggestions. A breach of these provisions will incur large fines and criminal convictions for those found guilty of the offence. It will also direct the appropriate FOI officer to report any breach of the new law to the Office for Public Integrity for further investigation.

I will finish off right now to save it going on. I think it is important to reform this law, given South Australia's freedom of information laws. If the Weatherill Labor government is serious about accountability to the community and about transparency, I think it must support this bill.

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

Motions

WHITE RIBBON DAY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:30): I move:

That this house recognises White Ribbon Day and encourages all men to swear an oath to never commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women.

White Ribbon Day, as I am sure members will know, is 25 November every year, and it is a very important day on the world calendar. It is certainly celebrated in Adelaide every year, with a very well attended and genuinely well-supported breakfast. I will not be able to attend that breakfast this year but I will be at a White Ribbon Day breakfast in Jamestown which is run by the Jamestown community, and I wholeheartedly look forward to supporting them in their local endeavours on this very important topic.

The White Ribbon foundation is a worldwide organisation committed to, ideally, ending violence against women. That is not because the people who started this cause are opposed to violence against men—I am sure, of course, that they are—but, overwhelmingly, violence is committed by men against women, so that is the first and most important place to start. The White Ribbon foundation does this very important work in many different ways, but one of the most important is by asking all men to swear an oath. It is important because it is simple, because it is effective, because it makes people think about the issue, and because (certainly in my mind) there

is absolutely no reason why any man should avoid doing that. That is one of the reasons I brought this motion to the house, to ask all men here to swear that oath, and I have no doubt that all men in the South Australian parliament would be of the appropriate character to do that very comfortably and without hesitation.

It is an important question to ask: why men? As I mentioned before, overwhelmingly violence to women is perpetrated by men—not exclusively, but certainly overwhelmingly. There are a lot of statistics that support that, Deputy Speaker, a lot of places I could suggest that you and fellow colleagues go to have a look. Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety (ANROWS) is one that provides a lot of that information. I will not dwell too heavily on statistics, but I will share with the house some that come from the ANROWS website. This is based on 2012 ABS figures, so they are very much Australian information but were published only in May this year so, while they are 2012 figures, they are the most recent available—to me, at least:

- alarmingly, one in five Australian women have experienced sexual violence;
- one in six Australian women have experienced physical or sexual violence from a current or former partner;
- one in four Australian women have experienced emotional abuse by a current or former partner; and
- one in three Australian women have experienced physical violence. One in three women, on average across our nation, have experienced some form of physical violence.

To any clear-thinking reasonable person, that is completely unacceptable. Nobody could ever support doing nothing to try to correct that. From a personal perspective, this is not about trying to turn every man in the world into a SNAG, a sensitive new-age guy. It is not that sort of thing. You can be any sort of responsible man you want to be: you can like the footy or the ballet, whatever you like. It really does not matter to me.

Mr Gardner: Both.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Or, as the member for Morialta says, you can like both. You can enjoy sports, or you can enjoy being a computer nerd, it makes absolutely no difference to me. But however you like to describe yourself, however you like to live your life, however you like to pursue your own life in a responsible way, violence against women just cannot be part of it.

It is not about trying to turn burly footy-playing blokes into ballerina-loving computer geeks, or whatever inappropriate stereotypes I could dream up. It does not matter who you are, just take violence to women out of your life, out of your mind, out of anything you could ever contemplate or actually participate in. People are different, they deserve to be different, but not on this issue.

One of the foundations of the White Ribbon organisation is the oath, and it asks that men never commit, never excuse and never remain silent about violence towards women. There are some myths that I will share with the house, which I got from the White Ribbon website, and I will work through them quickly. They set a tone, and they are worth talking about and considering, as they set some misconceptions right.

There are 10 commonly-held myths. The first is that violence against women is an issue that only concerns women. Clearly, we know that is not the case and, in addition to the points I made before, it is men's wives, mothers, sisters, daughters and friends who are affected by violence towards women. It is a men's issue because a minority of men treat women and girls with contempt and violence. So, it is very much a men's issue. Another myth is that there is nothing we can do to stop violence against women. That is absolutely ridiculous. Research shows that violence against women is the product of learned attitudes and norms, and it is crazy to think that there is nothing we can do.

The third myth: women should just remove themselves from abusive relationships. That is probably one of the things that is harder for men to understand than for women, and it is probably harder for women who have never confronted this issue to understand than women who have confronted this issue. Really central issue to all of this—and I do not pretend to be an expert—is that the reality is that we could all understand that a women who is fearful, who has less power in a

relationship, who worries for children, or who has lack of knowledge, low self-belief, or self-esteem, could find themselves trapped. The fourth myth is that some people deserve to be beaten for provoking the violence. What a ridiculous, crazy, disgusting concept. Responsibility for violence must rest solely with the abuser.

Another myth is that violence against women only occurs in specific groups. This is another really important issue. Violence against women occurs across all religious beliefs, all levels of education, all sexual orientation, all occupations, all community positions and all cultural or ethnic backgrounds. That is just a fact. We cannot pigeonhole people and say, 'It's people like that who do this', because it is just not true.

Myth 6: violent people are mentally ill or have psychopathic personalities. It might be true, but it is certainly true that violence against women is committed by people who do not have those problems as well. The vast majority of violent men are not suffering from mental illness and could not be described as psychopaths. Most abusers would appear to be respectable men who are very much in control.

Another myth is that some people need the violence, enjoy it or are addicted to it. That is an absolutely disgraceful concept once again. Myth 8 is that violence against women is caused by drugs and/or alcohol. Almost even numbers of sober and drunken people are violent—a fact that is important. It is a little bit like having a mental illness. It may be the case or it may not be the case, but it is certainly not the case that violence against women is limited to people who have difficulties with drugs or alcohol.

Violence only happens to a certain sort of woman. Again, research has repeatedly shown that violence crosses all boundaries and can happen to women from all social, economic and cultural backgrounds and family situations. The last myth is that violence only affects a small number of Australian women. I have provided some statistics already which show that one in three will be affected by violence. Violence is the biggest cause of injury or death for women between the ages of 18 and 45. One in three women will experience physical or sexual violence in their lifetime.

I thank the White Ribbon foundation for making that information so readily available on their website because I think it is very important to try to explode some of those myths and, by doing so, take away the excuses. That is what it is about. If you can expose the myths for what they are, you can take away the excuses for people who commit this sort of behaviour.

Back to the oath asking men to swear that they will never commit, excuse or remain silent to violence against women. I have a personal preference. I do not suggest for a minute that I know any more about this topic than the White Ribbon foundation or any other organisation that works in this space, but I have a personal belief that the pledge should actually be to not commit, excuse or remain silent about violence towards 'a' woman, not towards women, and the difference for me is it makes every individual victim a person in their own right.

It is not about all Christians or all Muslims or all Aboriginal people or all non-Aboriginal people or all women or all men. It is about violence against a person. It is about violence against a woman, and I think if people think about it in those terms maybe the point hits home just a little bit harder. Maybe people will actually understand that it is not against a section of the community or it is not against a class or a big group or whatever: it is actually physically hurting a person. That is just a personal view.

There are three sections. Never commit violence towards a woman. This is pretty straightforward. It is hard to imagine that any reasonable person could have any concerns about that whatsoever—a man, a young boy, a teenager, a middle-aged man or an older man. It is pretty straightforward: just do not hurt women. Do not physically hurt a woman or any women.

The next phase, I have to say though, gets a little bit harder. Not for me personally, but for people it can get harder. The next is never excuse violence towards women. That is where people can say, 'I never do it and I never would do it' and any man could say that, but they might just turn a blind eye to it if they are aware of it and it does, if you ramp it up, become a little bit easier to avoid your responsibility to contributing positively to addressing this issue. It is, quite understandably for a lot of men, a harder thing to do.

Then I come to what I think is actually the hardest part of this for men in general: never remain silent about violence towards women, because that is actually about asking men to take some positive decisive action about an issue that they are not actually directly involved in themselves. The man who is not the perpetrator of the violence is asked to say something about it if they are aware of it happening and that is a really important step.

I am often reminded of a situation that I was in as a 21 year old, working in the hospitality industry, going upstairs late at night to return the tills, the cash, the paperwork and everything for the night to the manager's home within the establishment. There was a system whereby you did not go into the home but you could drop the gear off in a secure place without entering their premises, and, from outside the door, I did not hear any violence but I did hear this man's wife yelling and crying, saying, 'Don't hit me again, don't hit me again, you bastard.' I did not do anything. I waited to see that essentially it was over. I stayed there for about five minutes to make sure there was no more violence going on at that point in time and then I left.

That was nearly 30 years ago, and I still feel a bit ashamed about that. I am not sure that I need to put too much pressure on myself about what I should have done differently, but since then I have tried to take some positive responsibility for making a difference and fulfilling all three parts of the White Ribbon oath—not to commit, not to excuse and not to remain silent about violence towards any woman.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:45): I rise to support this motion. I thank the member for putting it on the agenda and also for his thoughtful words in speaking to the motion. Women experience violence in public places, at work and at home. I think it is also safe to say—and I am proud of this—as a government, we have been consistently looking at ways by which the government can set the prevention of violence against women as a key priority.

A lot of these things are reactions to violence that has already occurred. I agree fundamentally with what the member previously said, that it is an individual and a collective responsibility to ensure that violence against women—violence in all forms, particularly we are talking about violence against women—is stamped out. All the best measures that we will have in place to how we manage situations after it has occurred are still learnings that we can put in place as part of the strategic approach to stamping it out.

In recent years the government has made changes to legislation that has given additional rights and protections to victims of rape, sexual assault, and family and domestic violence. We have also included, as you will be aware, Deputy Speaker, the introduction of a target in South Australia's Strategic Plan to have a sustained reduction in violence against women and also you would be aware that the government introduced A Right to Safety, the next phase of South Australia's Women's Safety Strategy.

From early intervention work focused on preventing violence through to community education and awareness, and improving service responses to women experiencing violence, A Right to Safety reaffirms our commitment to reducing violence against women. It is not a commitment that just the government needs to make; it is a commitment that everyone in our community needs to make. A fundamental part of A Right to Safety is the recognition that men can and must take a role to respond to and prevent violence against women. Men can prevent violence from occurring when they see it or hear it, call out casual sexism or misogynistic comments that create attitudes where violence against women is tolerated and show boys and young men—in fact, we all have that responsibility to show the rest of society—how to live without resorting to violence.

A Right to Safety also includes a focus on improving systems through the Family Safety Framework. This is a framework that is an initiative that seeks to ensure that services to families most at risk of violence are dealt within a structured and systemic way through agencies sharing information about high-risk families and taking responsibility for supporting these families to navigate the service system. We have recently seen examples of matters within circles that were not addressed in such a way, that that could have been a preventative mechanism for some of the things we have seen in recent times. However, it is a model that has been successful and it has gone beyond state borders. It is operating in Alice Springs with family safety meetings occurring there and being established there, and a similar model is proposed for New South Wales.

With the completion of the rollout of the Family Safety Framework and the continued focus of a right to safety, we can keep on working towards ensuring that all women in this state are able to live free from violence. However, it will not matter what the government does—and I make this point without being derogatory in any way—because it needs to be a commitment by everyone in the community to ensure that we, individually and collectively, play our role in ensuring that all women in this state are able to live free from violence.

The government will also continue to improve our systems by reviewing domestic and family violence-related deaths. A position was established in the Coroner's office in 2011 which, as at 1 January 2014, had conducted file reviews and investigations on over 70 deaths reported to the Coroner. In turn, these reviews have contributed to three finalised coronial inquests with a domestic violence context. All three of these inquests have had findings and recommendations released which relate to systemic improvements regarding responses to domestic violence. These include responding appropriately to disclosures of domestic violence, and interagency information sharing, including, but not limited to, the Family Safety Framework. As a direct result of these coronial inquests, 20 recommendations specific to improving domestic violence responses have been made by state and deputy state coroners.

One of the new initiatives announced during the election, the domestic violence serial offender database, is a direct result of one of these recommendations. This, together with other new initiatives, such as the perpetrator pays intervention program model, provides an opportunity for South Australia to continue to lead innovation in the area of women's safety.

The government has also taken a strong stance on primary prevention. For example, the establishment of violence against women collaborations is one of the four key strategies in this work. The primary purpose of violence against women collaborations is to build community capacity to prevent and reduce the incidents of violence against women in local regions, creating cultural and attitudinal change within the community, thus addressing one of the underlying causes of violence against women. Each of these collaborations identifies the key issues and priorities in their own region.

For example, in western Adelaide, the Western Adelaide Violence Against Women Collaboration held successful White Ribbon events in 2012 and 2013 and has now developed a relationship with Adelaide United Football Club and will work in partnership to deliver White Ribbon activities throughout 2014. I think that is a very good initiative. We heard the previous speaker talk about organised sport. I also link that initiative to what can be done at schools to make sure that all children growing up know the respectful way of treating not only all people but, in this circumstance, women.

This government is also committed to the National Plan to Reduce Violence Against Women and their Children 2010-2022, which was released in February 2011 following endorsement from the Council of Australian Governments. This is a national plan that brings together government efforts across the nation to make a real and, importantly, a sustained reduction in the levels of violence against women. The national plan was developed in response to the Time For Action report of the National Council to Reduce Violence Against Women and their Children. The report made recommendations designed to tackle the unacceptable levels of sexual assault and domestic and family violence in Australia and provided clear directions about helping Australian women live free of violence within respectful relationships and in safe communities.

Violence against women affects all of us: men, women and children. Men can take a stand and should take a stand and refuse to accept violence against women by taking the White Ribbon oath. As half of our community, the support of men and their influence as role models to young men and boys in ending violence against women is absolutely essential. I encourage—as do all members of the government and, I expect, all members of this parliament—all men to take the White Ribbon oath to never commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:54): I rise to support this motion and I commend the member for Stuart for introducing it. Much of my information has come from the White Ribbon website and I encourage all members to view that website at some stage. When I was thinking about what I

was going to talk about today I thought about where did White Ribbon begin and where did it start? It began on 6 December 1989 when a man walked into the École Polytechnique University in Montreal and massacred 14 of his female classmates.

His actions so traumatised the nation that it brought the issue of domestic violence and violence against women to the forefront of their collective consciousness. So that was 1989. Two years' later a handful of men in Toronto decided that they had a responsibility to speak out and to work to stop men's violence against women. As a result, the White Ribbon campaign in Canada has become an annual awareness-raising event held between 25 November and 6 December.

In 1999, the United Nations General Assembly declared 25 November as the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women with a white ribbon as its iconic symbol. White Ribbon began in Australia in 2003 as part of UNIFEM now UN Women. Its vision: all women to live in safety free from all forms of men's violence; with its mission: making women's safety a man's issue too.

The campaign works through a primary prevention initiative involving awareness raising and education, programs with youth, schools, workplaces and across the broader community. Globally, White Ribbon is the world's largest male-led movement to end men's violence against women. Originating in Canada in 1991, White Ribbon is now active in more than 60 countries.

White Ribbon Australia observes the International Day of Elimination of Violence Against Women, also known as White Ribbon Day, annually on 25 November. White Ribbon Day signals the start of the 16 days of activism to stop violence against women, which ends on Human Rights Day, 10 December. However, the campaign runs all year and is evident across the community through examples like advertising, marketing campaigns such as 'Uncover Secrets', social media, community events and White Ribbon Night in July.

Intimate partner violence is the most common type of violence against women affecting 30 per cent of women worldwide. In Australia we are not immune. Violence against women is a serious problem where, over a 12-month period, on average, one woman is killed every week as a result of intimate partner violence. A woman is most likely to be killed by her male partner in her home. Domestic and family violence is a principal cause of homelessness for women and their children.

Intimate partner violence is the leading contributor to death, disability and ill health in Australia for women aged 15 to 44. One in three women have experienced physical and/or sexual violence perpetrated by somebody known to them. One in four children are exposed to domestic violence which is recognised as a form of child abuse. The estimated cost to the Australian economy is \$15.6 billion per year. One in five women over 18 has been stalked during her lifetime.

Research indicates that there is an increased risk of mental health, behavioural and learning difficulties from children exposed to intimate partner violence. Children exposed to domestic violence are more likely to perpetrate this violence. Domestic violence impacts an employee's ability to perform tasks in the workplace. Violence against women in the workplace impacts on the organisational climate and employees' sense of wellbeing.

But there is hope. Research also shows that building greater equality and respect between men and women can reduce attitudes that support violence. Social policy initiatives addressing gender inequity are central to reducing violence against women. The violence perpetrated by men against women must stop and it is up to men to stop it. The victims are not merely statistics: they are wives, sisters, mothers, daughters and friends. Good men cannot and will not sit on the sidelines while those they love are at risk of harm.

The White Ribbon campaign is about recognising the positive role that men play in preventing violence against women. It fosters and encourages male leadership in the prevention of violence against women, based on the understanding that most men are not violent. The campaign is a means for men to speak out against violence against women and to safely and effectively challenge the attitudes and behaviours of a minority of men who use or condone violence against women.

White Ribbon Australia believes in the capacity of an individual to change and to encourage others to change as well. Our generation can and must work towards stopping violence against

women so that all women can live in safety, free from violence and abuse. The prevention of violence against women will change society for the better. White Ribbon exists in Australia due to the generous support of individuals, community partners and governments, as well as the community at large.

In doing a bit of research about how White Ribbon is funded, I must admit I was a little bit shocked to find that only 4 per cent comes from state government, 34 per cent from the commonwealth, 23 per cent from merchandise sales, 15 per cent from fundraising community events and 24 per cent from donations. In the region I represent, the seat of Mount Gambier, we hold numerous White Ribbon events and have a group of men who are extremely dedicated to the cause, and I will mention their names individually.

White Ribbon events kick off tonight at the town hall with a White Ribbon cocktail event, and I have been paired out this afternoon with the Hon. John Dawkins from the other place to make sure we can make that event down in Mount Gambier. It is followed tomorrow, Friday, by a White Ribbon breakfast sponsored by the Limestone Coast Family Violence Action Group.

On Sunday, there is Walk the Talk, which is a community event walking around the Blue Lake. If last year's numbers are anything to go by, it will be very well attended and something to be proud of. On Monday, we have the Mulga Street White Ribbon presentations, where we will be talking to years 6 and 7 boys at Mulga Street Primary School about White Ribbon and its importance.

On Tuesday, which is of course White Ribbon Day, we have Mount Gambier's Loudest Shout, where groups of five are encouraged to come together with a decibel reader to record the highest decibels in saying no to family violence. As you can see, tonight kicks off the start of a very proactive community response to the White Ribbon campaign.

I want to point out some of the main contributors in our region and people whom I hold in high esteem and classify as friends in many instances. Superintendent Trevor Twilley has tirelessly campaigned for White Ribbon for many years in our region, and Scott Dickson, Robert Foggo, David Mezinac, Steve Perryman, Norm Elliott, Brenton Lewis, Tony Byfieldt, Mark Thompson, Andy Thomas and Paul Scicluna are just a few of the many active members of my community saying no to violence against women.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:04): I too rise to support the motion by the member for Stuart:

That this house recognises White Ribbon Day and encourages all men to swear an oath to never commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women.

This motion is very apt in this week leading into White Ribbon Day next week on 25 November. On that day, I will be leading the pledge at Murray Bridge. Everyone will be meeting at Diamond Park and then walking down one side of the main street (Bridge Street), crossing the street and coming up the other side to Edwards Square and having some lunch. I will then lead the pledge. For some reason, they reckon I am good enough to lead the shout-out to a record. I think that we will crack it.

We have many male supporters of White Ribbon Day in our community in Hammond. The pledge is where men participate by placing their right hand over their heart and raising their left hand to swear 'not to condone, excuse or remain silent to violence committed towards women and children'. White Ribbon is a male-led campaign to end men's violence against women. Men can play a positive role in preventing violence by challenging the attitudes and behaviours of the minority of men who condone this type of behaviour.

The vision of the White Ribbon campaign is that all women live in safety, free from all forms of men's violence. We must always remember that the victims may be someone we know—a sister, a neighbour or a friend. The campaign works through primary prevention initiatives involving awareness-raising and education, and programs with youth, through the schools, workplaces, and across the broader community.

The White Ribbon campaign started due to an horrific event in 1989 in Montreal: a man walked into the École Polytechnique and massacred 14 female students. Two years later, a group of men decided that they had a responsibility to speak out and to work towards stopping men's violence against women. In 1999, the United Nations General Assembly declared 25 November as the

International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women, with a white ribbon as its iconic symbol. White Ribbon began in Australia in 2003, and there are six ways of being formally involved:

- as an ambassador, which I am: men representing White Ribbon in the community;
- as an advocate: men and women supporting the White Ribbon campaign;
- in the workplace: the workplace accreditation program and workplace giving;
- schools and young people, a very good place to reach the youth of today: Breaking the Silence schools program and the White Ribbon Australia Youth Forum;
- as a supporter: progressing the White Ribbon campaign through grassroots activities, which I think is extremely important, as is the schools and youth program, in making sure that we get education through to everyone. Starting at a young age gets that message through at an early stage in a person's life; and
- as a partner: getting involved in strategic activities to expand the reach and impact of the White Ribbon campaign.

The mission of the White Ribbon campaign is to make women's safety a man's issue too. White Ribbon Australia believes that most men are good, and good men abhor such violence. We cannot sit on the sidelines while women are at risk of harm. Everyone in this house can become a White Ribbon Ambassador by registering on the White Ribbon website.

The prevention of violence against women will change our society for the better. I am always dismayed and horrified when I hear news of a woman who has suffered a horrible assault or has been killed because of a man's violence against them. It is far more manly and far better for men to control themselves and to walk away; in fact, it is gutless to be involved in such activity.

White Ribbon has many interesting articles on its website, and it talks about what action can be taken, apart from other steps in offering support and taking action. Experience has shown that when people start to talk about violence they can often feel compelled to disclose their own experience.

Alternatively, you may recognise the signs of violence in a family member, a friend, a neighbour or work colleague and wonder what to do. Many women who have experienced or are experiencing domestic violence cope with it alone and stay silent. While they may develop a range of active strategies to protect themselves and limit the impact of the violence, many do not seek any outside help. They tell nobody at all. Sadly (and I will not identify the people involved) there was a murder in the Mallee many years ago now, and from what I understood the woman involved always had another exit out of a room in most rooms in the house, but sadly the day she was murdered she got caught in the laundry, I believe, and there was only one way in and one way out; a very sad story of someone trying to deal with an abusive husband.

When women do disclose the situation to a family member or friend, the first response is often critical in determining how and whether they will proceed any further. Typically, violence against women is under reported and statistics show that a victim of violence is more likely to discuss and disclose their experience to a friend or family member than to the police or another public authority. It is important to know where to refer people and how to deal with people telling you about their experience. If someone wants to talk to you about their experience, there is some simple advice from the White Ribbon website, which includes:

- Find a safe/quiet space to talk;
- Listen—this may be the first time [the woman] has spoken about the experience;
- Have a non-judgmental attitude;
- Believe the woman's story;
- Reassure her that it is not her fault;
- Hold the perpetrator responsible for the violence and abuse;
- Provide emotional and practical support;

- Support the woman's choices;
- Don't be overly directive.

The theme in this advice in dealing with a victim of domestic violence is to listen, take everything on board and take appropriate action.

There is also some advice on the website about people using violence and how you treat them. If you talk to someone you suspect is violent to their partner or another person, it is highly likely they will tell you to mind your own business, make excuses or totally deny it. None of these responses mean that abuse is not occurring. It is common for a person who is being abusive to deny or minimise the abuse, and probably the only way you may be able to verify that a person is abusive is if their partner tells you they are or if you witness the abuse.

People who often appear to be 'respectable and normal' can be abusive in the privacy of their own home. If you do observe abuse, and you feel safe or able, talk about the behaviour you have observed. For example, 'You are my friend, but I think the way you criticise and intimidate her is wrong.' I can understand that many people would find that action intimidating in itself, but it needs to be taken, especially if it is a close friend involved in such behaviour, because it must not happen at all, and it must be stopped.

Also if you only know about the abuse because the victim has talked to you about it, be careful to check with her first before saying anything to her partner. Her partner could become more abusive to her if he or she thinks she has told someone. Research also shows that men who use violence generally seek relationship counselling rather than domestic violence counselling, often in response to ultimatums delivered by their partners. White Ribbon Day is something we can all easily be involved in and should be involved in, and we must totally stamp out any form of violence against women and children.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:14): I rise to support the member for Stuart's motion in recognising the White Ribbon Day and his invitation for men to sign up to this worthy cause and be examples to others of the importance of the demonstration of rejection of any form of domestic violence, principally towards women and children. I have said before in this house that I only ever acted for one man who was a victim of domestic violence—he was brutally beaten, actually, by his partner—but overwhelmingly the statistics confirm to us that women and children in a domestic situation are the most vulnerable. They are frequently the most victimised and our statistics in relation to death and serious injury speak for themselves.

I just want to place on the record that recently I learned at a domestic violence forum that, far from the one person a week being murdered in Australia as a victim of domestic violence, in fact for the 10 months of this year we are already up to 80 in Australia and, if we go along at the same rate, we will be up to at least four per fortnight for this year, which is frightening. We welcome initiatives of any governments or parliaments, whether that be programs or legislation respectively, that will assist in this regard. The importance of White Ribbon Day is to reinforce the significance of the general population also saying, 'We reject this. It is alright to say no, we should say no, and we should report and protect and support those who are victims or are suspected to be victims.'

I can say that certainly before coming into this place, there have been circumstances where I was frequently asked questions like, 'Why do women stay in these environments?' and there is a multitude of reasons, but we do not need to traverse them today. I have had questions like, 'What should we advise women to do in this situation?' and there are some programs (not many, but some) which are working very hard to provide support in that regard, and also, 'What laws are there to protect us?' and, again, there are several, some more effective than others.

I suppose the concern I have, having been in here now for over 12 years, is that much is talked about in expanding the definition of violence, in making it easier for intervention orders to be made or the old restraining orders to be made in recognising that this is a serious problem and protection is not only warranted but necessary to be elevated and, included in that, the power for police officers in certain circumstances to be able to grant intervention orders. So, more people more often for more things can grant a legislative framework to give protection to women.

Yet, sadly, just in the last few years, we have had the Coroner's report for the Robyn Hayward case—the murder of a woman by her partner who was subsequently shot by police. She was murdered in a circumstance where there was already a restraint order in place. More recently, sadly, there was the stabbing of Zahra Abrahamzadeh at the Persian celebration a few years ago. The coronial report there confirmed that, even in the absence of an injunctive procedure, multiple reports had been made to the law enforcement agencies, particularly the police, and they had comprehensively failed this lady. The tragedy for me is that we keep reading these reports and we continue to have this problem.

I picked up *The Advertiser* the other day to read a report prepared by Lauren Novak in which the government were exclusively giving a story about how they are doing great things, in particular minister Gail Gago, with respect to intervention orders. Having been introduced four years ago, taken two years to actually get operational, and now been operating for two years with the knowledge of what deficiencies surround those intervention orders, her great initiative is that she is going to talk to her department about cranking up penalties. Well, hello: you need to enforce these. The attention and energy needs to be in ensuring they are enforced.

It is a feeble excuse, and I put it as high as that, to say that sometimes there is an inconsistency between Family Court orders and state-based court intervention orders when there is a clear provision in our law that enables a state magistrate or judge to make an order where there is an existing Family Court order and even vary the terms of that order in circumstances including that new evidence has to be brought before the state court. It is clearly set out in the legislation. So it is a pathetic excuse to hide behind what to me is an area which ought to be crystal clear to the minister.

To simply say, 'I'm going to go back in to my department and talk to them about how we might enforce this better by cranking up penalties,' none of that will mean anything unless the minister is prepared to go to the cabinet and say that this has to be a priority for all of the government, and to ensure that the agencies, the Minister for Police and the Attorney-General understand the significance of the enforcement in relation to that.

I am always concerned when these issues are raised. Recently, there was a statement made by the government which included that police had established a Family and Domestic Violence Branch within its structure. I am old enough to remember when we had debates in the 1970s and 1980s on rape within marriage, and the importance of having specialised units within the police department and the then prosecution arm (which was pre the DPP) to ensure that we had sensitive collection of information from the victims and a provision of enforcement within these agencies. We have had taskforces and units; I do not care how much they rebadge them, but in reality they need to be acted upon.

Have some alarm bracelets, have some opportunities for women to have real protection in circumstances where they are obviously under threat, rather than continually just saying, 'Well, we will talk amongst ourselves and come up with some higher penalties.' That will never resolve this problem. It concerns me greatly, for example, that we have a Victims of Crime Fund which is overflowing with money.

I am not here to talk about the problems the Attorney-General is having in actually making sure money gets out to victims, but what I do want to say is this: we have got an advertising campaign for just about everything in this state. No matter what it is, we have an advertising campaign or a pamphlet from the government, firstly about how good they are, and secondly how brilliantly their idea is in respect of the material that is being distributed or advertised.

Advertising campaigns are now so prolific that they come under the watch of the Auditor-General, and yet where do I see an advertising campaign to the general public in respect of domestic violence which says, 'It is not okay,' or whatever the logo is that the marketing and advertising people come up with? I am not the expert on that, but I make this point: we have got driving advertisements, we have advertisements in relation to no smoking, no punching, no—everything, but where is the domestic violence advertising campaign?

We have a fund for victims of crime which is exploding with money—I think it is up over \$180 million now—which props up the balance sheet for the government in respect of the money in their control, rather than applying it to what it really needs to do, and that is to be active in the space.

Do not come into the parliament and just crank out laws, add on penalties, say that you are going to undertake enforcement and not do that, and not address the most important issue, which is educating the public that it is not acceptable to beat or hit women.

I will finally conclude by saying that it was very disappointing when the government dealt with this issue of mandatory imprisonment in respect of manslaughter charges, in respect of which we on our side of the house pointed out that it would mean, in some cases, only a day, but then they amended that to actually make it more effective. But do they not realise how significant this is to women, the many women who are sitting in the women's prison as we speak, who are in there for murder or manslaughter charges in respect of those spouses who have inflicted domestic violence? That is what is missing.

The government do not click on the brain to understand the importance of the legislation they are making in relation to their mantra of, 'We demand a harder, tougher, better, stronger, rack, pack and stack 'em approach,' without understanding that the victims here are women and children. That is what they need to refocus their brain on so that we actually have some improvement in this state.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Frome, I would just like to acknowledge the group in the Speaker's Gallery this morning: the Colonnades walkers group. They are guests of the member for Mawson, who is not here, so they are being looked after, very ably I am sure, by the member for Reynell. We welcome them to parliament today and hope they enjoy their time here with us. Member for Frome.

Motions

WHITE RIBBON DAY

Debate resumed.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:24): I, like other members on both sides of this house, have great pleasure supporting the member for Stuart's motion that this house recognises White Ribbon Day and encourages all men to swear an oath to never commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women.

I think it is a poor state of affairs that, in today's society, we have to speak about issues of violence against women in general. I think it is an issue that we all should have respect for, no matter who we are, whether male or female. We should be able to respect everybody without violence, and it does not have to be physical violence, it can actually be mental violence. This is a real issue that society needs to address very seriously. The member for Bragg went on about lots of issues, and I agree with some of the concerns that she raised.

I am a White Ribbon Ambassador and have been for many years and, as others in this room, I am very proud to be an ambassador. One of the ways we can promote White Ribbon Day to stop violence against women is to become a White Ribbon advocate, advocating for the cessation of any violence against women, or a White Ribbon Ambassador, recognising the importance of men taking responsibility and playing a leadership role in preventing men's violence against women. White Ribbon ambassadors are formal representatives of White Ribbon Australia who have the knowledge, skills, attributes and determination to influence Australian men—and let me say also non-Australian men, our new migrants coming in to our communities—to critically evaluate their attitudes and behaviours toward women.

I am sure everybody here wonders how we could get that message across. As I said earlier, I do not think we should have to try to get this message across; it should be instilled in us in our youth and as we grow up. We can get the message across by wearing an ambassador pin. That would promote it but it would not reduce the violence or make anything secure. We could also promote it through the media, whether it is the TV, the local papers or social media. Social media these days, with Twitter and suchlike, seems to be the way everything is going.

We could also promote it by speaking about it in our general conversations, with our wives, our families and our friends, making certain that we do not accept any violence whatsoever, be it physical or mental, against any women. We could promote it through community involvement, and everybody in this house is very heavily involved in our communities. We can do that as part of the annual march. As with other members, provided I am not down here in the parliament, I always participate in my home town of Port Pirie.

Also, I think breaking the silence at schools is one area where we need to start to get the message across. However, we also have violence at schools, so that is another issue that we need to address as a society. We seem to allow violence to happen at schools—with all due respect, I have come across this personally with some of my family—and that does not help the attitudes or confidence of those young kids. I think that is certainly where we need to start: in schools, making certain that we break that silence. If there is any idea or identification of any violence, we need to speak up.

It is also about encouraging partnership opportunities. Whether it is the White Ribbon group or others, we all need to work together. Whether we are married, in a partnership, a de facto relationship or in general, we should all show tolerance. We really should show some tolerance and step back a bit, because we all get to the point where we feel lots of pressure, especially in our field and others. The best thing to do, the manly thing to do, is not take it out on your partner, your wife or your girlfriend, but to stand back. I think that is more manly and courageous than anything else.

Violence against women is not a masculine act. I think it is an act of cowardice. It is absolutely low. It is the lowest act I can think of. We all get frustrated but, as I said, it is more manly to say, 'I'm going to walk away' and defuse the situation. It is more masculine to step back and cool your head. I ask everybody here and everyone in the general community to keep an eye out for our female friends for any sign of violence.

As I said earlier, at times there may be no signs of actual physical injury to the person. It can be emotional or mental violence, and I will talk about this with regard to suicide later on. It is something we may not be able to see but, if there is a change of attitude, a change of mannerism or a change in the way our female friends operate, maybe they are hiding something. We can ask, 'Are you alright?' but if they say yes, it does not mean there is nothing behind the scenes. I would ask everybody to look at our female friends and associates very closely and report any signs at all to the authorities.

I know other members have spoken in this house this morning. I support this 100 per cent, and I encourage everybody here to at least speak about this but also speak about it outside of this house here and promote it out in the communities and our regions. The member for Stuart always brings very worthwhile motions to this house. They are not always political. They are about the general communities out there. Again, I congratulate the member for Stuart on bringing this to the house.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:30): I also rise today to support this motion and commend the member for Stuart for bringing it to the attention of the house. I support White Ribbon Day in its entirety, and I also encourage men to swear an oath to never commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women.

As you have heard, White Ribbon is Australia's only national male-led campaign to end men's violence against women. They have a great vision for all women to live in safety, free from all forms of men's violence. We have heard a little bit about their mission today. It is clear that women's safety is certainly a man's issue as well. I note that this group's ongoing campaign works through many initiatives: primary initiatives involving awareness raising, education, and various programs not only with youth in schools but also workplaces and across the broader community.

We have also heard that, globally, White Ribbon is actually the world's largest male-led movement to end men's violence against women. It originated, I believe, in Canada in 1991, and is now active in more than 60 countries across the world. It began in Australia in 2003 as part of UNIFEM, which is now UN Women, and formally became a foundation in 2007.

The campaign obviously runs all year, but I wanted to bring to members' attention that there is a wide array of ways in which they can become part of White Ribbon. I certainly intend to take the

oath in due course, but I note that there are six main ways of becoming involved in White Ribbon. One is to become an ambassador, another is to become an advocate and another is to be involved through the workplace, then through schools and with young people. You can also become a supporter through grassroots activities and then, finally, you can also become a partner to engage with and be involved in the strategic activities to expand the reach and impact of White Ribbon.

I was looking at some of the statistics, and some of them have been brought to the attention of members today, in relation to violence against women. The facts that I saw were amazing in regard to how large this issue is. I will certainly put my weight behind supporting this cause wherever I can, both in this place and also in my electorate.

I note that close to half of all women—they say about 40 per cent—have experienced violence since the age of 15. Not only that, it is said that just under one-third of women have experienced physical assault. In addition, it is shocking to hear that, of that number, nearly one in five women have experienced sexual assault, and nearly one in six women have experienced violence from a current or previous partner in their lifetime.

This is a massive issue. I commend again the member for Stuart for bringing this motion to the attention of the house. I think we all have a duty here as elected representatives of this place to get involved and support this worthy and admirable cause wherever we can. I commend the motion to the house.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:34): It goes without saying that we agree with all the things we have heard this morning about this motion. I would like to point out, too, that one of the things that I am most concerned about is the portrayal of violence in film and TV. If we have those sorts of examples before us all the time in movies and on television, and not the examples that we are talking about, they are the sorts of things that will help change community views on violence not against women in particular, but against anybody.

In terms of violence, as we have heard, the statistics are fairly horrific. If we do not know someone who has had that lived experience, we have experienced it ourselves. In my childhood, growing up in Sydney, I had a father who came home from the war very unhappy with a whole pile of issues. It was definitely a lived experience for us as children. The thing that really is important is that people know what to do when they see violence. As children, we would run out into the yard with a whistle to alert our neighbours to come in. That might seem an old-fashioned method of dealing with the problem, but it is actually important that, when the problem is discovered, something is done about it. One person going in to confront someone who is very angry is not really the answer, so we need to have ways that people can join together in groups to help people who are obviously troubled about something and need to speak to people about it.

As part of the very useful intern program through the University of Adelaide this year, an intern assigned to me has done a paper on the role of companion animals in domestic violence situations. We often hear and know—and, indeed, the paper will show that when I speak on it in more detail—that people who have pets are reluctant to leave them behind, and it is often one of the reasons that women say they stay longer than they perhaps should. It is also true that partners who perform violent acts on their animals are only one step away from being further involved in violence.

I hope to look at a way that we can introduce help for people, to have their pets boarded, so that when they do decide to leave, if that is what they decide to do, pets are safe and come with them. It is a really sad thing to think that companion animals are tied up in all of this. We also know that people who perpetrate violence against animals in front of children embed in children that sort of behaviour as being normal.

I think all the good points that have been raised this morning are terrific. It is marvellous to see people taking action, and I look forward to seeing more action on this in the community and to bring to the house in more detail the paper on pets and domestic violence after I have had a chance to read it thoroughly.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (12:37): I also rise today in support of the member for Stuart bringing this motion before the house, recognising White Ribbon Day and encouraging all men to swear an oath to never commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women. As we have

heard here today, I do not think it is acceptable in any way, shape or form to witness or to do violence against women. It is appalling, and everyone, I think, in the house would concur with that.

We have heard people talk about the different ways you can get involved—by becoming an ambassador, swearing the oath or buying a pin—but I really believe the White Ribbon message is one to be lived. I am proud to say that I am of a generation of men who have been very outspoken and made it very clear that violence against women is totally unacceptable. I note that it was in 1991 that this movement first originated in Canada. It is now active in more than 60 countries, and it is the largest male-led movement to end violence against women. I mention 1991 because at that time I was aged 20, and at the time I became a young adult—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Mr WINGARD: Yes, you become a young adult at the age of 20. I am really fortunate, I suppose, to be part of the evolution that is speaking out against violence against women, but also of a generation that has lived the White Ribbon movement. The White Ribbon campaign works through primary prevention initiatives involving awareness raising and education, programs with youth, schools, workplaces and across the broader community.

White Ribbon began in Australia in 2003 as a movement, as was pointed out by the member for Hartley. White Ribbon Australia observes the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women, also known as White Ribbon Day, annually on 25 November. White Ribbon Day signals the start of 16 days of activism to stop violence against women, which ends on Human Rights Day on 10 December. As we point out, it is fantastic to have these days or weeks where it is brought to the attention of the public per se, but I think it is great that we acknowledge it as something that, as I said earlier, must be lived. It is a movement that must be lived not one that is just singled out for a day or a week in a year.

As far as violence against women goes, we have heard some of the stats and I will repeat some of them because they are worth noting just to drive home the point. Over 12 months, on average, one woman is killed every week as a result of intimate partner violence; a woman is most likely to be killed by her male partner in her home; domestic and family violence is the principal cause of homelessness for women and their children; intimate partner violence is the leading contributor to death, disability and ill health in Australian women aged 15 to 44; one in three women have experienced physical and/or sexual violence perpetrated by someone known to them; one in four children are exposed to domestic violence, which is a recognised form of child abuse; the cost of violence against women to the Australian economy is estimated to rise to \$15.6 billion per annum; one in five women experience harassment in the workplace; one in five women over 18 have been stalked during their lifetime; there is increased risk of mental health, behavioural and learning difficulties from childhood exposure to intimate partner violence; children exposed to domestic violence are more likely to perpetrate this violence; domestic violence impacts on an employee's ability to perform tasks in the workplace; and violence against women in the workplace impacts on the organisational climate and employees' sense of wellbeing.

You can see from some of those facts how damning they are and how important it is, for all the obvious reasons but for more in depth reasons, to stamp out violence against women pretty much right across the board. I have had a number of constituents come to me, which has been one of the less pleasing parts of this role since I have been a member of this place, clearly panicked and in a very distressed state about their living conditions and the threat of violence against them, people who have lived through domestic violence and people who are working very hard to remove themselves from that situation.

On the flip side of that, I have also seen some wonderful organisations that have been working extremely hard with people in these positions. I would like to commend the Salvation Army and a number of their people who I have had through my office and worked with very closely to try to help people in situations where they feel they are under threat from domestic violence. The Salvation Army does a marvellous job in tirelessly helping people. As the member for Florey said earlier, there are people who are in a domestic situation where they feel they cannot leave their home or they have extenuating circumstances that make it very hard to leave their home and they feel they are forced to stay in a situation that is potentially threatening. It is a very disturbing place to be and they are very disturbing stories to hear.

Working with the Salvation Army was fantastic for me, just to see these great groups like that out there helping people in these difficult situations. As I say, there are plenty of great things we get to do in this role and plenty of people we get to help, and whilst I would help anyone in those situations, when you are confronted with it and you see it it is very alarming, it is very shocking and it drives home the point of why we must support the motion the member for Stuart has put forward. I again commend him for bringing it to the attention of the house because it is something that we need to be very aware of, not only on the day (25 November) but every day of the year. We need to be very aware that whilst it is something that may not directly impact on us, there are people around us who are experiencing this and when and where we can help we really must do so.

White Ribbon Day is about recognising the positive role that men can play in preventing violence against women. I talked about the White Ribbon movement and having lived through it as a young man, and grown into an older man now, and seeing the great work they have done. It is fantastic that the White Ribbon movement is so accepted, so understood and so acknowledged in society and it has really played a very big role in, I think, bringing this to the forefront and hopefully helping to reduce domestic violence against women.

We talk about the movement and how important it is to recognise that domestic violence is not just perpetrated by men against women, and that is something that should also be noted at this time. Domestic violence is not just violence perpetrated by men against women. It is important to open dialogue and discussion about all types of domestic violence, so that all victims, no matter their age or gender, can feel brave enough to come forward and seek help. That is a real key and a real great initiative of what the White Ribbon movement does; they make it so that people feel comfortable and brave enough to come forward. It creates an environment for them to be able to do that.

Domestic violence takes many shapes and forms, which include long-term psychological and emotional attacks, breaking down even the strongest of people. Not all bullies are the physically strong attacking the physically weak. Not all domestic violence involves a black eye or visible signs of abuse. Mental torture can be as damaging, and sometimes has long-lasting impacts that never heal. Not all domestic violence is perpetrated by strong men on vulnerable women. It is important that we take the time to consider that bullying comes in all shapes and sizes, and that shapes and sizes are not always what we expect.

We must be wary of falling into the path of not only supporting those whom we typically expect to be the victims of bullying or domestic violence; we must also train our emergency services personnel, social workers, doctors, teachers and others to look for the unlikely victims, the ones who keep quiet and suffer in silence. Domestic violence is not a postcode problem. It does not just impact the poor or uneducated. It is independent of wealth, education or social standing. We must give victims of violence the courage to speak up without the fear of ridicule or disbelief.

In closing, I would like to point out the fact I mentioned that the movement came about when I was a young man. Now, being an older man and the parent of children—two boys and two girls—I think it drives home the message even more. Having young children and knowing the impact that domestic violence has on them, it is important, again, as a role model to make sure that you can talk, as the member for Florey did, about other factors that can impact on the perception of domestic violence for young people, be they television or movies. I think as a parent it is important to keep a check on that and to make sure that there is no undue pressure or influence put on your children through those mediums or in the home.

I conclude by saying how important it is that we not only recognise White Ribbon Day and the movement there, but that we live the White Ribbon movement every day in our society. As role models and figures in our society, it is very important that we do pass on that message in every way, shape or form that we can, to all those around us, to young people and to people in our communities. I think it is a big part of our responsibility of being in this place, and I do accept that responsibility with great honour and hope to live up to all expectations and in the future continue to be a strong advocate for White Ribbon Day.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:48): It has been quite surprising how many of these confronting issues we deal with in parliament, whether it be domestic violence, prostitution or a whole host of other things. It has been difficult at times to confront and understand some of the not so nice things

that exist in our society. I first of all commend the member for Stuart on this motion. Can I say how important it is for the Schubert electorate. In a previous motion brought to this place on domestic violence, there was a broad discussion, and I said at the time that there are approximately 150 families in my electorate who have instances where domestic violence has been perpetrated against women—150 families. I keep repeating that figure, because it is not good enough. It is something that my community needs to grapple with, get over, deal with and move on.

To that end, I believe that my role as a local leader is to get involved and do what I can. Something small I am going to do tomorrow morning is be out at the Nuri Foodland, or the co-op, as we call it in the Barossa, for my local White Ribbon Day barbecue. I look forward to serving sausages and providing a gentle reminder to all those with whom we come into contact that this is not okay and that as a community we are doing what we can to move on.

But there is more that I would like to do, and I have been lucky enough to be working with the Northern Domestic Violence Service and also the police, my local LSA, to help change this culture. I think it is important that we find ways to actively change the culture, and White Ribbon Day is certainly part of it, but, as previous speakers have said, it cannot just be confined to one day or a week: it has to be a constant focus.

What I am going to do with my local NDVS and police is go out into community groups and spread the message, encouraging young people to sign up to the pledge to help bring about generational change in the culture and the way that we deal with domestic violence. We are hoping to go into local sporting clubs and predominantly male-dominated sporting clubs, giving them the message that this is not okay and that our generation and the next generation are going to be at the forefront helping to stamp this out of Australian and South Australian culture.

We need as a society, and especially as men, to stand up and say it is not good enough. We need to call it what it is. We need to not stand idly by. The motion brought forward today deals with all those things and it is fantastic that we can debate it in this place, but it does need to translate into action. That is why I thought I would put on the record a couple of the things I am doing in my local community to try to address this problem so that it is not just about politicians getting up and speaking in parliament but that it is about real action and real effective change that helps to improve the culture of this beautiful place we call home.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:51): I too rise to speak about this very important motion regarding White Ribbon Day. I commend the member for Stuart for bringing forward another fine motion.

A bit of the history around White Ribbon Day has been stated over and over, but I will put on the record that the 1999 United Nations General Assembly declared 25 November as International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women. While the white ribbon is its iconic symbol, the White Ribbon foundation was formed in Australia in 2003, and White Ribbon Australia is Australia's only national male-led primary prevention campaign to end men's violence against women. White Ribbon Day also signals the start of the 16 days of activism to stop violence against women which ends on 10 December which, of course, is Human Rights Day.

I concur with you, Deputy Speaker, that the modern day TV, the modern day video and modern day interactive video games are a real fuel for violence of all descriptions. I was watching a show late last night and was horrified at the violence, but it is just a modern day TV show and modern day viewing. That is something I would like to see reviewed, over time. It is a crazy world we live in.

I declare that I have witnessed domestic violence and I have been touched by domestic violence, particularly as a younger fellow but, also, in my role as a member of parliament. I have been to a number of incidents around domestic violence. I also commend our police force because they encounter domestic violence on a daily basis. What they have to deal with certainly is touching.

Domestic violence is traditionally seen as a hidden issue and, in many instances, it happens behind closed doors, but it should be everybody's business. There is a need to have more community education so more people talk about it and domestic violence is part of discussion so that it is talked about and dealt with and frowned upon, so that people are aware that everyone is watching.

On average, as we have seen, one woman is killed every week. The member for Bragg has noted that at the moment it is more than that. In some cases, it is almost two a week. I think that is of grave concern. It is having a devastating impact on families, and, particularly, children.

It is important to note that the Riverland is holding a White Ribbon Day event next Tuesday on the Berri riverfront and I will be in attendance. I will be taking the oath and making myself a White Ribbon Ambassador. I would also like to note that the current White Ribbon Day ambassadors—Reggie Black, Geoff Carson, Ashley Couzens and Brad Sargent—are great ambassadors. They are great role models within the Riverland community and they are just some of the voices and advocates for White Ribbon Day.

Centacare Murraylands Domestic Violence Service services the Riverland, Adelaide Hills, Murray Bridge, the Coorong areas and has offices in Berri and Murray Bridge. It has a far outreach service to Mount Barker, Loxton, Renmark, Waikerie and elsewhere. The service covers a population of about 70,000 people, and an area of about 49,000 square kilometres. The Murraylands Domestic Violence Service is funded by government to provide support and supported accommodation for women and children experiencing domestic violence. This service deals with about 550 individuals per quarter. However, the funding is only there to deal with about 400 cases but in the last financial year the local staff worked with more than 700 families—and 700 families is significant.

A recent survey by that organisation of 100 local women showed that 48 per cent did not report domestic violence incidents to police and 66 per cent of women had lost count of how many times they had been physically assaulted. That is an alarming statistic.

I also acknowledge the efforts of Salvation Army in this area and I acknowledge other organisations dealing with domestic violence and, once again, I particularly acknowledge the police who deal with domestic violence on a daily basis. No-one should have to live with domestic violence and it is vital that our communities continue to educate people that domestic violence is never okay. White Ribbon Day is an important initiative and I encourage everyone to attend events being held in their electorates. Anyone affected by domestic violence can call the one 1800RESPECT hotline to provide help and information. I commend the motion to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Stuart, to close the debate.

Ms DIGANCE: Can I speak to this?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Only very quickly. You weren't on the list; I have made arrangements—you've got a minute.

Ms DIGANCE: Maybe I can seek leave to continue after.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, that was not the purpose of the exercise. If you were going to speak we would have appreciated notice.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (12:57): I apologise, madam. I will cut to the chase. I wanted to speak about the plight of children in particular in relation to violence, as a group that is exposed to violence against women. ABS personal safety reports show that almost 1.2 million women around Australia had experienced partner violence at some time in their lives. There is a large body of work on the impact of domestic partner violence on these children. The report says exposure to domestic violence or being a victim themselves may affect children differently depending on their circumstances and may also affect them differently as they grow older.

Several studies have found that toddlers from violent homes expressed emotionally distressed behaviour less often than other children; nonetheless, common developmental problems in small children include excessive irritability, regressive behaviour around language and toilet training, sleep disturbances, emotional distress and a fear of being alone.

In summary, children who are exposed to domestic violence and witnessing violence against women do suffer along life's journey. Some manage to become self-actualising adults who can champion the cause against domestic violence, and that is significant. I commend White Ribbon Day and its acknowledgement and I commend the fact that deep at the heart of this is the education program. I think education is the key to changing our values and our attitudes towards violence

against women in society. So, member for Stuart, thank you for raising this important matter today in recognition of White Ribbon Day.

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

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Ombudsman SA—An audit of state government agencies' complaint handling
November 2014 [Ordered to be published]

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

Central Adelaide Local Health Network—Cardiothoracic Intensive Care External Review
12 Month Progress Report November 2014
Health Advisory Council—Kingston Robe Health Advisory Council Inc.
Annual Report 2013-14
National Health Funding Pool—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee—Annual Report 2013-14
Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board of South
Australia—Annual Report 2013-14
Teachers Registration Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Communities and Social Inclusion, Department for—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Social Housing (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

South Australian Housing Trust—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Multicultural Affairs (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Ageing (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Administration of the Retirement Villages Act 1987—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Dog Fence Board—Annual Report 2013-14
Environment, Water and Natural Resources, Department of—Annual Report 2013-14
Native Vegetation Council—Annual Report 2013-14
South Australian Water Corporation—Annual Report 2013-14
Technical Regulator Plumbing—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Across Government Asbestos Risk Reductions—Annual Report 2013-14
Harbors and Navigation Act—Annual Report 2013-14
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, Department of—Annual Report 2013-14
South Australian Rail Access Regulation—Annual Report 2013-14

Surveyors Board SA—Annual Report 2013-14
Tarcoola -Darwin Rail Regulation—Annual Report 2013-14

Ministerial Statement

CHINA-AUSTRALIA LEADERS FORUM

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:00): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yesterday, I attended the first China-Australia Leaders Forum in Sydney along with state and territory leaders from around Australia. Representatives from the Chinese sister provinces of each of our states and territories were also present.

We are proud of South Australia's sister-state relationship with Shandong Province, and it was highly encouraging that the most important decision-maker in the province, the Communist Party Secretary of Shandong Province, Jiang Yikang, was present at the forum. This was the third time I have had the opportunity to speak to Mr Jiang, and together we further strengthened our relationship.

I was joined at the forum by a delegation of South Australian business, industry and government leaders representing the many sectors of the South Australian economy likely to benefit from the trade agreement. I greatly appreciate their interest in developing stronger ties with China, and it indicates a growing awareness of the China opportunity—an opportunity that we are well placed to seize.

The forum represented an immediate opportunity to develop a strategy to maximise the benefit of the recently concluded China-Australia Free Trade Agreement. Leaders like Hagen Stehr, Darren Thomas, Karen Kent and Jason Kuchel were present yesterday to take advantage of the opportunity to promote newly-strengthened opportunities in the agribusiness, aquaculture, wine, education and mining sectors in South Australia.

The first session of the forum was a one-on-one session between South Australia and China. Together, we agreed to hold the second South Australian Shandong Development and Cooperation Forum in May next year. This represents another significant opportunity for our state. Both sides want to take the relationship to the next level.

During the final session of the China-Australia Leaders Forum, I was asked to address the forum. I took the opportunity to promote our health industry sector, describing our health precinct and our expertise in this area. Subsequent discussions confirmed Shandong's demand for our products and expertise in the health industries, and we will now work hard to develop opportunities in this sector. The forum concluded with speeches from Prime Minister Tony Abbott and the President of the People's Republic of China, Mr Xi Jinping.

Following the announcement of a consulate general, and the signing of the FTA, our presence at the China-Australia Leaders Forum capped off a significant week for South Australia's relationship with China.

CLEAN ENERGY SUMMIT

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:03): I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Last week I made a statement in this place about renewable energy. I spoke of Prime Minister Tony Abbott's proposed cuts to the renewable energy target that will hurt existing clean energy projects, undermine new investment and force up household power prices. I spoke of the importance of this sector to South Australia and of this government's priority in building, from the ground up, a thriving, clean energy sector in this state. Indeed, South Australia's achievements in this area are remarkable.

Earlier this week the Climate Council released its report into renewable energy where it identified that:

South Australia is the most desirable market in Australia for renewable energy investment with around \$5.5 billion invested since 2003, with the majority in rural areas. With effective renewable energy policies, South Australia moved from having little renewable energy a decade ago to installing the most renewable energy since 2001 on a total and per capita basis. South Australia leads the country in wind and solar PV.

However, in a policy environment that proposes cuts to the renewable energy target, much of this is at risk.

That is why I announced in this place that I would convene a clean energy summit. I am pleased to inform the house that this summit will be held on 1 December here at Parliament House and will bring together key industry, community and opinion leaders because this issue is about more than emissions. It is about jobs, it is about our future industry, and it is about reducing power prices. It is about supporting local employment, transport companies that haul turbine parts, electricians who install PV panels, and fitters who construct housings. It is about transitioning to advanced manufacturing, developing high skilled high value industries to replace automotive manufacturing following the Abbott government's withdrawal of support for Holden. It is about substituting power that is effectively free to produce into our power grid offsetting higher cost generators.

Beyond our borders international leaders are recognising the need for action on climate change. The recent US-China climate agreement shows two of the world's largest economies are working together to address climate change. Australia is at risk of being left behind and it is South Australia's nation-leading clean energy sector that will pay the price.

This emergency summit will send a clear message to the commonwealth government that bipartisan support for clean energy is integral, not only for our state, but for our nation. We hope that as a result of the summit we will have a clear agreed position from the clean energy sector on the way forward, recognising the importance of the renewable energy target and the impact of the removal of this target, not only to the sector but to all South Australians.

CARDIOTHORACIC INTENSIVE CARE REVIEW

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: In 2012, Central Adelaide Local Health Network began working towards creating an integrated intensive care service that will provide intensive care to patients across the Royal Adelaide Hospital and The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The new model includes the co-location of cardiothoracic and general intensive care patients in the same intensive care unit, and is the model that is intended for use at the new 60-bed ICU at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Historically there has been a level of disagreement between cardiothoracic surgeons and intensivists over the management of patient care following cardiothoracic surgery at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and until last year cardiothoracic patients were treated in a separate unit and not the general ICU. A review was commissioned that aimed to identify how the cardiothoracic ICU and general ICU could progress to an integrated service, and this review was completed in September 2013.

The team selected to carry out the review included well-respected peer experts from interstate including: Dr Richard Chard, a cardiac surgeon from Westmead Hospital in New South Wales; Professor Charlie Corke, an intensivist from Barwon Health in Victoria; Professor Geoff Dobb, an intensivist from the Royal Perth Hospital; Judy Currey, director of postgraduate studies (critical care nurse educator, researcher and clinician) from Deakin University in Melbourne; and Professor Paddy Phillips, chief medical officer at SA Health.

The review team made several recommendations to help with the integration of the two units as the care of post-operative cardiothoracic patients in intensive care moved from the stand-alone cardiothoracic unit to a hub within the RAH's general ICU.

In September 2014, the review team returned to assess the progress of their recommendations and provided a new report that includes 20 recommendations for improvement and has highlighted several matters that are of grave concern to me.

The reviewers found that the central matter of culture and behaviour remained a serious issue and that little progress had been made on the lack of teamwork between clinicians in the ICU and the cardiothoracic unit. Stunningly, the report highlights incidents of bullying, derogatory behaviour and a lack of respect for fellow professionals within and between clinical specialties, culminating in the reviewers concluding that 'some of the levels of dysfunction are unprecedented and present a real risk to patient care and staff wellbeing'.

Another behaviour uncovered by the reviewers was, 'a long running episode of bullying anonymous notes about certain members of nursing staff'. I find this kind of abuse of authority over the hardest working patient carers reprehensible. This sort of behaviour would not be tolerated in a schoolyard and I will not tolerate it in an intensive care unit.

The safety and wellbeing of our patients has to be at the centre of everything we do as a health service, and internal conflict and dysfunction within and between clinical teams should never be allowed to impact on the care that patients receive. To address the significant importance of patient safety, a new Head of Intensive Care for the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, Dr Gerry O'Callaghan, has been appointed, as has a new Head of Cardiothoracic Intensive Care, Dr Matt Hooper, but I am concerned there is still a long way to go.

The Central Adelaide Local Health Network is now focused on carrying out the remaining recommendations from the review team's report and fixing the problems that have been identified. The successful implementation of these recommendations needs leadership from the hospital's management team and the cooperation of clinical staff. They must all work together to deliver the best and safest outcomes for patients, setting aside whatever internecine disputes they have.

This process will be headed up by Dr O'Callaghan, Dr Hooper and the Nursing Co-Director of Critical Care, Dr Tina Jones. I place a great deal of trust in this team's skill, knowledge and experience, and I expect that they will put the appropriate measures in place to rectify this wholly unacceptable situation.

We have entered on the journey of transforming our health system. This means that we must change, and that includes moving on from the past and looking to the future. It means examining all aspects of our system from clinical practice and professional behaviour to where our clinicians provide services and the impacts of things like the way we employ our staff and private practice for doctors.

Under our health system some of this state's most highly paid public servants, our doctors, have access to patient practice entitlement which the public tolerate in return for better health outcomes. However, any doctor in any public hospital who engages in private practice needs to understand that matters of private practice cannot impact on the public health system lest that public trust be broken. Doctors have good access to private patients and it is important to ensure that any conflicts that arise from their work in the private sector, whether these issues are real or perceived, are managed appropriately.

I want to emphasise that the overwhelming majority of our doctors and nurses and other health professionals diligently work day in and day out to help us create a health system that makes best use of its resources, is adaptive to the latest medical knowledge and can cope with big changes such as the transition to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital so that patients receive the best possible care. For this, these doctors and nurses have my wholehearted thanks. To those few other clinicians, who are not doing the right thing, my message is plain: your behaviour is childish, unacceptable and potentially dangerous. It will not be tolerated and it must stop.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I ask that the minister table both the September 2013 report that he has referred to and the September 2014 report in this ministerial statement.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am more than happy. It was released on the Health intranet last year. I do not have a copy on me but I am more than happy to make that available. If the member for Schubert googles it, he might find it.

The SPEAKER: I was about to call on the member for Schubert.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: there is a second report referred to in the ministerial report and that is—

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I just said I would bring it back.

The SPEAKER: Both reports.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is called to order.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament the Colonnades walkers group, who are guests of the member for Mawson.

Ministerial Statement

SERVICE SA

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:16): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I rise to update the house on yesterday's computer system outage that affected the ability of Service SA to process licence and registration renewals. At the outset, I apologise to everyone who was affected by this disruption and assure the house that every single person adversely affected will be assisted to resolve their problem.

In the early hours of yesterday morning a major problem with the TRUMPS computer system arose while a contractor was undertaking some maintenance work. SAPOL, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and relevant DPTI staff were made aware of the computer outage in order to allow for steps to be taken to avoid unduly affecting individuals as far as possible. The system came back online around 2pm yesterday and Service SA customer centres reopened at 9am today, with additional staff to help address any backlog in processing renewals.

I recognise that there will be some people who have been inconvenienced by not receiving sufficient notice that the system was down and centres were closed. The communications response was not adequate and is being reviewed so that we have an improved response should a similar event occur in the future. I am also aware that there will be some people who inadvertently paid more than once over the internet. TRUMPS completed reconciling transactions overnight and anyone who had more than one amount debited from their account had the overpaid amount refunded to their financial institution for processing by that bank or credit union.

There may be some customers who will require a personal intervention from staff. Staff, on both phone and face to face at customer service centres, are ready to assist those customers. I ask, if any members have constituents with ongoing problems, that they put them in contact with my office to address their issue in a timely manner.

Again, I apologise to customers affected by this problem and assure the house that my office and Service SA will do all we can to remedy individual problems. Computer systems will fail; our priority needs to be the customer. People need to be informed as soon as possible when these events occur so that they can make alternative arrangements and the inconvenience is minimised as much as possible. We will be learning lessons from this week's events and put in place plans to improve communications.

*Question Time***EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Given that CFS modelling has shown we face a prolonged and intense fire danger season, is the government considering any contingency plans to deal with the possibility of mass resignations across the CFS in protest against the ESL tax hikes?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:19): I would like to thank the leader for the question. In answer to the first part of his question, we are preparing for contingency plans. Of course, we prepare, based on the information we have available for contingencies. In other words, we are also planning for the early onset of the summer season, for example. In terms of mass resignations, I have not been advised. If you have the information, pass it on to me.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): Supplementary, sir: is the minister aware, or can he confirm, that a further six CFS units from the Barossa Valley region are now also refusing to fight fires on government land due to the ESL increases?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:20): I am not aware of the Barossa one. It has not been brought to my attention, but I am certainly aware of the one in Echunga, which was announced. It was interesting to note that the members from the Echunga CFS Brigade actually did not provide a blanket withdrawal of their services. They said they would actually take every matter case by case. The other matter is that all government land has measures in place, and have had measures in place for many years, to deal with that.

Mr Pengilly: A bucket of water and a hose.

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is called to order.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Actually, that's quite insulting to the staff who do work in DEWNR and other agencies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is called to order. The member for Finniss is warned.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: We have a number of staff in a number of agencies who provide—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —a primary fire service. That is not to say that we do not appreciate and do not benefit from the support of CFS volunteers, but to suggest that these areas are not protected in some way is just inappropriate and wrong.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, leader.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Is the minister aware of any other CFS units that are joining the protest on ESL increases?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:21): Sorry, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Which other brigades are joining the protest?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The only ones that have come to my attention are two on Eyre Peninsula. I am also aware that the CFS brigades in the Riverland have made a public statement saying that they will not join that protest. The only other one I am aware of is, as mentioned, in Echunga.

In my discussions just recently when I met with the volunteer group officers from region 2, which incorporates the Barossa, none of them brought that to my attention. In fact we had a very good discussion about a range of matters and the ESL was raised. Having said that, I noted their strong commitment to work for their communities.

BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Is the minister confident that there are enough trained firefighters still on staff within the government to protect government land in the event of a large bushfire, given significant staff reductions in the DEWNR and PIRSA departments in recent years?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:22): I thank the leader for his question. I am advised that, based on current information, we have enough measures in place. However, like every season, in any major incidents we work in partnership with other states, in the same way that we as a state support other—

Ms Chapman: The rest usually come from Victoria.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The question is always being put to me: do we have enough resources? I am advised by the chiefs of the services that we have enough resources at this point in time. Should we have a major incident, we do what we do under national agreements: we actually seek the support of other states in the same way that we support other states. There is nothing unusual about that. That has been happening for decades.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is warned a second and final time.

BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary, sir: how many trained firefighters are there across DEWNR and PIRSA at the moment?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:24): I don't have that exact figure with me, but I am happy to give it to the leader.

BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Is the government considering a recruitment drive in order to have enough CFS volunteers to fight potential bushfires on government land?

Ms Redmond: Koutsty thinks there will be hundreds of them lining up.

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

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:24): Again, I thank the leader for his question. The repeated advice I have received from my agencies in this area when I have raised that matter on a number of occasions is that they are confident we can deal with the matters.

BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:24): A supplementary, sir: my question is to the same minister. Has the minister been approved a budget allocation so that government-paid firefighters can be paid for fighting fires outside of office hours?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:24): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary question. The reality is that if additional funding is required, as it was this year for Bangor and other years for other fires, the special allocation is made to cover that. So, should the need arise, we will make sure we have the resources available.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption has now taken statements from witnesses regarding the actions of the President in another place, Mr Russell Wortley, when he was an official at the gas employees union?

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is called to order.

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) (14:25): Indeed, he's been disrupting them all day so far.

The SPEAKER: He's been doing it all day.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'm glad you've caught up with him.

Mr Marshall: Is that your answer?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, it can be, if you would prefer. First of all, let's be clear: the royal commission was established by the present federal government to look into matters they think might be of political advantage to them. Let's be clear on what it is.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: surely the minister is entering into debate.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is bogus. I call the member for Unley to order, and he is lucky he is not on his way out of the chamber. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. That royal commission will go on about its business as it sees fit. This government has no control whatsoever about how that royal commission proceeds. We have had conversations about this matter in one or other of the chambers of this parliament going back for years. I think, in fact, if my memory serves me correctly, that before the President was even a member of this place, the portend of him coming must have been detected by the auguries because they were out there beating the tom-toms about this very issue.

The SPEAKER: 1995.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: In 1995—in fact, probably more than a decade ahead of his arrival there was a drum-roll about this matter—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: And yet they voted for him to be President.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and they voted for him to be President. In spite of the fact that, since 1995, they had been troubled by this terrible, terrible matter, they thought they would cure the defect by voting for him as President. There is nothing new about this matter. The only thing that is new about this matter is the new angle of engagement. The story has been around and around and around.

I don't know what the federal royal commission is going to make of this matter, but it is a very old story—a very old story that has been ventilated periodically, certainly in the other place, and has taken nobody anywhere. So far as I am aware, there has never been any scintilla of evidence produced to suggest that there is any substance to any of these suggestions. The matter remains

where it has always been, so far as we are concerned, which is that we have a series of unsubstantiated, varying degrees of vague allegations which have been vented periodically for nearly the last 20 years, and we don't anticipate that that matter will change in any way.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question again is to the Premier. Has the Premier spoken to Mr Wortley about his past involvement with the gas employers union which is the subject of the matters presented to the commission?

The SPEAKER: That's the Federated Gas Employees Industrial Union.

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) (14:29): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was confused until I had that clarification. The fact of the matter is this: given that these matters, which as I have just explained are matters which are essentially historical artefacts, are being ventilated yet again in a royal commission, the notion that any of us should be canvassing with the President matters which might potentially be investigated by the royal commission would not be appropriate.

We think it's a matter that needs to be dealt with according to the process of the royal commission without interference from us. As I recall, the last time this matter was ventilated, which was some months ago now, if my memory serves me correctly, the President's attitude then was, 'Well, look, let them ask me whatever they want to ask me and I'll give them whatever answers I can give them.' So, he doesn't appear to be troubled by this matter. Last time I heard him on the topic, which was on the public record, not in the context of a conversation, he was saying to all people who put these things forward, 'Well, put up or shut up.'

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): A further supplementary, if I may, and again my question is to the Premier. Given the Attorney's answer indicating that he is satisfied that there is no basis in the substance of the matters that have been raised, and his then answer that it would be inappropriate to discuss it with him, how is he satisfied that there is no basis in the allegations?

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) (14:31): I have discovered that most science fiction movies commence with—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No; I'm not going there. They commence with one little leap of faith at the very beginning, which is something like you can travel in time or that you can travel faster than the speed of light, or something like that. Once you accept that fallacy, the rest of the show is pretty logical, really. What was inserted into that question—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: What was inserted into that question was the additional words, 'I am completely satisfied.' I did not say anything about that at all.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is not a matter of any significance to the federal royal commission whether I'm satisfied or even, Mr Speaker, whether you are satisfied. The question is whether they are satisfied, and that is a matter they will determine in due course.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Further supplementary, again to the Premier: given the statements made by the Premier in respect of the

standing down of Mr Finnigan, pending his inquiry, does he agree that it is appropriate that the President of the other place continues in his role as President pending this investigation?

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) (14:32): Okay, well, this is another example of the time travel analogy I just gave you a minute ago. We have two separate things: category No.1 is a member of parliament who is subject to a charge which is brought duly before the courts and is being prosecuted—

Ms Chapman: Four years later.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and is being prosecuted for a criminal offence. That is situation A. Situation B is scuttlebutt, which nobody has ever been able to substantiate.

Ms Chapman: What about Julia Gillard?

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned a second and final time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Scuttlebutt that has never been—never been—the subject of any proof, so far as I am aware, has been—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —floating around this building for about 20 years and, even in the context of a building with the history this place has, 20 years is getting pretty stale. This sort of rumour floating around this place for 20 years—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I ask you to deliberate on whether the Deputy Premier is actually debating the question.

The SPEAKER: No, I don't think so.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: To put it another way, this rumour has been in this place for nearly as long as the Hon. Rob Lucas or even yourself.

The SPEAKER: No, nowhere near as long. He was here when I was a cadet.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, not that long, but nearly. Put it this way: only you, Mr Speaker, and the Hon. Rob Lucas remember a time when this rumour was not current. That is a quantitative and qualitative difference between that and a person who is actually being put to a trial on the basis that there are proceedings issued against them which are authorised by the prosecuting authorities. There is absolutely no similarity at all.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will leave us for half an hour under the sessional order for repeat offending.

The honourable member for Bragg having left the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Is there another supplementary on that line? No? Member for Stuart.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Given that the minister has repeatedly told the house that Ambassador Exploration had sufficient exploration experience to beat all other bidders, why is it that in April 2011 the minister announced personally to the media, and the government announced in the *Government Gazette*, that Ambassador Exploration had one petroleum licence, PEL 570, when at that time the company had only been formed for six months, only had one director and that person was a builder from Melbourne with no prior experience in the resources industry?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small

Business) (14:36): Mr Speaker, as I said yesterday, the attack on the oil and gas industry from the Liberal Party continues and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I also note the *Hansard* yesterday showed the leader of the Liberal Party in the upper house saying they are on the same page as the Greens on resources policy.

The SPEAKER: Could the minister return to the substance of the question?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. As I said in my answer yesterday, in terms of technical capacity, Ambassador was represented by Mr Tino Guglielmo, who subsequently became a director of Ambassador Exploration and was appointed to be managing director of the company that was subsequently floated on the ASX. He had many years prior with the oil and gas sector, including 20 years at very senior levels of Santos, then as managing director of Stuart Petroleum—and, of course, Mr John Davidson.

Mr Speaker, what the opposition is calling into question is the bid process conducted by the department. Once you bring that into question, it ruins the reputation of the regulator, which stifles investment. Like I said yesterday, and I will say again and again, if you have any evidence of any wrongdoing, make the accusation.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:37): Supplementary question, sir: given that the minister in his answer mentioned Mr Tino Guglielmo, can the minister detail what the exact role held by Mr Guglielmo in Ambassador Exploration was when he announced petroleum exploration licence 570 had been awarded to that company in April 2011?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:38): I will have to ask the department and the bid group about that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, I think it is important to remember this: I don't assess the bids. The government doesn't assess the bids. For example—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As I said yesterday, the bids are done in a way that is world's best practice, and it is world's best practice for a reason. It is recognised by the Fraser Institute, it is recognised by APPEA, the industry body that governs the oil and gas sector and, indeed, is their peak body. Indeed, they say that our processes are world class. I have no doubt that process was world class and best practice when Ambassador was awarded the contract. I have also just been advised by my office that Mr Guglielmo was engaged as their agent or representative.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The bid assessment groups make these judgements, and my delegate to whom I delegate my authority to issue these exploration licences is the one who makes the final assessment. I do the public announcements. But I do say this, Mr Speaker—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —the attack on the oil and gas sector and the processes by the regulator—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They can scream all they like, Mr Speaker.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: the minister is now descending into debate.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to what the minister has to say.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The attack on the regulator and the sector is becoming so politicised—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: the very statement accusing the opposition of making an attack on the regulator or anyone else is clearly debate.

The SPEAKER: No. Member for Morialta, I think that is a bit fragile. Question time is more robust than that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The attack on the regulator and the attack on Ambassador winning this call into question the processes of the regulator. Like I have said, Mr Speaker, if they have any evidence of any wrongdoing, make it public, and if they do not have any evidence, all they are doing is bringing into question the integrity of our regulator. Quite frankly, that is appalling.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:41): My question is again to the Minister for Mineral Resources.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Given that the minister has said that Ambassador has not completed any of the promised exploration work on its tenement PEL 570 due to bad weather in the region, can he advise whether any exploration work has been undertaken by the companies that won exploration licences PEL 516 and PEL 113 at the same time and in the same region?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:41): I will go back to my answer yesterday. The three new petroleum exploration licences in the Cooper Basin that were offered in 2010 by the government were on the basis of work program bidding. The CO2010 acreage release opened in April, as I said yesterday, and the bidding closed on 10 March. I know you are asking about work, but I want to build up the case. Applicants are provided with details of the scoring system. Everyone understood the process and Ambassador's work program scored the highest of the six programs.

I have details for PEL 570 but I do not believe that I have in front of me the results from the other work programs. But what I will endeavour to do is provide those to the member by either the close of business today or at the next opportunity in question time. I also note, in the spirit of our two friends back there, that this information is probably publicly available anyway. I would hate to think that the member opposite has asked me a question to which he already knows the answer. He says he does not have the answer, Mr Speaker; he is telling the parliament that he does not have the answer. So, Mr Speaker, I will endeavour to come back to the house with a detailed answer to the question that the member does not know the answer to.

The SPEAKER: Well, that is the normal situation, isn't it, Treasurer?

Ms Sanderson: Exactly. We ask the questions.

The SPEAKER: As the member for Adelaide says, we ask the questions. The member for Stuart.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:43): Can the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy advise the house whether it is regular practice for the government, or his department, to award a petroleum exploration licence to a company simply on the strength of the quality of its agent or its representative?

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned for the second and final time. Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:44): No, Mr Speaker. As I have said, we only issue exploration licences and retention licences to companies that we think are capable of carrying out the work—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, scoffing at the companies that have passed the bid process is an attack on the regulator. It is just an attack on the regulator, which lowers the standing of the state in the eyes of the industry. One of the great strengths of this industry is that it used to have bipartisan support, until the current Leader of the Opposition took over. He has brought the Liberal Party on the same page as the Greens—quite an effort. And I can see former premier Playford looking down with disgust about the way the current opposition thinks of their industry.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: Sir, will you rule once again on whether the minister has entered into debate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will be banning duck hunting, sir.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right.

Mr Pisoni: Lame duck.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, there is a lame duck in the house! There is a lame duck in the house, Mr Speaker! To the point of the question, there were five companies who first took their petroleum exploration licences before drilling anywhere else, but they all had experienced people to guide their operations. They are: Stuart Petroleum, Adelaide Energy, Ahava Energy, ACER and SAPEX.

We support start-ups, we support companies that take risks, and we support companies that bring people together to start a new venture under a new banner, under a new name but, obviously, the Liberal Party only wants the old establishment to have access to our exploration licences.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Well, the last part was out of order and, accordingly, I call the minister to order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Supplementary question, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:46): Can the minister advise whether in those instances which he just mentioned to the house those people who were guiding their operations were directors or employees, or were they agents or representatives?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:46): No, I don't have that information to hand, other than to say again that it calls into question the integrity of the bid process, Mr Speaker—

An honourable member: He just wants an answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm giving you the answer. The bid process—

The SPEAKER: No, you will give me the answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I did say that, sir. 'I'm giving you the answer,' I said.

The SPEAKER: Nice try.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes; Koutsantonis one, Atkinson nil. But we're used to that outcome, aren't we? Mr Speaker, it calls into question the bid process because, as I detailed to the house quite extensively yesterday, the bid process has a high standard of integrity, and when you start to question the bid process, what the opposition is attempting to tell the house is that the bid process has been flawed because Ambassador Oil won an exploration licence. That calls into question—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Ninety-eight: the opposition is not trying to tell the house anything; the opposition is trying to ask direct questions and get direct answers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to the minister, even though he is one-nil ahead.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That was a disorderly point of order because he is making an argument.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I find it impressive that the Leader of the Opposition when he doesn't have the call can have a conversation with you, but is not warned. But anyway, Mr Speaker, we won't let the facts get in the way—

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated!

Mr Gardner: You are a joke and a thug.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta will now rise in his place and apologise and withdraw for that remark.

Mr GARDNER: I apologise and withdraw, sir.

The SPEAKER: How I handle the interjections of the Leader of the Opposition is a matter for me, not a matter for the minister. Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My point is, Mr Speaker, if you call into question the petroleum exploration licence through inference through the question, you are calling into jeopardy the reputation of our regulator. I think our systems are world class. APPEA stands by this system, Santos stands by this system, Venture Energy stands by this system, Senex stands by this system and Chevron stands by this system. The only people calling this system into question are the Greens and the Liberal Party.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:49): Supplementary: given that the minister says that Mr Guglielmo is so central to this issue—

The SPEAKER: Is there any chance that you and the minister could pronounce his name correctly?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, there is. Can the minister please advise the house when he joined Ambassador Exploration as a director or an employee?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:49): I think I told the house earlier in my first answer and yesterday that he subsequently became a director of Ambassador Exploration, but—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, calling into question the processes, via interjection, into the big process. I don't know why the Liberal Party don't like the resources sector. I don't know why they don't like the oil and gas sector.

The SPEAKER: Could the minister return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sure, Mr Speaker.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is still one more than you—the real game. I don't have the details of the date that he joined, but I did say in my answer that he subsequently joined.

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Can the minister outline how the government's position to no longer fund the approximate \$33 million per year in pensioner concessions for local government rates from 1 July 2015 complies with the agreement that the minister made with the Premier in order to form government that states that the Labor Party will commit to a review of pensioner concessions as applied in respect to local government rates and the pre-election position of the minister for pensioner concessions to be increased from \$190 to \$230?

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is called to order because, of course, any member of the government can answer a question.

Mr Pengilly: Just like he answered the last two.

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is so close to joining his Kangaroo Island colleague.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:51): I have to say one of the cruellest aspects of the most recent commonwealth budget—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, I thought we were on the same page about these cuts, but obviously not. Apparently now we know that the opposition supports the commonwealth cuts. I have to be careful how I pronounce that. You don't want to say it too quickly.

I think it is important to note that one of the cruellest cuts was the \$30 million reduction in subsidies in concession payments for pensioners. We have increased pensioner concessions for utilities and water. We made a commitment to do so in the election campaign. When the commonwealth, with five weeks notice, cut \$30 million per annum from concessions to pensioners, the state government stepped in to fill that gap, so pensioners would not be impacted by the cuts made by the Prime Minister and we said on budget day that we would campaign for the next 12 months with the Local Government Association and this government together to have that cut reversed.

At the time, the opposition said they would join us. Instead they scoff at us in this place. Also at the same time, to meet the costs of other cuts they have made to our most vulnerable, we removed the remissions from the emergency services levy except for pensioners. We protected pensioners: they have kept their remissions. I have to say the good work of this government and the member for Frome in protecting the most vulnerable in our community from the most savage parts of the Liberal Party cuts are testament to his influence in this government and what motivates this government.

ART GALLERY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:53): My question is directed to the Minister for the Arts. How is the Art Gallery of South Australia working to make Adelaide a more vibrant city?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:54): I thank the member for Ashford for her question and, in particular, acknowledge her personal commitment to our cultural sector.

The Art Gallery of South Australia is a fine example of how traditional art spaces can maintain relevance in a contemporary society. We all know people are becoming increasingly time poor. It is important that, as with the business community, our arts institutions look at how they can be more accessible outside of the traditional nine to five.

The Art Gallery has over the last few years trialled opening late for special exhibitions, and I am pleased to inform the house it has been so well received that I recently had the privilege of joining with Art Gallery Director, Nick Mitzevich, and Petrina Coventry, Vice President of Santos, a great South Australian firm which is well regarded on this side of the house. If only it had bipartisan support, but nonetheless used to have bipartisan support, but certainly is well loved on this side of the house. I joined Petrina Coventry, Vice President of Santos, to launch First Fridays.

First Fridays will see the gallery stay open from 5pm to 9pm on the first Friday of every month. This will give the public more opportunity to see exhibitions and displays in the gallery's permanent collection, as well as twilight tours with guest speakers and other entertainment. While I was at the launch of First Fridays I had the privilege of viewing the *Fashion Icons* exhibition. Exclusive to Adelaide, the magnificent fashion—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Sorry?

Mr Marshall: It doesn't show!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Oh, come on, don't be so rough, Basil! Exclusive to Adelaide, the magnificent *Fashion Icons* represents a rare opportunity for Australian audiences to experience French fashion from the 1940s to the present day. *Fashion Icons* has been drawn from the most comprehensive collection of French fashion in the world at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Thank you, I have been practising that, I have been listening— and on behalf of the government, I would like to put on record—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Museum for Decorative Arts, I understand is the English translation. On behalf of the government, I would like to put on the record the government's sincere gratitude to Olivier Gabet, the Director of the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, for allowing this iconic collection to tour to Australia, and our thanks to Nick and the staff at the gallery for bringing this incredible exhibition to our state.

Not only does *Fashion Icons* allow the people of South Australia to experience a little bit of Paris but their own gallery will no doubt draw an interstate crowd creating an economic return for our state. *Fashion Icons* is on show until 15 February. I encourage everyone to view this iconic exhibition and, of course, support one of our best cultural institutions, the South Australian Art Gallery.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is slipping.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OATH OF OFFICE

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:57): Again, my question is to the Minister for Local Government. You can't answer this one, Tom. The Local Government (Governance) Amendment Bill passed through parliament on 28 October with one part of the act dealing with the oath of office for members who are elected.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: No. Can the minister detail why the regulations under this legislation, with the specific words elected members were to say, were not gazetted until today? Why has it been

necessary for the Local Government Association in three circulars to talk about if members are making the undertaking prior to gazettal of the new regulations they use the current wording?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:58): The member already knows the Local Government Act very well. The regulations came through after the bills were put through both houses. The regulations have now been put through, so some of the new councils—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey and the Treasurer are warned.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Some councils have already been sworn in, but they will also be obliged to the new wording.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is called to order.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OATH OF OFFICE

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:58): Sir, if I may have a supplementary to the minister. Does the minister accept that the regulations not actually being gazetted until today means that the majority of the approximately 700 people elected on 7 November would have made their oath of office with regulations that should not actually be in force? The legislation was passed in time for changes to be made. Do you accept responsibility?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:59): The bills were passed; the legislation has gone through. I am advised that the members who have already been elected in there will be applicable to the new regulations. I have been advised of that.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OATH OF OFFICE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): A supplementary, sir: could the minister explain to the house why the regulations were not put through in time for the swearing-in ceremonies?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:59): I don't have the actual reason for the delay that the regulations took, but I certainly will get a report and bring it back to the house.

REGIONAL CABINET MEETING

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house when there will be a regional cabinet meeting in the South-East?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:00): If I could get there next week, I would, because I know that the people of Mount Gambier would be carrying us on sedan chairs around the beautiful City of Mount Gambier, thanking us for delivering to them one of the great cultural institutions of the world, which will be the James Morrison academy of jazz. I know the honourable member is thrilled about that. It seems to have escaped the notice of the local media, but certainly down there in Mount Gambier it has lit up the sky.

I certainly do plan to get down to Mount Gambier, and we would like to bring the cabinet down there. I will be consulting with my colleague the minister for regional affairs to organise that schedule. We, of course, committed ourselves to three of these country cabinets each year. We have done that for this year, and we will certainly do it for next year, but there are very strong reasons to get back down to Mount Gambier.

The last time I was there, I had 6,000 screaming people there. Sons and daughters, little children all came out of their homes to see me. I had the warmest welcome I have ever received in Mount Gambier. It was actually about 40°, I think, on that day as well. Actually, I have been back since that fateful day, when there was a cause of some conflict and some friction, but since that time we have been working very hard to show a very clear future for this region.

I think this is one of the most exciting regions in South Australia, the South-East region. I think it is blessed with extraordinary natural beauty. I think it has abundant natural resources. I think, though, that there is much more that we can do with those natural resources.

Mr Williams: Absolutely.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is—its food, its fibre, it is our natural resources, our energy resources and all of those things. Of course, the natural beauty of that district means that it should be our premier tourism precinct. I know that minister Bignell—

An honourable member: Where is he?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He's ill, and it would not be proper to reflect upon that. Minister Bignell, who hails from that region—is it Glencoe? Is that his town?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He is very proud of his relationship with the South-East, and he spends a lot of time there. I know he is trying to forge a strong relationship with the member for Mount Gambier down there because we believe this is a jewel in the South Australian crown. For too long, I think, the people of Mount Gambier and the South-East have seen themselves as a long way away from Adelaide and in some ways—

Mr Williams: No, that's the way you have seen them.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I think they have an independent streak of mind. They have had an independent streak of mind—up until very recently, a very independent streak of mind.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. But I do remind the member that we did indeed bring the regional parliament down there when the former member was able to persuade us all to pull up stumps and constitute the whole of this parliament in Mount Gambier. That was the first time, I think, that we had moved outside of Adelaide and convened a parliament outside of Adelaide. It was something that I think the people of Mount Gambier appreciated. I can't give you an exact date, but I can tell you that I am very keen to get down to Mount Gambier very soon.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. What is the status of the aerial fire bombing fleet available to the Country Fire Service this summer?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:04): I would like to thank the honourable member for his question and also his constant advocacy for the CFS and other emergency services workers in his electorate.

As we approach summer, our emergency services agencies are busy again preparing for what is shaping up to be another very dangerous period, unfortunately. The South Australian Country Fire Service has recently identified additional areas of the state that have the potential to experience above normal fire conditions in the coming months, which has prompted a revision of the South Australian Seasonal Bushfire Outlook. This bushfire outlook is conducted by the CFS in partnership with the Bushfire & Natural Hazards Cooperative Research Centre and the Bureau of Meteorology.

Earlier today, the CFS and the Bureau of Meteorology held a press conference advising of the revision, noting that much of the state is currently experiencing a level of bushfire threat normally only experienced in February of the season. Members of parliament, the media and the general public, particularly those in high fire-risk areas have a significant interest in knowing what aerial assets are available to support our firefighters on the ground, particularly given the revised conditions.

The South Australian Country Fire Service firefighting aircraft are procured through the National Aerial Firefighting Centre. The firefighting centre was established by the states and territories to provide an internationally competitive tendering process and to facilitate a resource

management agreement for the sharing of aircraft between states. The CFS budget for aerial firefighting is \$7.6 million for 2014-15, which includes \$1.8 million funded from the Australian government through the firefighting centre.

The CFS fleet will consist of 17 aircraft, including 10 fixed-wing bombers, one high-volume helicopter, four fixed-wing observation aircraft and two rotary-wing observation aircraft. The CFS has brought forward—

The SPEAKER: Point of order, the member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL: The information the minister refers to is on the cfs.sa.gov.au website.

The SPEAKER: It's on what? I didn't catch that.

Mr KNOLL: On the CFS website.

The SPEAKER: Can the minister say whether this is so?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, today's media release issued by the CFS is there, so part of it would be there, but I have other additional information to convey.

The SPEAKER: Can we have different information?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I'm not aware what he's got in front of him.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No. The CFS has brought forward the aircraft exclusive use periods for the Mount Lofty Ranges and Lower Eyre Peninsula and is closely monitoring other districts to determine when to commence remaining aircraft contracts. As such, 10 aircraft, comprising six bombers and four observation aircraft, have also come into service. They are based at the Woodside air base and Port Lincoln, but are also available to operate across the state. Four additional aircraft will also be available in Mount Gambier from next week.

The staggered start dates ensure maximum aircraft availability in the critical fire danger months of January and February. As recently as Friday 7 November, the CFS called on six additional aircraft to address the significant fire weather conditions faced across the state on that day. Additional aircraft can also be sourced from other states and territories through the national resource management agreement if required. The CFS can also utilise aircraft from the State Rescue Helicopter Service for observation and coordination roles.

The Victorian government has decided to contract two higher-capacity air tankers commencing mid-December. These large air tankers are used extensively in North America, particularly in tall forest regions. In line with the national resource management agreement and depending on Victoria's willingness to release them, South Australia may also be able to access these resources at times over the coming fire danger season. Notwithstanding these capabilities, it is important to note that, while aircraft are a valuable firefighting resource, they do not replace firefighters on the ground. Firefighting aircraft cannot be used at night or operate in low visibility environments, such as thick smoke.

Today I have spoken about the CFS. However, the SES is also busy preparing for extreme weather ahead. I remind the house of the outstanding performance of the SES earlier this year when it responded to several severe extreme weather events, including heatwaves. The MFS also provides significant support to the CFS and SES during the bushfire and extreme events, in addition to their own urban responsibilities. Rest assured, while we cannot control the climate, our emergency services agencies are prepared and ready.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:08): Supplementary, sir: my question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Does the government have any arrangements or procedures in place so that contractors with uncontracted firebombing aircraft can react to a situation so that we do not have another situation as happened in Wangary where a pilot was not allowed up because he was an uncontracted water bomber contractor?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:09): I am not aware of that situation. Rather than give inaccurate advice, I will check it out for you.

SA POWER NETWORKS

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:09): My question is to the Treasurer. Has the Treasurer responded to correspondence from the Leader of the Opposition regarding SA Power Networks tree-logging requirements?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:09): On radio this morning, the Leader of the Opposition claimed that he had written to me:

I've written to the Treasurer and apart from having the acknowledgement...'I've received your letter' I've had no response and I must have ESP—

he claims to be hearing voices or have special perceptions—

because yesterday—

and he laughs and scoffs—

I sent a letter to the Treasurer following up my, er, my earlier correspondence on this issue because we've got the highest electricity prices in the country here in South Australia and, you know, households—

He is interrupted then by Mr Abraham. The letter the Leader of the Opposition is talking about is a letter to me saying:

Dear Minister—

I am surprised he said 'Dear', but that's how he is: he's polite—

I write in relation to SA Power Networks legislative requirements outlined under the *Electricity Act 1996* and *Electricity*—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Is it in order for a minister to answer a question by reading a media summary? You're just reading—

Members interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Well, a media transcript.

The SPEAKER: It may be included in an answer if it's relevant. The answer is yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He writes:

Residents of my electorate of Dunstan have longstanding concerns regarding the impact on street trees from the pruning methods utilised by SA Power Networks and its contractors.

He asks that I consider directing ESCOSA, as he discussed this morning on radio. The Leader of the Opposition then claimed on radio twice that I hadn't responded to him. I have here a letter, which I signed on 25 September, to the Leader of the Opposition:

Dear Mr Marshall—

I am being just as polite as he was to me—

Thank you for your letter dated 20 August 2014 about your constituents' longstanding concerns with the impact on street trees resulting from the tree pruning methods utilised by SA Power Networks and its contractors.

I go on to detail why we can't do what it is he is asking me to do in his letter. I responded to the Leader of the Opposition. He had my letter and he still went on radio today and said, 'I have not received a response.' The Leader of the Opposition is happy to go out on radio and say, 'I've written to the government about this, I'm very concerned about this, but they won't respond'—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —yet I have responded—

The SPEAKER: Point of order?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and I have written to him.

Mr GARDNER: Notwithstanding that this should actually be a personal explanation, not a question, he is now debating.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for a second and final time for interjecting and also drawing attention to the absence of a member from the house when in fact there is a perfectly reasonable explanation.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Very well, sir; then I apologise. I call on the Leader of the Opposition to apologise for his remarks, to go on radio and clarify that I did indeed respond to his letter. I didn't just send him an acknowledgement, I took the courtesy to find out what the answer was to his question and I answered it. For the benefit of the house, I will explain why.

We conducted a review and we introduced a risk-based approach to pruning around low-voltage powerlines of 415 volts. That is so that in residential communities where people enjoy the amenity of tree-lined streets we have allowed there to be a risk-based approach where the arborists and pruners can make a decision about whether or not the trees do impact on the quality of the amenity and whether they do pose a fire risk. However, I say in my letter to the Leader of the Opposition (which he claims that I didn't send him, but I did):

The safety risks associated with high-voltage powerlines (greater than 1,000 volts) are unfortunately too great to allow reduced clearances and the use of this risk based approach. Vegetation contacting high voltage powerlines can immediately catch fire.

As an example in the Leader of the Opposition's own electorate, in 2007 an 11kV powerline on George Street, Stepney, came into contact with a tree. The resulting fire caused property damage and an electrical flashover. As a result of the flashover, one of the cables fell to the ground onto a member of the public who was walking under the powerlines at the time. I responded to the Leader of the Opposition's questions, but he went on radio and made up a story anyway.

The SPEAKER: Well, fortunately it's one of life's mercies that there are no penalties for misleading Matt and Dave.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:14): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister detail any discussions she has had with the Treasurer about providing emergency services levy exemptions for childcare centres to stop this extra cost burden being passed on to parents?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:14): I have to say that, after the savage commonwealth budget, for us to be lectured about the impact on families by the emergency services remissions being removed—we have said, sir, all along that we would return these remissions immediately.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: I believe that the minister is not answering the substance of the question. The question was specifically about discussions in removing the emergency services levy for childcare centres.

The SPEAKER: Yes; I'll listen carefully.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, I want to return the remissions to everyone. I don't want anyone paying any more than they need to, but I point out to the opposition that our pensioners have had \$30 million a year cut from their concessions by the commonwealth. Members opposite said they were with us on this.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: again, the minister has entered debate. The question—

The SPEAKER: No, I don't believe he is.

Mr PISONI: —is clearly about childcare centres.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order, and I have my reasons, if you want, but we will go to the Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, I'm happy to return remissions to childcare centres, to schools, to anyone who has been adversely impacted by this, because the cuts that the commonwealth have imposed on the state are far too large for us to bear; they cannot be absorbed. You cannot give a state government five weeks' notice and cut nearly \$1 billion—\$1 billion.

We had a funding partner. We had deal to change the way health care was delivered in this country, and the commonwealth have walked away from it leaving pensioners, people who go to hospitals, our children in our schools at the mercy of the very ravages that the opposition said before the September election that they would not introduce. We have seen it in the most recent cuts to the ABC and SBS. They promised no cuts—no cuts, Mr Speaker—and here they are, and yet they say 'How dare you—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: I definitely suggest that the ABC is not relevant, unless you're talking about childcare centres.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In the context of why decisions are made to remove remissions from emergency services levy payers and those people who are about to bear the impacts of it, I say this to the opposition: join us, join our campaign, join South Australians, voice anger at the commonwealth—one voice in opposition would be nice.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley will leave us for the rest of question time.

The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would appreciate, at the very least, that of all the cuts the commonwealth has made you would have thought, Mr Speaker, that cuts to our pensioners are the most horrific and abhorrent. And you would think, Mr Speaker, that members opposite would stand with us on this. Instead, they attack us—

Ms Chapman: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader.

Ms CHAPMAN: I don't think there could be anything further from pensioners and aged-care cuts than childcare centres. This is clearly straying from the question of whether there was a conversation between the two ministers—

The SPEAKER: Yes; I think the Treasurer has strayed. The member for Colton.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Can the minister inform the house about the recent community consultation convened by the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:18): I thank the member for his question. The South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission convened its sixth community consultation on Wednesday 5 November 2014. This community consultation focused on the western suburbs and was held at Reedbeds Community Centre in Fulham. I think you were invited, sir, but were unable to attend, as was the member for Colton. It was my pleasure to attend the SAMEAC western suburbs

consultation and engage with representatives from various culturally and linguistically diverse communities.

The consultation was attended by approximately 40 community members, who raised a number of issues with a panel of senior representatives from senior state and commonwealth government agencies, including Department for Communities and Social Inclusion, Department of Social Services, Department of Human Services, the department for employment, higher education and skills and the Department of Immigration and Border Protection. The consultation was also attended by the mayor of West Torrens and representatives from South Australia Police, Multicultural Community Council of South Australia, Multicultural Aged Care Service and various community leaders from new and emerging communities.

A variety of issues were raised during the community consultation, which included settlement services for eligible migrants, access to cross-cultural services, assessment of overseas qualification, administration of local, state and commonwealth grant programs and the provision of training and employment pathways to skilled migrants and to humanitarian entrants. The community consultation model worked well, with many of the issues raised being addressed during the session, while other inquiries were subsequently followed up by a relevant government agency or service provider representative.

The SAMEAC western suburbs consultation was a great opportunity for members of culturally and linguistically diverse communities to be heard and for SAMEAC members and various service providers to address some of their concerns. South Australia is a multicultural place, and this diversity brings many benefits to our state. In recognition of the importance multiculturalism plays in our community, the Weatherill government announced earlier this year that linguistically and culturally diverse communities will receive an increase in funding for projects, events and activities. Annual multicultural grant funding has been increased from \$650,000 to \$1 million per annum.

Our multicultural communities help make us strong because they support the social, economic and cultural fabric of our state. I look forward to being part of engaging and enlightening future discussions with representatives from our multicultural communities, and I congratulate the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission on the success of its sixth community consultation.

Ministerial Statement

MARINE PARKS

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:21): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to marine parks earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation.

Grievance Debate

CHINA-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:22): I rise to congratulate the commonwealth government on its outstanding work to secure the free trade agreement with the People's Republic of China. I particularly want to acknowledge and thank our Prime Minister Mr Abbott, the Chinese President Mr Xi Jinping, the trade minister Mr Robb and his Chinese counterpart, who have worked tirelessly to secure this agreement for the benefit of our two great nations.

Australia's trade and investment relationship with China is massive. Exports to China in 2013 totalled \$94,655 million, imports from China totalled \$47,150 million, and total trade (being exports and imports) in Australian dollars in 2013 with China totalled \$141,805 million. This is an extremely important week for the two nations and I thank the commonwealth government for having the foresight to instil this agreement for the betterment of generations for many years to come.

The federal Liberal government is an example to this government, which is tired, and it shows them how to actually drive an economy by boosting trade and reducing tariffs on our exports. While the Treasurer and the government are stuck blaming the commonwealth for their own misconduct and apathy over 12 years, the federal government is a real government that does not run out of

agenda and does not run out of ideas, unlike this government which ran out of ideas yesterday and adjourned this place so early.

In South Australia, I note that the Premier has ridden on the back of the Prime Minister's coat-tails in trying to steal the success of the Liberal government's agreement. I draw the house's attention to the media release of the Premier, released hours after the agreement signed by President Xi and Prime Minister Abbott, where he states:

The South Australian government has placed a significant focus on our engagement with China and we have opened up significant trade opportunities as well as opportunities to deepen educational and cultural exchange.

The Premier's rhetoric since this agreement was announced, I suppose, shows how lucky we are to have the current federal government.

Having said that about this important agreement, I know that it will come as a great thing for many of my constituents in Hartley who are of Chinese background, and the number stretches into many hundreds. I would like to acknowledge them and wish them all the very best in their endeavours. Many of them are small business people who will benefit from this agreement.

I would like to acknowledge some of the business associations around Australia, particularly in South Australia, that support Chinese and Australian investment and investment between the two countries. The most prominent of these organisations include, but are not limited to, the Hong Kong Australia Business Association, the China Business Network of South Australia, the Australia China Business Council, the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, the Australia and China friendship and development association, and in Hartley I am proud to say, we have the China Australia Entrepreneurs Association Inc., which is based in Campbelltown in my electorate.

Although it is important to highlight the Premier's paucity of ideas, it is important to acknowledge that the commonwealth government has secured a Chinese consulate for the first time in this state's history, and I hope this will serve my constituents and all Chinese expats well for many years to come.

Once again, I thank the Prime Minister and the President for their excellent work in achieving this deal. I hope, in stark contrast to this lacklustre state government, that we can generate real jobs and growth into this ailing economy, because it is needed.

WHITE RIBBON DAY

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:26): Earlier today I signed the pledge in support of the White Ribbon Day campaign, raising awareness—

Mr Picton interjecting:

Ms DIGANCE: That's good, I am glad you did—and challenging the situation that violence against women presents. It is for this reason that I wish to highlight the plight of young children who can find themselves as innocent bystanders experiencing the negative impact at the hands of episodes of violence against women.

The 2012 ABS Personal Safety Survey reported that almost 1.2 million women around Australia had experienced partner violence (and this also included threatened violence) at some time in their life. Of these instances, roughly half had children in their care at the time and the children either saw or heard the violence.

There is a large body of work on the impact of domestic violence on children that reports that exposure to domestic violence or being a victim themselves may affect children differently, depending on their circumstances, and may also affect them differently as they grow older. Several studies have found that toddlers from violent homes expressed emotionally distressed behaviour less often than older children, suggesting perhaps that they were used to it and saw it as the norm. However, common developmental problems of small children include excessive irritability, regressed behaviour around language and toilet training, sleep disturbances, emotional distress and a fear of being alone.

Research finds that children may be significantly affected by the experience of domestic violence in their lives and the impact which may resonate intergenerationally with their own

involvement in adult violence. Given the potential negative repercussions of children's exposure to domestic violence, in particular the intergenerational transmission of such violence, there exists a need for a wide range of programs that can intervene to improve the potential for healthy adjustment. Children who are exposed to extreme stress are at greater risk of developing mental and physical disorders.

The World Health Organisation World Mental Health Survey of a few years ago shows that childhood adversity was responsible for 22.9 per cent of all child or adult mood disorders, 31 per cent of anxiety disorders, 41.6 per cent of behavioural disorders, 27.5 per cent of substance abuse disorders, and overall, 29.8 per cent of all psychiatric disorders.

A 2011 report from the Australian Institute of Criminology surveyed the studies which looked at the impact of domestic violence on children. These reports covered surveys of the psychological and behavioural impacts, as well as studies looking at the health and socioeconomic impacts of domestic violence on children in these families. They identified and reported psychological effects including: depression, anxiety, trauma, trauma symptoms, increased aggression, antisocial behaviour, lower social competency, temperament problems, low self-esteem, the presence of pervasive fear, mood problems, loneliness, school difficulties, peer conflict, impaired cognitive functioning, increased likelihood of substance abuse, eating disorders, teenage pregnancy, leaving school early, suicide attempts, delinquency and violence.

While some studies have concluded that children who witness domestic violence are more likely to use violent behaviour themselves in later life, the Australian Institute of Criminology notes that this evidence is mixed. In addition, other findings suggest that children who witness or who are involved in family violence have significantly higher rates of health problems than other children, and their experience may contribute to a range of serious health conditions, including alcohol and drug abuse and depression, and even early death.

They and their mothers are at a higher risk of homelessness than other families and a higher risk of welfare dependency. As a member of parliament, a member of the community, a nurse, a businesswoman, a company director, a daughter, a sister, a mother and a woman, I for one will not stand by and allow the continuation of those children being lost from being their best at the hands of a preventable public health issue: it should be of extreme public concern to each and every one of us.

Campaigns such as White Ribbon Day are important in activating change, and I applaud it. No woman deserves to have violence of any kind committed against her and, in turn, no child deserves to experience the negative effects of this violence. To counteract the devastation that befalls these innocent bystanders of violence against women, education coupled with will is key. It takes the whole of society on all levels, all demographics, to combat and right this situation.

Time expired.

PURCHASE CARDS

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:31): I rise today to talk about another of my explorations through the Auditor-General's Report. As I have traversed government documents in my role as an avowed member of the Waste Watch Committee, the more I delve into government business and government spending the more I realise that the waste we see from this government is cultural—it is endemic and it is cultural.

Indeed, at certain times I feel there is a sense of entitlement by the government across all spectrums when it comes to spending hard-earned taxpayer money. From my experience, I know how hard money is to earn and how responsibly it is given over to the government, and I feel it is incumbent on the government to return that sense of responsibility with its own sense of responsibility.

What I want to talk about today is the pervasive culture that obviously exists within government departments and the use of purchase cards. I could forgive if the Auditor-General highlighted one or two complaints in one or two departments, but the Auditor-General has made complaints against five separate government departments when it comes to the use of purchase cards, and there are a number of them I would like to put on the record.

The first government department on the list that may need to look into some purchase card practices is the Environment Protection Authority. The Auditor-General noted the splitting of transactions to comply with authorised transaction limits and certain expenditure being put onto purchase cards for goods and services that is not allowed by EPA policy. That is the first example I see where the culture of waste and misuse of government funds comes to the fore.

The second department, the Department for Education and Child Development, has a litany of examples where matters were raised by the Auditor-General in relation to purchase cards, instances where supporting documentation was not available to substantiate purchase card expenditure. I would have thought it was pretty front and centre and pretty straightforward that when you spent money on a government credit card you kept the receipt.

There is no evidence that purchase card holders' monthly credit limits are reviewed regularly, as required by Treasurer's Instruction No. 12. There were instances of incorrect coding of GST and instances where documentation to approve intrastate travel expense on purchase cards had been approved subsequent to travel, or had not been approved or could not be located. There were instances where documentation approving entertainment costs expensed on purchase cards was not complete or approved. There were also instances where card holders had not certified the correctness of their purchase card charges and instances where purchase cards of terminated employees were not deactivated on a timely basis.

Within the Department for Education and Child Development there needs to be a serious review, and the responses the department gave to the Auditor-General were such, 'We will continue to remind our staff that they need to comply with the requirements,' as if something as basic as keeping a credit card receipt were not fundamental and basic enough already.

The Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, again, had instances of splitting transactions to comply with authorised transaction limits, which basically says, 'Well, I've got a \$1,000 cap, but if we go 600 bucks each on this we'll be able to get away with it.' Also prior written approval required for some transactions, gifts and entertainment was not obtained. There is the idea that somehow these purchase cards are the plaything of departmental staff and that hard-earned taxpayer money is an entitlement for departments to spend.

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, again, had quite a number of instances where cardholders had not certified a significant number of purchase card charges for a considerable time period, and a significant number of transactions had not been independently reviewed and approved in accordance with departmental policy. Documentation to support expenditure charged to purchase cards was not always provided or was not maintained. Again, keep your credit card receipts.

There were a number of instances where the documentation attached to support purchase card charges was insufficient and instances where former employees of the department did not have their purchase card cancelled. TAFE SA had issues where purchase cards were not always used for purposes allowed by TAFE SA procedures.

This culture of waste is becoming more and more pervasive and it comes from the top. I think that any cultural change, any cultural direction, comes from the top, and I think that ministers need to be held responsible for what is obviously endemic and cultural misuse of purchase cards within this government.

CHINA-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:36): I rise today to touch upon the trade deal between Australia and China and do so in the context of steelmaking in Australia and, specifically, Whyalla. At this stage very few people have seen the detail contained within the agreement, but the general consensus, at least in the media and amongst commentators, is that there will be a significant net benefit to Australia. South Australia looks like it will benefit in a number of areas. One area that is likely to face additional pressure, however, is manufacturing.

Manufacturing is the biggest employer in Whyalla. Whyalla-based Arrium is Australia's only manufacturer of steel long products. Approximately 80 per cent of Arrium steel production is used in the construction industry. Currently, 65 per cent of Arrium's sales base is under investigation by the

Anti-Dumping Commission for unfair trade. Record steel exports from China have led to historically low margins in the steel industry and the dumping of steel in Australia and elsewhere. Andrew Roberts, managing director and CEO of Arrium, said recently:

It is critical that in any free trade agreement the government may negotiate does not result in any weakening of our anti-dumping regime, whether directly or indirectly. Indeed, we believe that a robust anti-dumping regime can only build strength and integrity into a pre-trade environment.

The devil is always in the detail, and until the detail in the trade agreement is made public and its impact on our anti-dumping regime and manufacturing is clear, I will hold off on my praise. I will hold off on my praise because it is not clear what the impact will be on the many people in Whyalla who work in the steel industry.

It is worth noting that the Productivity Commission is not a great fan of bilateral trade agreements, and it has stated that gains from such agreements have been modest. Our free trade agreement with the US increased our trade deficit, or at least coincided with an increase in our trade deficit with the United States. Given the nature of our trade with China, similar outcomes appear to be unlikely.

I think it would be fair comment to suggest that there has been insufficient transparency surrounding the development of our free trade agreements and the lack of robust modelling, not to mention the growing concern over the implications of investor state dispute settlement provisions. The provisions have the potential to undermine sovereignty and constrain elected national and state governments from acting in the interests of the long-term public good.

On a practical note, one initiative that is within our power as a state government when it comes to government spending on construction is a requirement to use Australian manufactured long products. We should back our own. No other state manufactures long products. We should provide procurement support with appropriate provisions. We strongly and rightly advocate for domestic construction of our submarine fleet. We should just as strongly support our steel industry and ensure our procurement policies help provide that support.

I take some comfort from the words of the Arrium CEO when at a recent meeting he said that no large scale closures are planned in steel and it intends to continue running all of its iron ore operations. Steel has done it hard and now iron ore exporter operations are clearly going through a difficult period with a 50 per cent fall in iron ore prices since the beginning of the year. Arrium is now South Australia's only iron ore exporter with the mothballing of IMX near Coober Pedy. With additional capacity coming online globally and a softening Chinese market, we might be in for a challenging period which will impact not just on Arrium but also on those iron ore mining hopefuls in South Australia.

It is possible that the trade agreement might have a positive impact on mineral exports and I would welcome that, but my major concern is the future of steel manufacturing. Our steel industry has proven resilient. I hope that resilience continues.

SOUTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:41): I rise today to speak on an issue that is troubling many people in my electorate—the unfinished or ignored section of the Southern Expressway. The noise wall that is on the Southern Expressway that impacts on the residents of Sturt and Darlington is considered a very big eyesore and unfinished. There is a big fear that it is being ignored by this Weatherill Labor government. The Corten steel barrier is supposed to blend in with the environment as quoted on the Southern Expressway duplication information website. It states:

Corten steel noise barriers will be installed at the northern end of the project site (between Seacombe Road and the Darlington escarpment) as an urban design feature signifying the entrance to the expressway and the inner metropolitan area. They will range in height from 3 to 4 metres and have a natural and anti-graffiti finish that will readily blend with the surrounding landscape and is easy to clean.

Mr Picton interjecting:

Mr WINGARD: It is probably no surprise that the member for Kaurua interjects on this, the government having spent \$400 million plus on the project that pretty much services his electorate and ignores the other parts of the southern region. I think perhaps he does not care about the people

in the electorate of Mitchell and/or the suburbs of Sturt, Darlington, O'Halloran Hill, Sheidow Park, Trott Park and Reynella. He is only worrying about his patch and not really concerned about anyone else's.

There is supposedly a graffiti proof wall that is currently covered in graffiti which is very interesting, and it sits up to 25 metres in the air. Sadly, this is not a good neighbour-style fence; it has posts and rails. The residents are forced to look at these posts and rails every afternoon in their backyards, overhanging their backyard.

A number of residents have contacted me, including Andrew from Sturt, who said, 'It's a real blight on our surroundings and doesn't blend in at all.' Deanna of Sturt said, 'A real estate agent has valued my house and literally said because of that eyesore of a fence you'll lose \$15,000 to \$20,000 in valuation.' Kevin, and the residents of Graham Road, Darlington, said, 'We are all without exception concerned, alarmed, frustrated, disappointed and disgusted with the hideous rusty steel sound wall that has been left at the end of Graham Road.' John of Ralph Street in Sturt said, 'It's ugly, grotty and if this is the best SA infrastructure can do, we've gone down the gurgler. Coming from the South into the city, it says, "Welcome to rusty Adelaide".' They are not happy with it. It hangs over their backyards and they do not think it is acceptable.

Also noted in the original plans were a number of tree plantings that were supposed to block some of this rail and post rusted fencing. Those proposed tree plantings have not appeared as originally planned, so I and the residents are intrigued to see what is happening with this vegetation. The residents have made a number of inquiries to my office, as I said, and they have put a number of suggestions forward. In fact, we wrote to the minister on 22 August with a number of these suggestions about the ugly-looking fence that overhangs their yard.

In a meeting with the minister and his adviser on 25 September it was verbally agreed that they would come and have a look, with members of the associated areas, at some stage in the week commencing Monday 6 October. The minister's office was going to contact us to arrange a date and time where we could get the people together, have a look and discuss this issue. Unfortunately, the contact was not made and the residents are still chasing this meeting.

Correspondence has gone back and forth and, sadly, the residents of these suburbs in the electorate of Mitchell have been ignored. So we are holding a community meeting at Parson Street, Sturt on the evening of 4 December. The minister is invited to attend, issue his statement, speak to the residents and let them know what is going to be done about the unfinished portion of this fence, and why vegetation and other opportunities are not being taken to make this look far more appealing to local residents.

I also encourage the department to consider the options proposed by the residents in August and advise why a feasibility study cannot be done as to completing these works. I did get to meet the CEO of the department today and we discussed a few other safety issues there, such as signs that are incomplete on the Southern Expressway at the one-way off ramp that goes into Old Reynella. I did ask why the signs were not complete and he informed me that they will be done by Christmas, so I look forward to having those done. The on-off ramp at Reynella is still lacking signs, which is a little bit of a safety issue. I think in recent days they have just completed the other speed limit signs, so we look forward to having this problem rectified.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (15:46): I rise today to talk about issues of consumer protection and, in particular, door-to-door salespeople and people who call up people to sell them things. We obviously understand that it is very important that companies—particularly communication providers and energy providers—have the right and ability to market their products. That is very healthy because we want to see increased competition, particularly in the power industry where there are a number of providers that offer cheaper services. However, it is of equal importance that we balance that right with the right of consumers to be protected, and particularly those vulnerable consumers in our state, such as those who are elderly or those who have particular conditions that make them more vulnerable. I want to briefly discuss some of these issues today.

Many members of the house who will have been doorknocking over the past year in the lead-up to the last election I am sure, like me, encountered many, many door-to-door salespeople as they went around their suburbs—in particular, electricity providers. It is certainly a booming industry to provide that door-to-door sales service, but it does have its negative consequences.

In particular, I met with a family in Aldinga recently who were very concerned about a friend of theirs who has dementia and is in a residential care home. On two separate occasions, energy providers have come to her house and signed her up to products that she otherwise would not have wanted to sign up to. Her children, who have her legal power of attorney, were very concerned when they stopped receiving bills from her regular energy provider. They eventually found out that new energy providers had been appointed and went to vast effort and difficulty in trying to reverse those contracts that she had signed.

It really struck me that we have a special responsibility when it comes to places like retirement homes and nursing homes, and also vulnerable citizens who potentially have conditions such as dementia. If you are doing door-to-door sales, particularly if you are a persuasive salesperson, then you really can get those vulnerable people to sign up to anything.

Another gentleman came to my office last week and one of the things he talked about was the fact that he was phoned by an energy company recently. They told him that he should sign up for their product. He said he did not want to, but in fact they signed him up anyway. He stopped receiving bills from his previous provider and started receiving bills from this new provider he had never heard of. He has gone to much difficulty and expense to try to get out of that contract, which he did not agree to, and get back to his previous agreement.

We are trying to help him through the Ombudsman, and hopefully that can achieve a positive outcome, but I think it just goes to show the sort of tactics that can be employed in this industry sometimes, as the competition is particularly fierce. I think it highlighted for me some of the work that the former member for Hindmarsh Steve Georganas was doing in the federal parliament in trying to set up a do-not-knock register. We do have a Do Not Call Register, which I know many people across the state have signed up to and it is particularly effective.

Ms Chapman: It doesn't work.

Mr PICTON: I think it is particularly effective for Australian companies. What it is not effective for is scam artists, particularly those overseas, who are increasing in number, and we are seeing huge numbers of calls made out of Nigeria and other countries.

I had another constituent who recently received a call purporting to be from Microsoft saying that she needed to pay them some money to stop viruses entering her computer and to do an upgrade. She said, 'Well, I'm a Mac user; I don't have any Microsoft.' They quickly hung up and disappeared. It is a well-known scam and I encourage all South Australians to look at the ACCC SCAMwatch website, which details a number of those very common scams which you see across Australia.

I think a do-not-knock register should be something we look at as well. The Do Not Knock stickers are legally enforceable. There have been some federal court rulings, but you should not just have to have that sticker. If the carers of vulnerable people want to sign those people up for a register, I think that is something we should look at. I think we also need to look at the rules governing energy providers in particular, as a lot of the instances come from that sector.

Bills

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:52): I rise to speak on the Freedom of Information (Offences) Amendment Bill 2014 introduced by the member for Hartley, which I think is his maiden bill. Actually, it is the second. I think you had great success with the garnishee orders.

Mr Tarzia: We're hoping to.

Ms CHAPMAN: We're hoping to, is that it? Excellent; ever hopeful that the government might be enlightened to support that. This particular bill arises out of two things: firstly, the frightening report and recommendations to this parliament published in May 2014 by former Ombudsman Richard Bingham titled 'An audit of state government departments' implementation of the Freedom of Information Act', and secondly, the government's inaction in respect of the recommendations arising from that report.

Essentially, one of the very significant findings of Mr Bingham is that, in investigating 12 government agencies over the previous year in respect of their management and processing of freedom of information applications, he found:

- it is common practice across all of the agencies to provide copies of FOI applications, determinations (draft or otherwise) and documents to their Minister to 'get the green light' prior to [the] finalisation of access requests. While the Act permits a Minister to direct their agency's determination, evidence provided to the audit strongly suggests that ministerial or political influence is brought to bear on agencies' FOI officers, and that FOI officers may have been pressured to change their determinations in particular instances. If a ministerial decision or direction is involved, it should be clearly set out in the agencies' determinations

Specific details of allegations of political interference are outlined in part 8, in particular on page 83 onwards, of Mr Bingham's report.

I found this a staggering revelation. It did not surprise me, in fact, because, for someone who is a frequent utiliser of the Freedom of Information Act and has to wait many months and then have great fights in the District Court to get information for South Australians which should otherwise be available to them readily, it is an ongoing battle. It did not surprise me how difficult that process is and that Mr Bingham would come back with some recommendations to have better application of this act.

What was concerning was this abuse of the ministerial position to interfere with those determinations. That is really concerning. I think it requires very significant investigation. I am disappointed that the Attorney-General was flippant in response to questions about what he is doing about the findings in this report. He is basically saying, 'If somebody has a problem and they are concerned about it, they can rush off to ICAC or they can report it to the relevant officers.' The Attorney-General has had a damning report tabled in this parliament and is quite dismissive of doing anything about it; he has the whole head-in-the-sand approach.

The disturbing aspect is that, months later, the government has not produced any response to the recommendations put by Mr Bingham, including two of his most significant recommendations out of the 33, and that is offences need to be created to protect FOI officers and the agencies' decisions in respect of the FOI applications. There were two things that he recommended in respect of those offences, which have been taken up in this bill by the member for Hartley, because, quite frankly, the Attorney-General is either unwilling, unable or completely immune from any kind of feeling of responsibility to actually act on this.

The member for Hartley has come to the rescue and I think he should be commended for it. He proposes in this bill to make it an offence for a person to give improper directions or influence in respect of an agency's decision on FOI application to amend a record and, similarly, to give improper directions or influence in the same circumstances in respect of access to documents. Further, the bill makes it an offence of \$10,000 if an accredited FOI officer fails to report to the Office for Public Integrity a suspicion that such a direction has been given.

Since this report, we have had the annual report, of course, from the ICAC Commissioner, which details scurrilous practices of the government in respect of the operation of using private emails for the purposes of conducting business. He has given evidence to the committee of inquiry here at the parliament confirming that this practice should stop and that the Attorney-General should issue a memorandum to the persons who are in government to make sure that, if they are doing this, that practice ceases. It is potentially in breach of the State Records Act for them to be able to subvert the processes of the clear recording of government business.

Again, what is the Attorney doing on this? Nothing. Six weeks later, he has not even finished getting the draft memo out to government agencies to instruct these people, if they are doing it, to stop and that, if they have done it, they are not to destroy the records and that they are, of course, to be surrendered for the purposes of the State Records Act. It is critical that, if the government are not prepared to act when these independent watchdogs provide reports to this parliament, if the Attorney wants to put his head in the sand and the rest of the government want to just sit there in silence and pretend nothing is wrong, then people like the member for Hartley will come to this parliament and make sure that they are addressed. I commend him for that. This is a very important amendment.

I say also that I think it was yesterday morning I woke up and looked at *The Advertiser* to find a report on the Hon. Robert Brokenshire's bill in the Legislative Council, indicating that he was proposing offences in respect of FOI matters which offered a \$5,000—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Sorry, the Hon. Mark Parnell had similarly proposed a bill in the Legislative Council. I keep an eye on what is happening in the Legislative Council and I am a little bit disappointed that the Hon. Mark Parnell obviously had not already studiously read the member for Hartley's bill and was ready to give it some support, or at least identify some significant penalty that is there and not let them get off the hook too lightly with some pathetic \$5,000 penalty.

In any event, that is a matter which has already captured the attention of the Hon. Mr Parnell. I know that he has also been involved in attempts to get information. We are both seeking material in relation to the Mount Barker development and others. We had to go off to the District Court to get the material released.

I was given one pathetic excuse—just to give you one example of the sort of excuses we get sometimes on an FOI—when I had a rejection for some submissions made in respect of the Mount Barker development on the basis that it might cause marital discourse between the two different authors of the submissions. In other words, a husband and wife presumably had put in different and opposing submissions, and if one found out about the other there would be some kind of dust-up in the domestic environment. What a joke!

We are deprived of this information about which we are asked to make major decisions or to make some assessment on whether the government has acted properly in making its assessment, in that instance in respect of Mount Barker. That is the sort of nonsense we have to put up with in the government's secrecy surrounding the collection and availability of information in the public realm.

Congratulations go to the member. I certainly hope that the government realises the importance of this and that they are genuinely bona fide about transparency, which they claim to be. They came in here recently on the civil liability legislation, which has now passed, desiring to be more open and transparent, yet when it comes to matters such as this they advance at glacial pace in respect of introducing the reform as recommended by the independent watchdogs. I support the bill.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (16:01): I thank the member for Hartley for bringing the bill to the chamber because it is certainly an interesting discussion point, and I was drawn to contribute some comments. I do not think I am the lead government speaker on the bill, but I want to contribute some comments to put a bit of balance into this. I am sure that freedom of information is something that all members thoroughly support. I note that the current act about which members opposite complain is a far more improved act to the one that the previous Liberal government had. This government has made it much easier for information to be accessed through it.

We are certainly very keen to be an open and accessible government, but there does need to be balance and there need to be some limits on the use of that act. One example I would like to talk about is the experience we have seen federally, and one I have had some personal experience with, involving tobacco companies using the Freedom of Information Act federally to try to stop policies and to use it as part of a discovery process and as a time-wasting device against government departments and public health measures they do not agree with.

I refer members to Senate estimates on 15 February 2012, where the then secretary of the department for health and ageing, Jane Halton, discussed this. She said that 64 tobacco FOI matters had been received at that time since April 2010, which is a massive number of requests sent in to the department, and there were a number of others to departments across the federal government. She that said British American Tobacco Australia had 10 alone which had:

... tied up significant departmental resources to the tune of \$643,000 over a period of up to 18 months. The charging regime, which I think I am on the record as being unhappy with, only allows around the 20 per cent we estimated—that is, 21 per cent—of that to be recovered. At the same time, and by way of context, I make the point that the department has had to handle some 47 other requests on tobacco, including negotiations with applicants, reviews and appeals to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal and the High Court.

She went on to say that it was 'basically designed to tie up departmental resources which we cannot cost recover'. I think that is something that needs to be thought of in this house when we discuss freedom of information. While there are many good uses, and most of the good uses for the act are people finding out their personal information, there can be some abuses of it.

Certainly, in my time in the state government, I recall many times when we saw some huge fishing expeditions from the opposition, sometimes sending in a request for every document on a certain day—every department's documents on that day—with no context, no avenue of inquiry, just 'every document'. Then they would use those titles of documents to try to find out what murky things they could uncover. It was basically just an attempt to fish into a department and tie up resources, and it is something that the act should not be used for.

I think one thing that this government has been doing fantastically over the past couple of years is open disclosure, that is, putting data on the internet available for the whole public to see. We have our data.sa.gov.au site, which is very well used, and those sorts of data resources should be available for all the public to see and all the public to utilise.

There has also been a number of data disclosures in terms of travel costs by ministers and senior departmental executives which were routinely FOI'd, and we are now putting them on the web for all to see. I think that is to be commended. As well, in the health area, we have put up the emergency dashboard and the elective surgery dashboard so that everybody can see what the statistics are at any time, and that is to be commended. I would like to see that extended to other departments and other agencies.

One thing I would also like to see is what the federal government has done, which is have an open disclosure access for FOI so that, if you put in an FOI request to a department, they send out the information and they also put that information on the website so that everybody can see that information. That prevents some people, particularly politicians, using that information maybe three or four months later when the media might be having a slow news day. Out comes this file, and they say, 'Here's this secret file that we have uncovered,' and it has actually been sitting there for four months and they could have released this information at any time. We should put that on the website so that it is available for all.

As people might have suspected, I am not particularly supportive of this bill, but good on the member for Hartley for bringing it forward. I was listening particularly attentively to the deputy leader's discussion and not at any stage did I hear her say, 'This is now Liberal Party policy.' I never heard her say, 'If we get into government, we will bring in this act.' We all know, everybody who is listening to this debate knows, that this is something that you say in opposition but if you were over here you would never bring this bill forward.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PICTON: So I would like to see the member for Hartley sign in blood that he will move this bill if he is ever in government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm on my feet. You are called to order, and I am warning you now. Not another word.

Mr PICTON: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, for your protection. I would like to see the member for Hartley swear in blood that in, say, 16, 20 or 24 years' time when he is in government he will bring

forward this bill and will be completely committed to it then as he is now. In fact, I would like to see the Leader of the Opposition also say that this is Liberal Party policy and that, should he become Premier in 16 or 20 years' time, he will bring in this bill as his first act of office. I do not think that will happen. I do not think so. I think they will be very careful about what they saying about this bill because they do not want to see it if they are ever to be in government.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gee.

EMERGENCY SERVICES FUNDING (SACAT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:08): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Emergency Services Funding Act 1988. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

First of all, I commend the government for the amendments it made to the SACAT bill in the other place following the debate in this house. As you may recall, I made suggestions that we amend the SACAT bill to allow for any disputation regarding property valuations to be dealt with in the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal rather than at its current ultimate point of dispute resolution, which is of course the Supreme Court here in South Australia. I must say that I was delighted when the government took up this suggestion in its own amendments to its own bill, and of course that was approved in the other place.

In the contribution that was made by the Hon. Gail Gago regarding the amendments in relation to valuation, the honourable member went on to say that the Liberal member of the Legislative Council asked whether the amendments would mean that the appeals under the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998 would also be able to access SACAT. The Hon. Gail Gago suggested that, no, over or under payments would automatically be recovered following a review of valuation in the SACAT; however, other issues currently in the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998 would not be dealt with within the SACAT.

So, consequently I bring this amendment bill, the Emergency Services Funding (SACAT) Amendment Bill 2014 to this place. I do so for very good reason, and that is that we need to make sure that people who are paying the emergency services levy here in South Australia—the recently extraordinarily increased emergency services levy—have a very effective way of dealing with disputes which may arise.

When we read through the current act we note that there are many areas that relate to the potential for disputes and it points to different dispute resolution methodologies. My bill seeks to make the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal the ultimate determining jurisdiction for disputes under the Emergency Services Funding Act. I just wish to go through a couple of those disputes identified in the bill that is before us today.

Clause 5 deals with disputes which relate to aggregation of non-contiguous land. In South Australia, if there is a dispute between a landlord and the minister, currently the jurisdiction which presides over that dispute is the District Court, and we see that as inappropriate now that we have finally established a civil and administrative tribunal here in South Australia. Of course, we are the last jurisdiction in the country to establish this, but that is why we say that now that it is established, let us use it.

The second area, which I deal with in clause 6, is to do with land uses. Again, if there are disputes regarding land uses, where somebody might say, 'This is a rural property' and somebody else might say, 'Well, it's a commercial property,' there are different levy rates that apply to the two. If there is a dispute, currently that dispute is dealt with in the Supreme Court. Again, this bill would rectify that situation or redirect that jurisdiction to the SACAT.

The third area that is contemplated in this bill under clause 7 is alterations to the assessment book, and this is something that I was not particularly aware of before I read this. But there is an

assessment book and applications can be made to the commissioner for an alteration of the assessment book by a landowner on a range of grounds.

If there is a dispute in this area, my bill seeks to have that ultimate determination made in the SACAT. Clause 8 deals with the recovery of the levy, which the commissioner may try to make from time to time. So, this relates to section 21 of the Emergency Services Funding Act, and in this situation where the commissioner seeks to recover a levy, if there is a dispute regarding the recovery of this levy, then that would also be dealt with under the SACAT rather than the current arrangement which, I believe, is the District Court of South Australia. Finally, clause 9 deals with objections regarding the classification of a vehicle. Again, this is something which I understand is currently dealt with in the District Court, and we would seek to have that dealt with under the SACAT.

We essentially move this amendment bill to fully utilise the excellent attributes of the newly established SACAT which provides a cost-effective remedy, but, most importantly, a timely remedy for people who may have disputes with the government around a range of issues. In particular, this deals with disputes arising from the emergency services levy, and this is an issue which, of course, is capturing the imagination of the people of South Australia at the moment. Everybody is putting a great deal of scrutiny on their emergency services levy, and well they might, because in recent months people have been receiving the latest copy of their emergency services levy bill. For many people, they have gone up very significantly. I note that some people have even claimed they have had increases in excess of 1,000 per cent in a single year.

Consequently, people are looking very carefully at every element of their emergency services levy bills here in South Australia. That is why we are suggesting to the government they ensure that disputes regarding the emergency services levy are dealt with in a timely and cost-effective manner, not through the South Australian District Court or the Supreme Court, but through the new SACAT. With those words, I commend the bill to the house.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECRIMINALISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 November 2014.)

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:18): I rise today to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Decriminalisation of Sex Work) Bill 2014. I rise with full respect for the member for Ashford, but I oppose the bill. I oppose it not only because of my personal beliefs and the beliefs of those I represent, on balance or on the whole, but also because I believe this is a bill which attacks the fabric of society, the fabric of society of most of my electors. I will vote against it, but not necessarily based on any legalistic argument. I urge members to give the moral and legal issues full consideration, but on the whole I will not be supporting this bill.

I do not believe in legalising prostitution in any way, shape or form, and I know that the majority of my constituents would not support it either. Prostitution is legal in regulated forms in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland, and we have seen in those examples that it has led to an expansion of illegal brothels. It is said that one in four brothels in New South Wales do not comply with the act in many respects, despite their legalisation.

Since this debate has come to the surface again, I have had many constituents write to me over the past couple of weeks and they have drawn my attention to the member's bill. The vast majority encouraged me to vote against the bill. I understand that other lobby groups support the bill and I believe sincerely that their views are a bit misguided and that there is a clear lack of understanding of its implications, should it be enacted.

I want to talk a little bit about FamilyVoice Australia and some of the material they have circulated which has assisted me in realising the possible implications of this bill. We have seen jurisdictions around the western world that have decriminalised or legalised the sex trade and it is common knowledge that the police in several states find it extremely difficult to enforce laws regarding the exchange of money for sex. I am against any commoditisation of women or men and I

do not believe that this is in the best interests of my electorate or in the best interests of South Australia, not to mention the planning issues that are associated with this bill.

Before I was a member of parliament I was part of a local council, and let me just say that our local councils do a fantastic job, but the last thing they need is an extra burden, extra red tape or extra issues in trying to enforce and determine the planning issues that will result if these brothels are approved. It is going to be a massive issue. Apart from the moral issue, it is probably the biggest social issue that is produced by this bill. How will these be enforced? How will the Planning Act be regulated and incorporated to include these brothels? Where will these brothels operate?

I do not want these brothels to be operating near my community schools. I do not want these brothels to be operating in the vicinity of family spaces. This is a massive issue and, with full respect to the member for Ashford, her bill does not address these. I simply cannot support the bill. Many brothel operators appear to engage—I will be polite to them—in other illegal activity. It would seem very likely therefore that many brothels would continue to operate unlawfully.

Prostitution is often portrayed as an agreement between a willing purchaser and a willing vendor to which there could be no objection. We have seen time and time again studies that have illustrated that prostitution is certainly not the glamorous thing that some people make it out to be. I would encourage members to read a particular report that I have had a look at concerning the practical effects of prostitution. I refer to a 2006 article by Melissa Farley, PhD candidate, published in the *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism*, titled 'Prostitution, trafficking and cultural amnesia: what we must not know in order to keep the business of sexual exploitation running smoothly.'

There is also mass concern regarding the exploitation of children and women. Women are obviously much more vulnerable, particularly when they are put into this kind of environment. Sexual harassment is common. Sexual violence is common in these businesses when they are legalised. Do not be fooled and do not think that rape cases or HIV transmission by any means will actually decrease, because the threat of contracting HIV and the threat of rape is not at all diminished under legal prostitution.

There are many international examples where they have said to us blatantly, 'You know what? We got this wrong.' I implore members to look at the examples from overseas. Have a look at what it has done to the family structure. Have a look at what it has done to the fabric of society. Have a look at what it has done to the social platform of those countries. What you will see is that trafficking of women is still a major problem, even with the legalisation of prostitution. The case of Sweden, where police actively enforced the law, is another example I encourage members to look at.

There was an article in *The Sydney Morning Herald* last month that revealed some sex workers are frequently exploited and some are paid less based on other Australian counterparts. There are a number of issues, even when legalised. There are also issues concerning who owns these brothels if they are to be legalised. The member for Ashford has many answers to provide in relation to that. I have full respect for the member for Ashford and her passionate interest in this, but there are a number of issues with this bill and I simply cannot support it.

The prohibition of underage sex workers is something this bill fails to consider. There would need to be further controls on street sex workers, advertising, infected sex workers not working, licences and who enforces those licences, which office will administer those licences? This bill has none of these. Who is an approved manager? Is there a tribunal that overrides it? What are the powers of inspection?

I thank the police for providing recent consultation to members. They even say that enforcement is a massive issue. To catch one of these people in the act is extremely hard at the moment and there are a wide range of issues stemming from this bill. Planning controls and issues associated with planning controls are a massive concern, especially in residential zones, community and church areas.

Whilst I understand that the member for Ashford has a particular interest in this area, I respect her points of view, and I say this with deep respect from both sides of the argument. I implore members on both sides of the house to do their research on this issue. Have a look at it and have a look at what this bill will do to the fabric of our society if it is implemented. What will it do to the family structure? What will it do to the planning process and the social fabric that we have in our local area?

Brothels appear to engage or host other illegal activity, and it would seem likely therefore that many more brothels will continue to operate if this bill comes to fruition. With those few words, I am against the bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:27): I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Decriminalisation of Sex Work) Bill. I commend the speech that the member for Hartley has just delivered. Certainly, as the representative for the seat of Hammond, I will not be supporting this bill because I believe, too, that if the decriminalisation of prostitution happened it would break down society as we know it. I have been lobbied far and wide and by a lot of my local people, including my local churches and other groups.

In the context of the bill, I want to refer to some notes from Ngaire Button, Deputy Mayor of Christchurch, New Zealand, who has issued a blunt warning to South Australians, especially in respect of members of this house who are debating this bill. The deputy mayor indicated that Christchurch has been going through tough times since the huge earthquakes wrecked the central business district. New Zealand's Prostitution Reform Act 2003, which is basically the same as Steph Key's Sex Work Reform Bill, has only added to the city's problems, including financial problems. Ms Button spoke to Family Voice Australia leaders who were visiting Christchurch last week. She said:

It's really hard to get somebody that's employed to do traffic enforcement and enforce conditions on resource and building consents to go out and do enforcements around brothel compliance. It's a specialised skill. What we've found is that this whole thing has taken up so many resources. And who's paying? The ratepayer!

This (South Australian) bill will have an impact on rates, on the efficiency of how cities run, because it is staff time and not police time. The sex industry...because it is so fraught with so many criminal facets, it really is a law and order issue, not a local government issue. A parking officer who enters a brothel wouldn't necessarily know what to look out for.

Our staff have spent hours, weeks, months, over the last few years trying to manage prostitution in the city. We had 300 submissions from various groups in the city about signage. We had a big stack of submissions, hundreds—asking us not to allow brothels in their area. We can't do anything about street prostitution.

The street walkers fight about possession. They yell at each other across the road and argue, make a racket, and the cars are stopping...and there's the mess in people's yards, because there are no toilets. So they've been using people's yards as toilets. Then there's the condoms and needles and other things in people's front yards and around the property and on the streets. And husbands being solicited in their driveway as they come home from work.

Pimping has been an issue too. A council colleague has been to Manchester Street to talk to some of the girls. There are guys behind them with baseball bats. The exploitation has caused great problems with drug addiction.

Ngaire Button also indicated that the Christchurch council has tried to limit the placement of brothels, but was taken to court by a man who owned three brothels. The council lost the case. She said, 'It cost ratepayers \$100,000. It's put a huge burden on us to manage brothels within the city.' She also indicated that she was not aware of any prostitute murders before the sex industry was decriminalised in 2003, but since that time three Christchurch sex workers have been murdered, yet the law was supposed to make it safer.

I think just this one case of what is happening in Christchurch, New Zealand indicates how wrong it is to decriminalise this industry. In putting the onus of control back on local government, which is already overstretched, especially with a lot of functions that have been passed their way from state governments in the past, you have parking inspectors and other council inspectors having to take over the role of the local police force essentially. It becomes a local government matter and then it becomes a ratepayer matter. As we have seen in this case, when there was a contest about where brothels could be located, it cost the council \$100,000. This just should not happen.

From what was indicated in that submission, you can just imagine the problems with the street walkers accessing people's homes and yards, and the lack of control that people have on where these brothels will be located. They could be right next door or right next to the school that your children go to.

I will refer to a few quotes from a joint submission from Abolish Prostitution Now, Nordic Model Australia Coalition, Collective Shout, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women Australia, Amnesty members against the decriminalisation of pimps and punters, Adopt Nordic WA and SPACE

International. In their submission they say that they are writing to make us all aware that the proposal in this legislation is actually a strategy to deregulate the sex industry. They say:

Pimps and other prostitution entrepreneurs stand to profit from the deregulation of their market sector, which will allow them to expand and diversify their businesses in an environment of lax regulation.

Survivors of prostitution in Australia—

who are members of some of these organisations I quoted earlier—

oppose any further deregulation of the sex industry. Their experience of the Australian sex industry has been one of violence, degradation, intimidation and harassment. Pimps and sex industry customers already enjoy high levels of impunity in their sexual use and abuse of women through prostitution businesses in Australia, and any proposal to legislatively guarantee the privacy of their activities further threaten those who are sold in the sex industry.

The submission also states that it is the wish of these organisations that:

People in prostitution should attract no legal penalty, and laws punishing these people should be removed from the South Australian statutes. However, these laws can be removed without any need to decriminalise pimps and sex industry customers. People who financially and sexually profit from the prostitution of others should continue to be criminalised. Their actions inflict harm on individuals, as well as society at large.

It is interesting that across the world a number of governments have removed laws against people in prostitution while still retaining criminal sanctions against pimps and sex industry customers. These include Sweden, South Korea, Norway, Iceland, Canada and Northern Ireland. In their submission, this group encourages our parliament:

to alternatively investigate the examples set by these governments in implementing what is known as the 'Nordic model' of legislation.

It is to be noted that:

The NSW government deregulated that state's sex industry in the 1990s, and the results of this laissez faire prostitution environment in metropolitan Sydney were recorded in a report published in 2012. These results included the following:

- identification of 400 premises that were 'probably brothels' in Sydney's greater metropolitan area alone (and this number does not include escort agencies, street prostitution or strip clubs)
- 'A realistic estimate of numbers of sex workers working within 20 kilometres of Sydney's CBD within any one year might...[be] between 3,000 and 4,500. It is also known that there are a number of brothels operating in Western and South-Western Sydney and some NSW regional centres...numbers in these locations add...one or two thousand to the annual total'
- 'Two thirds...of the sex workers...were from Asian...or other non-English speaking countries...and nearly half...rated their English skills as 'Fair' or 'Poor'
- '11% of the Asian women...reported that they were unhappy about being involved in sex work'
- '8% of...participants reported being assaulted by clients, 10% threatened by clients, and a third...reported being pressured by a client to do something they didn't want to do'

I think this shows that decriminalising prostitution does not work. It has not worked in making prostitutes safer under the police who have been conducting oversight of brothels in the situation that already exists in South Australia.

Certainly, in light of all the information that has been given to me, and in my representation of my seat of Hammond, I will not be supporting the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY ON ELECTORAL REFORM BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 November 2014.)

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:38): We had progressed quite far along in my contribution last time, but there are a number of points I would like to make in my remaining time. Whenever we look at change and when we look at the evolution of South Australia, it is instructive to look at history. It

is difficult to look at history merely from trying to read newspapers or understand text from that time. It is really good to get firsthand experience.

To that end, I was extremely fortunate to be able to catch up with former premier Steele Hall, a man who should know a thing or two about electoral reform and the reform of the parliament. We talked about a great many things, and I said, 'How long did it take to change the electoral system that gave weight to rural residents?' Premier Hall said it took over a decade. It took over a decade of Don Dunstan railing against what he saw as that injustice and for there to be action. It was a constant, long-term campaign by a young, energetic pink shorts-wearing member of parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not all the time.

Mr KNOLL: Yes. What struck me most was Steele's words in relation to why, in the end, electoral reform was undertaken. In Steele's words, the reason for the change was that the electorate had moved on. The city population was growing, and this necessitated a change in the electoral system. In fact, we had seen over many years the shift of South Australia's population from the country to the city, and this necessitated that change. Indeed, by the time it happened, he said that it was a case where South Australia had moved on and that these were merely common-sense changes that were then supported.

It was more about evolution than straightforward unfairness, and can I say that I think we have hit that time again. I think we have come to a time where current-day South Australia has moved on from the current electoral system, where the primacy of individual electorates has given way to a greater statewide focus, brought about by increased media attention, the all-pervasiveness of social media, and the plethora of ways in which people can engage with a statewide campaign.

We see more presidential-style campaigning, and indeed the activities of the leaders of the government and the opposition are very much at the centre of the way campaigns are run. This is now, in essence, what I believe people are voting for, and I think we need to have a system that allows and reflects that style of campaigning and that style of focus when it comes to elections. I believe that a top-up system would place voting for your local member on a much more equal footing with the party that receives the majority vote.

There is a way to achieve both aims. This idea that we are talking about 24 seats in the house versus winning a majority of the two-party preferred vote does not need to be on a mutually exclusive basis. Indeed, the top-up system is a system where both those aims can be guaranteed to be achieved. I think that serves the people of South Australia much better by them being able to get both of the things they want—the local member they want and the party that they want to form government. With modern communications, with information dissemination, this is the way South Australia needs to go.

In closing, can I say that South Australia has moved on. In the elections over the previous years, we have shown that South Australia has moved on, and it is time for the Labor Party to catch up with the people of South Australia.

Mr GARDNER: Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There not being a quorum present, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

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) (16:44): Just to make sure I am absolutely clear on this, I believe we are dealing with a private member's bill moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You haven't been listening in your room?

Mr Gardner: Commission of Inquiry on Electoral Reform Bill.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's the one I was listening to. I wanted to say a few words about this. The first point I wanted to make is that I think all of us in this place agree that there is a need for a conversation about parliamentary and, quite probably, constitutional reform in South Australia. There are a number of issues that are sitting around the place, and some of those are issues which

have been ventilated by the opposition, some of those are issues that the government has raised, some of them refer basically to amendments to the Electoral Act, in effect, and some of them look at more profound changes, for example the tenure of people in another place; and having spent a few minutes there recently, my views have been reinforced.

Let's try to confine this particular conversation today not so much to the outcomes that all of us would like to achieve, because I suspect there are things that we would all have in common and there are some things that we may differ on. Without going too far down the track, for example, the proposition advanced by members of the opposition was that there was some failure of the electoral redistribution process which in effect denied the opposition a favourable outcome at the last election. That is a conversation that has been advanced by members of the opposition.

I simply make the point that if the number of seats which were won by people who were non-Labor candidates, in the context of those seats being notionally Liberal Party seats, was 24, and the number that were won by the Labor Party candidates was 23, that means that, all other things being equal, the redistribution that occurred in 2012 produced exactly the sort of result that it was intended to produce. The fact that two of those seats—

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, sure, but given the two-party preferred vote, which is a mathematical fiction, etc., etc. Two of those seats were in fact won by the member for Fisher and the member for Frome. It is not reasonable to say it is the government's fault that in what would notionally be a Liberal Party seat a person who is not a member of the official Liberal Party ticket has won one of the seats. That is not our doing and that is an internal issue for the Liberal Party; it is not an issue for the Electoral Commissioner or an issue for the boundaries commission.

More particularly, we have now two contending models sitting there to deal with electoral reform. We accept that electoral reform and parliamentary reform is important, and we have said that from the time of the election. There are issues like, for example, optional preferential voting in the other place to deal with the scourge of microparties. Let's have a look now at what is going on in Canberra and the absolute mayhem that has been let loose in the Senate because of the outcome of not being able to deal with that problem.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Being sold a pup.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Indeed, being sold a pup. The situation is basically this: what is the best way forward for us to have the conversation? Bear in mind that all of us are going to have different priorities about what should be in that conversation, and we are going to have different priorities about things we want to see happen out of this conversation. That is the question. It is the how question, not the what question.

There are two contending models as to how. The first model is the one the government put up, which is to have a joint house parliamentary standing committee to which all matters of concern relating to these issues can be referred and that those members of parliament, who will be in that committee, will call such evidence as they need to call, will hear from such witnesses as they need to hear from, and that can include academics—it can include anybody they want. That is model number one.

Model number two is the one that is being advanced by the Leader of the Opposition. Model number two basically says this: there is to be an inquiry. The inquiry is to be led by three commissioners. These commissioners no doubt are intended by the Leader of the Opposition to be quite august and meritorious individuals, and they will go off and prepare a report which they will then bring back.

Presumably, and inevitably, that report will simply be a report to the parliament by a bunch of people who are not members of parliament, and that report will make recommendations to the parliament coming from a bunch of people who are not members of parliament. The parliament will be perfectly entitled to say, 'That might be your view, commissioners, it's very interesting, but, guess what: we don't agree with you,' and into the wastepaper basket it will go.

The Hon. P. Caica: Like so many other reports.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Like so many others. In the time I have been here, I have learned one or two things and they are that, when it comes to things of particular interest and, understandably, particular knowledge of members of parliament, members of parliament are reluctant to have people who do not know what is going on tell them how things should work in a perfect world. It just does not work.

My suggestion, and the government's suggestion, is simply this: for goodness sake, let us elect members of the opposition and members of the government in both houses. Let both the major parties—and the minor parties for that matter—advance all of their grievances. Give it to this committee. Let the committee call whatever evidence they have to call. Let the committee bring back a report to the parliament, but that committee will be a committee of this parliament.

The people sitting on that committee and writing that report will be members of this parliament. They will be able to debate in this chamber and the other place all of the recommendations of that committee. That is a fundamentally different proposition than to have some outsiders, albeit well-meaning and perhaps well-qualified people otherwise, trying to tell the parliament how to do the parliament's business.

I also point out, and I know this is a matter of detail, that it is quite peculiar for a bill not only to propose something like this but also then to go on and talk about this subsidiary committee which is created in the schedule which names the members who are going to be on that committee—and one of them, unfortunately, is not with us anymore, because the member for Fisher is named. This proposition, naming the Hon. John Darley, the Hon. Kelly Vincent, the Hon. Bob Such and the Hon. Geoff Brock, whether or not they wish to be involved (and one of them, as we know, is unable to be involved), is so prescriptive and unhelpful. What we should do is say to each chamber, 'Each of you are going to get a certain number of spots. Just work it out for yourselves.' We then will have this standing committee of the parliament which can then get on and have a look at these issues.

I strongly agree with the Leader of the Opposition that we do need to have a grown-up conversation about parliamentary reform and about constitutional reform. I strongly agree with that, and the government strongly agrees. My quarrel is with the mechanism, and I fear that a mechanism which involves handing over to outsiders a conversation which needs to occur with and be persuasive of members of parliament is bound to fail and it will just waste valuable time.

For that reason, and that reason only, I object to this method. I do not support this method. I do, however, endorse and welcome the idea that the Leader of the Opposition has embraced the notion of being open to parliamentary and constitutional reform. That is good. I am happy about that. All of us on this side are happy about that. We are not happy with this method.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. J.R. Rau.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (16:54): I do not support the proposition before the house, for the reasons that were very well articulated by the member for Enfield (the Deputy Premier), and believe that the proposition to establish a select committee of members of both houses would be a more appropriate and proper way to go.

Having said that, like others on this side, I am not against having a proper discussion on things that may well be required to deliver some parliamentary reform, particularly in the other place. However, I just want to make this point: if you are really serious about having an inquiry, I think the inquiry should be into why the opposition lost the election. I say that because—

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, they should have an internal inquiry, or even get people in from outside, and ask, 'How did we lose that election?' I can give you a few hints as to why I think you did.

The Hon. S.W. Key: Let them find out for themselves.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, the simple fact is that on this side of the house we have people who are very used to being campaigners in marginal seats. You know that yourself, Madam Deputy Speaker, because you have won five elections as a marginal seat person over a period of time. The fact is that you did not, as was the case with the member for Ashford, start campaigning two, three or four months out from the election. You do it 24 hours a day, seven days a week over the four-year

electoral term. Maybe not 24 hours a day. If you are not doing it 24 hours a day, you are probably dreaming about it. The simple fact is that marginal seat campaigning starts immediately after an election—

Ms Chapman: You shouldn't say terrible things about Chloe.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, Chloe lost. You won that seat; I accept that.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: The only person who is insinuating terrible things about Chloe is you.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before we go any further, the deputy leader did spend some time out of the room, so she is back to clean, but I am going to call her to order.

Mr Gardner: Can you get him back to the bill?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, without interjections we might make some progress.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am talking about the bill. In fact, I am talking against the bill. I am talking about where an inquiry should lead, and that inquiry ought to lead to how useless you were with respect to the last campaign in regard to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I said order. I am bringing him back.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I said order and I know he is going to come straight back to the topic.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am. You cannot win an election, Deputy Speaker, by not differentiating yourselves from the government of the day. You cannot win an election by being a small target. You cannot win an election by not saying what you mean and meaning what you say. You cannot win an election if you are going to only ever say, 'We need to take the handbrake off the economy.' You cannot win an election if on the very last day of the campaign you tell people to vote for Labor if you are the Leader of the Opposition.

The point I am making is this: elections under our Westminster democratic system are won on and by the party that wins the most seats. That is simply a fact and it is not going to change in the near future. What the opposition is doing by putting forward this proposal is actually a bit like sour grapes: 'God, we lost; we should never have lost that. We want some type of reform in place that's going to guarantee us a better chance of winning.' Well, I am telling you right now that the best chance you have of winning is getting off your backsides and working harder than you have in the past—it is as simple as that.

Nothing that we ever put in place is going to take away the fact that it is still going to be the party that wins the most seats that is going to be delivered government. For all intents and purposes, you can continue to get 77 per cent, 79 per cent, two-party preferred in Flinders, 73 per cent in MacKillop and 70 whatever it is in the seat of Chaffey (it is above the 70s), but I am quite happy to continue to get 51.5 per cent in Colton, although I would like a bit more of a buffer. But I will take that any time as a marginal seat to ensure that that works towards delivering our party back to government. So I do not support this bill before us, but I do agree that we need to have a proper and mature discussion about electoral reform—

Mr Knoll: It sounds like you don't want any.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I do want some, but I do not want what you want. Why on earth would we give this to someone else, to three commissioners, to go away and come back and tell us what they think when we could be in charge of our own destiny? I would urge the opposition to support

the government's proposal to establish a standing committee made up of members of both sides of the house. I will also tell you this—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have a point of order. Member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: The member is speaking about a different bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is coming right back to topic.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I will also say that, with respect to parliamentary committees, we know from time to time that they have also delivered reports which are collecting dust around this place, but bipartisan approach to electoral reform determined by a committee of the parliament, this parliament, will only ignore those recommendations at its own peril.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:00): The Leader of the Opposition has presented this bill in good faith to establish a commission of inquiry for electoral reform with independence. Much has been said in this debate about the outcome of the last election, and it is pivotal to the basis upon which the Leader of the Opposition presented this bill; namely, to have a short inquiry by independent parties deliverable by 1 July 2015 dealing with this question of how is it that the objectives in our constitutional obligations in respect of boundaries and electoral mandates for the purposes of election success have got it so wrong?

We can argue the point about what happened at the election, who should have won and all those things. They have been traversed in many speeches in the house in the last six months. The Leader of the Opposition has presented a formula so that, rather than having a group of us advise us on what we might do to remedy this situation—and, clearly, we will never agree—we actually have independent parties do that.

I think it is rather churlish of the government to say, 'Let's have mature conversation' when, in many instances, they appoint independent parties to give advice to the government on how they progress their business. If there is going to be a genuine review of what we do and how we can do it better, and have some level of independence, then having independent parties is a sensible way to go.

Recognition of the fact that the across-the-board representation of the parliament is included in the committee of appointment, or the panel that is going to select the parties, is why the late Hon. Bob Such was included. He was included because he was an Independent member in this house. Sadly, his passing means that he could not be offered membership on that panel in that regard. I think it is rather churlish of the Attorney to suggest that the approach here is faulty because we have a nomination from the Leader of the Opposition, and the nominee is now deceased.

We think this is a superior model and much more likely to be effective. The public, indeed, in their contribution on any submission they might make, will also see this as a level of independence that is important. The Attorney appointed Mr Brian Hayes QC to conduct a panel inquiry into planning law in this state and reform, and appointed a number of people independent of the parliament to carefully examine what we have and how to do it better. It is exactly the same formula. I find it rather disappointing that the government will take this approach.

I know that the Leader of the Opposition would want me to thank those who have made an enormous contribution to consideration of reform—those many people who wrote, emailed and telephoned the leader and other members on our side of the house (and probably to the government as well) after the election saying, 'Fair crack of the whip; something needs to be done.' There is a serious problem if the public is not able to rely on there being an outcome that is consistent with their voting.

It may be, ultimately, that a panel of inquiry identifies that determinations of one or more of the commissioners under the electoral boundaries had erred—that is possible. No-one would escape the inquiry in relation to the nature of what is being presented, and how that operates may need to be strengthened. Clearly, something is not working, and we are keen to have some electoral reform in that regard. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for carefully considering this bill. In presenting

this bill to this parliament, I thank him for his attempt to have a fair representation, to remove the political mischief or motive and to have an independent panel in that regard.

I am disappointed the government has been so fulsome in their rejection of this, rather than look at a body which will obviously be partisan in its contributions. That is particularly disappointing. It is a little bit like saying, 'Let us have a Legislative Council committee that will consider whether we should abolish the Legislative Council or reform it.'

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: As the member says, 'That will work—not.' It is absurd. We cannot internalise this and give the public a true and considered assessment of what that position is.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: If the member for Bragg is offering that as an inducement, I might need to reconsider my position.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have not advanced any expansion of the terms of reference for this committee. That is another matter; it is not an electoral matter. That is obviously parliamentary reform as distinct from electoral reform, and the Attorney well knows my view. I only point to Queensland whenever anyone raises with me the question of abolition of the other place. The upper houses are worthy and they do make a contribution and section 10 of the constitution is important, and I do not think I will be changing my mind any time soon in relation to that.

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: I know the Attorney is now whimpering away with the new pathetic shrinking from their 100-year old tradition of abolition of the upper houses and what a dastardly waste of money they are and that they are now into this sort of principled reform. The reality is that we are proposing a targeted independent body in relation to a specific problem which we think would have merit and which the public would appreciate. I am very disappointed, as is the Leader of the Opposition, that the government has taken such a narrow and immature approach to this.

Second reading negatived.

CITY OF ADELAIDE (CAPITAL CITY COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July 2014.)

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) (17:07): I just want to say a few words about this matter. In a way I understand why this has been put up by the member for Adelaide. At a fairly sort of superficial level it seems a reasonable proposition but, in fact, I do not believe it is and I will explain why.

At the recent council election, the candidates for Lord Mayor—the two really seriously contending candidates for Lord Mayor—got two and a bit thousand votes, and after the distribution of preferences we have a new Lord Mayor, and I wish him well. I have to say I have had a brief conversation with him because I thought it was appropriate to sit down and have a chat. I am quietly optimistic that, so far as he is concerned, there will be a good, progressive and engaged relationship, and I look forward to that and I hope my anticipation of that turns out to be correct.

Getting back to the main point, the fact is that it depends on how you characterise the city of Adelaide. I characterise the city of Adelaide as the capital of South Australia. What happens in our capital city is of relevance to everybody in South Australia.

We have 1.5 million people or thereabouts; 1.2 million or thereabouts reside somewhere around the metropolitan area, and obviously the centre of the metropolitan area is the area within the Parklands; that contains most of the commercial centres, the cultural centres and all those other things. Those are assets for all South Australians. They are things that all of us as South Australians are entitled to feel belong to us and are part of our collective heritage.

Consider this: each person sitting in this room has roughly 22,000 people who are electors who have made a decision that you, whoever you might be, are to be the person who will represent them in the parliament for four years. Every person in this room has had 22,000 voters, not to mention how many people in their electorates are not voters because they are too young or they are not citizens or whatever they might be. Each person in this room has 30,000-odd people or whatever they stand here to represent.

I come back to the point—and no disrespect to the candidates—that the highest single vote for a councillor in the Adelaide City Council was 1,500 or 1,600, something like that, and then there were 900 and something else. So, the basic proposition that comes from that is the council is an elected body, which is elected on a relatively narrow base. It is given an opportunity to interact with the state government that represents everybody through the City of Adelaide Act. One might argue as to whether or not it interacts well—that is a different topic—and that may change from time to time depending on who the personalities on the committee are. That is the purpose of it.

The important thing to understand is the state is on that committee representing everybody in South Australia, not representing anybody in particular. For example, why are the residents of Tanunda any less relevant in having their opinions known about what should happen to the City of Adelaide than the residents of Quorn or the residents of Mount Gambier or the residents of Kadina? Why are they less relevant? The answer, of course, is that they are not less relevant, which then brings me to the other question: why is it that the member for Adelaide's residents are so important? Why are they so important that they get on there twice?

They get on there once because the City Council has been elected by them, those of them who choose to vote, and they then have no other member of parliament representing the other 1.5 million people in the state. The member for Goyder does not get there to talk about what people in Kadina think of what they are doing in here. He misses out. However, the member for Adelaide, whoever that person might be from time to time, gets a seat at that table, and that is a little bit like any member of this room expecting to be seated at the table of the G20 because it is in Brisbane and we are the city councillor for Brisbane.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, that followed, didn't it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It just does not add up. It does not make sense. That is the first point, and that is actually the main point about this. This is really about the state government of the day, whoever that might be, interacting with the council of the day, whoever that might be. No individual member of this chamber has any more relevance being at that table than anybody else, including the member for Adelaide. Leave aside what might happen if the Redistribution Committee decided, heaven forbid, to separate North Adelaide from Adelaide. Which one is going to go in then? Who is going to go in then? Or if you separated lower North Adelaide from upper North Adelaide and drew a line down Grote Street, my goodness, you would have five of them in there. Do they fight it out to see which one gets in?

In order partially to avoid that terrible possibility of five so-called members for Adelaide under the definitions here having to fight it out for who gets a seat at the table—and that would be very unseemly—and partly because the member for Adelaide, whoever she or he might be, has no greater reason to be there than anyone else in this room—

Mr Knoll: Except that her constituents are within the seat of Adelaide.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The member for Schubert points out the constituents are in the seat of Adelaide, and I make the point that your constituents, member for Schubert, are just as entitled to have a view about what goes on in Adelaide as mine are, as are the member for Goyder's and, yes, even the member—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —for Bragg's people are entitled to have a view about what goes on in the city. I am surprised that she has been left out, quite frankly.

Ms Chapman: I have a little slice of the Parklands in Bragg.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The member for Bragg has a small slice of the Parklands and yet is being ignored by the member for Adelaide. There is an example. I was not aware the example was already there, and it is there. The chopping up of the city has begun. This is worse than I thought. I anticipated it was possible; I was not aware it had already begun. The other point I would make, and I say this with some degree of earnestness, is this: in the fullness of time, perhaps when the member for Schubert is 20 or 30 years older, those who sit on that side of the chamber presently will be sitting on this side of the chamber.

The Hon. S.W. Key: No.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It could happen. Were that to happen, one thing they should ponder carefully is, if amongst their ranks there happens to be the member for Adelaide of the day, and if that member for Adelaide happens to be, by reason of something like this bill, on that Capital City Committee, look out.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member for Schubert and the member for Hammond.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is the case that members for the seat of Adelaide, of whatever party, over time have felt particular pressures peculiar to the City of Adelaide—when I say 'the city' I mean the city in its small sense, not the city in the metropolitan sense—which makes things very, very difficult for them from time to time.

Ms Chapman: Yes, like opening up roads.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Name one! Don't use the 'B' word.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I would invite members of the opposition, in the event that this bill is defeated, to consider themselves fortunate as having had a near-death experience at some point in the future.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:17): I rise to support the member for Adelaide's bill in which she seeks to be represented in respect of the decisions made by the Capital City Committee. This structure has existed for some time. In fact, the Deputy Premier, Premier, Deputy Lord Mayor and Lord Mayor all sit on it. I am not even sure what they do. I read their annual report every year. I think they meet every three months, sit around a table, chit-chat about what they think would be good for Adelaide and spend a bit of money. They have a couple of staff, I think.

Frankly, I read the report every year and it does not tell us that they have actually advanced anything, but I suppose at least there is the chance to say, 'Are you going to the Christmas Pageant?' or, 'What are you doing for the day?' I do not know, but I can tell you that the action statement in relation to this document is pretty thin. Nevertheless, I think it is important that levels of government do meet. It is just unfortunate that it does not seem to be terribly productive.

When the former member for Adelaide was the member for Adelaide, the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith, and a member of the cabinet under the Rann government, she of course fought very hard to have specific, special representation. In fact, she was appointed the minister for the City of Adelaide. That is far more important than actually being on this committee that sits around and drinks cups of tea when it meets. She was appointed the minister by this government.

In the circumstance where there is special recognition of Adelaide as the capital city and as the cultural and commercial centre of South Australia, the government did just that. It gave special recognition to the local member of parliament. All the current member for Adelaide is asking for is the opportunity to be represented in some form, and at that table would be appropriate. I think it is rather churlish of the government to suggest, 'Why should the member for Adelaide be there and have something different from the others?'

Of course, the Attorney-General speaks as though uniqueness is something to be shunned and that everyone has to have the same. I did wonder, then, why Kangaroo Island, as an iconic part of South Australia and also very important for South Australians and the tourism and agricultural industries etc., should have a commissioner as some great advocate in the cabinet on behalf of that

region and no-one else in South Australia should have one or is eligible to have one or has been given any provision to have one.

There are aspects of this state and areas and regions that do have a uniqueness and are significant and are afforded some special attention. This government has demonstrated that by its own provision of special arrangements, so I think it is rather churlish that they should deny the member for Adelaide having an opportunity when she is ready and willing to advocate for her region and for the capital city of Adelaide and is in a unique position, interacting with people within her electorate on a daily basis, to be able to make that contribution.

I commend the bill and ask that at least the Independent members in this house give due recognition to it and appreciate the importance of it. I would also like to congratulate the new Lord Mayor who will take his position and, I think, the new deputy. I am not sure whether that has actually changed in the elections, but, if it has not, then they will of course become members of the Adelaide capital committee as well, and I hope they can make a productive contribution.

Obviously the Premier must be deeply disappointed that his publicly-nominated candidate failed in the election as lord mayor, so he will have to weep over the loss of Mr Yarwood. Nevertheless, we have every confidence that Mr Haese will make a very significant and positive contribution. I do agree with the Attorney on that aspect, that he is to be congratulated and commended, and we should all endeavour to work with his new council for the interests of all those who either live, work or play in the City of Adelaide. With that contribution, I support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (FIREFIGHTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July 2014.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:22): On behalf of the member for Morphett, I move:

That the bill be withdrawn.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

Motions

WHITE RIBBON DAY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gardner (resumed on motion).

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (17:24): I am very pleased to be able to speak, having signed my pledge this afternoon, which is now sitting proudly in my office. The member for Stuart is obviously to be commended on bringing this motion to the house. Violence in general is to be abhorred in our society, but particularly violence against women. It is good to be able to have the opportunity in this house to speak out on the matter. It is not a good thing in our society.

If we are ever to bring our wives and daughters in our society to the point where they are able to really participate freely and fully, as they should, it is important that they are in a safe and secure environment to be able to do that, where they feel free to participate and make the choices that are available to them and to take part in this life and in our society—this wonderful Western civilisation of ours—as fully and completely as they can. The most basic requirement for them to be able to do that is a safe environment: one where they do not feel threatened, bullied or intimidated, where they are not beaten or abused in such a way as they would then refuse to participate or in fact are hurt physically or emotionally. So many people have spoken so well on this topic that I will not hold the house—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You better, because the member for Little Para has gone for his notes.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: I will conclude by strongly supporting the motion and, again, congratulate the member for Stuart on bringing it to the house.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:27): I am pleased to be able to speak on the member for Stuart's motion. I commend to anybody who was not present at the time or to anybody who is a casual reader of *Hansard*, as I like to refer to them—I know there are actually people who ask our officers to have the *Hansard* sent out to them—to ignore what I am about to say and go straight back to the member for Stuart's original moving of this motion. It was an exceptional speech.

Mr Picton interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: I am not saying that what I am about to say might not yet reach loftier heights than it started at, but the member for Stuart's speech was exceptional. I think anybody who has any regard for the way we conduct ourselves in this place can have a look at the way the member for Stuart did so this morning. This house recognises White Ribbon Day, which is of course tomorrow, but we recognise today as it is the last sitting day before—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: The 25th.

Mr GARDNER: Indeed, White Ribbon Day is the 25th. We recognise it in this house as it is the last sitting day beforehand. We encourage all men to swear an oath to never commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women. I am pleased to have made that pledge. I am pleased to have applied and am hoping, at some stage, to become a White Ribbon Ambassador. It is an excellent organisation. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (17:28): I, too, took the pledge today proudly. I do not know if I can add too much to what particularly the member for Stuart has had to say and others, of course, who have made really valuable contributions to this. I just want to speak very briefly about some things I have been looking at in relation to this recently.

I was particularly moved by the Premier's response to the Coroner's inquiry into the death of Zahra Abrahamzadeh, and it caused me to look at some of the things that are happening in the UK. The UK Law Commission is having an inquiry into offences against the person, which is basically their assault laws over there, which are very archaic—more archaic than ours—and are in desperate need of some tidying up. As part of that inquiry, the Law Commission is looking at the question of whether there should be specific offences for domestic violence: domestic violence assaults and also domestic violence without actual violence in terms of coercive bullying and those sorts of things. So, there is a debate going on in the UK.

I would like the chance to talk to people, talk to my colleagues, talk to the Attorney, about whether it is a reasonable thing to look at, creating offences around domestic violence. There are arguments for and against. One of the good ones, I think, is that you can label it as such, you can compile statistics more easily, and you can allow the police intelligence sections and the courts to look at statistics more easily.

The other thing is that, rather than it appearing on someone's criminal record simply as an aggravated assault, or something similar, it will appear clearly as a domestic violence offence, so it gives notice to social services and other agencies. My lawyer fiancée has given me numerous arguments against such a thing, so I look forward to having those discussions as we go on. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (17:30): I also rise to support this motion and thank the member for Stuart for bringing it to the house. I was very delighted to sign the pledge this morning, with both the member for Napier and the member for Stuart also present. It is a pledge I have signed before, but I think it is good to continually restate commitment to it. Most recently, I signed it at an event at the Port Noarlunga Football Club. It was the fifth time that they had held a White Ribbon event at the football club, and I congratulate them on that, particularly the community development officer, Todd Stokes, who helped organise it.

All the players sign up their commitment, as do all the fans and supporters of their two teams. I think they were playing Marion that day, and there was unanimous support from across all those present to take action in their own lives to prevent violence against women. I think it really highlighted that domestic violence and violence against women is not just a women's issue; it is as much a men's issue. We all need to take action in our own lives to make sure that we do not tolerate it, we do not accept it, and we take action to stop it.

I would also like to support the action of the member for Reynell, who moved a motion that the Social Development Committee looks into domestic violence in South Australia and what action we can take as a parliament and as a government to help to prevent that. I believe that a similar inquiry is also underway federally. I hope that we can identify more measures that we can take to help prevent such violence.

Like the member for Little Para, I support the actions the Premier recently announced in this regard. I was lucky enough to represent the Premier at the Unmask the Silent Crime Ball recently at Adelaide Oval. The Leader of the Opposition was there, as was the leader of the Greens and perhaps other members as well. It was an excellent night not only to raise awareness but also valuable funds for the fight against this horrible violence. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:33): I very genuinely thank all members who have spoken in support of this motion, and I appreciate the government's support greatly. I know that everybody who has contributed has done so very genuinely, very earnestly and in their own way.

I did particularly appreciate the member for Bragg's contribution because she put forward some suggestions for particular actions which she would like seriously considered and which would go towards reducing domestic violence and impacting upon people's inclination towards domestic violence. The member for Mitchell also made the extremely important point that it is not just White Ribbon Day on 25 November that counts; it is a milestone that makes us think about these things in a more formal structured way, but every day, every hour, every minute it is an incredibly important issue.

I am a very proud White Ribbon Ambassador, and I know that there are other White Ribbon ambassadors from both sides of politics in our South Australian parliament and that they take their role very seriously. There are ambassadors from all walks of life, in fact, and at this point in time, while not any more important than the others, I would like to single out the South Australian police force's very genuine contribution in supporting the White Ribbon foundation. I know that the commissioner, the deputy commissioner and several assistant commissioners, all the way through the police force, do what they can to support the White Ribbon foundation.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Port Augusta Homelessness and Violence Against Communities collaboration which, about three years ago, nominated me to be a White Ribbon Ambassador. They do outstanding work in Port Augusta and have my full support.

In closing, one of the really important aspects of this issue—and we have dealt with this to the very best of our ability among all those members who have taken the opportunity to speak about the reasons why we think this is such an important issue—and one thing that really needs to be said is that the White Ribbon foundation does not have it in for men. The White Ribbon foundation highlights that this is an issue that men can contribute to fixing far more than women can, and it is a responsibility that we have.

Most men do not commit violence towards women but the men who do not and the men who do are the ones who have the greatest responsibility with regard to trying to stop this problem and have a positive impact upon the men who do, and I think that that is a very important issue. Most men do not commit domestic violence, but all men have a responsibility to try to stop it. As is in the motion, I very genuinely ask all male members of parliament to swear the oath. Many have today, as the member for Kaurna has just said, and I think that is an outstanding thing. As he said, some have done it for the second or the third time.

It is something to always keep close to your minds: to swear an oath and to have it in your heart and in your mind that you will never commit or excuse or remain silent about any violence towards any woman. That should be at the forefront of people's hearts and minds every day of the year, but particularly on 25 November, I ask members to support the White Ribbon foundation in their functions in any way that they can.

Motion carried.

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (17:37): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that 2014 is the 140th anniversary of the University of Adelaide;
- (b) acknowledges the significant achievements of the university, past and present; and
- (c) promotes the future of the university as a world-class institution.

Established in 1874, the university is the third oldest in Australia and the first to admit women to academic courses in 1881. It is only the second university in the world to admit women, a reflection of, I suppose you would say, the pioneering social changes that had begun within South Australia and affected the entire nation. In another first, the university became the first in Australia to grant degrees in science.

In addition, obviously it can boast many influential and successful alumni today including Sir William Henry Bragg and his son, William Lawrence Bragg, who won the Nobel Prize in physics in 1915; physiologist Thorburn Brailsford Robertson, who was the first to manufacture insulin using the university's Darling building in 1923; and, some 22 years later, Adelaide Medical School graduate Lord Howard Florey (whom you would have heard of, Deputy Speaker), who was awarded the Nobel Prize in physiology and medicine with his research partners for the discovery of penicillin and its curative effects—and would you believe that I am allergic to penicillin but it is good for everyone else perhaps.

Members interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: There you go. I can see some members writing that down. The University of Adelaide has even educated a prime minister of Australia (we have to give her that credit), the incumbent President of Singapore, South Australia's first NASA astronaut, an outstanding 107 Rhodes scholars, and it has many other notable alumni including members of both my party room and also the government of the day.

Additionally, it was the university's physics department, led by professor John Carver, who launched Australia's first satellite in conjunction with the Weapons Research Establishment in 1967. It has long encouraged the pioneering spirit, as evidenced by the appointment of Sir Douglas Mawson as lecturer of mineralogy and petrology in 1905, a position he held until 1920, during which time he and his team completed their historic journey and expedition to the South Magnetic Pole.

This motion congratulates the University of Adelaide on what has been, certainly, an exceptional 140 years. It has truly become a world-class institution and I am certain that, as the university moves into the future, it shall remain a leader in its field producing world-class graduates. I also congratulate the newly appointed Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, and know that he will do a wonderful job.

During my time at the University of Adelaide I was extremely grateful for the affordable education that we get in terms of the tertiary system. I was lucky enough to complete a Bachelor of Laws and a Bachelor of Commerce (Corporate Finance) at the University of Adelaide. Education aside, I can honestly say that I have wonderful memories of my time at Adelaide University, and I thank the university for the education it has provided not only to people in my electorate but also across South Australia. I believe that the South Australian government, and also the opposition, have a role to facilitate education in this state and to ensure that universities make our graduates the best that they can be once they complete their tertiary studies.

A particular of interest of mine is I would like to see the government work closely in partnership with the University of Adelaide in relation to the commercialisation of intellectual property. I think it is fair to say that, whilst we do have some great grassroots stuff happening, unfortunately, we do lose some of that. I would like to see more in that space. But, on the whole, I do note that 2014 is their 140th anniversary. I acknowledge the achievement of the university and commend them, and I will be certainly ensuring that I can do everything I can, and on this side of the chamber we will do whatever we can, to promote the future of the university as a world-class institution for many years to come.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (17:42): In adding my hearty congratulations to the University of Adelaide on this amazing milestone, I would like to comment also, as the member for Hartley has just done, on the fact that Lord Howard Florey was a graduate of the medical school there, but to

remind the house also that he was ably supported by his wife, who is not mentioned at all in the work that went into perfecting the manufacture of penicillin. It was actually she who pedalled backwards and forwards (at Oxford, admittedly), with the samples of urine to remove the drug. As the manufacture of the drug became more reliable, it was necessary to actually distil it from the patients who had taken it. Her role in that is not spoken of at all.

There is another famous alumni of the University of Adelaide, and I refer to Muriel Matters, of course. Is there no story that we can attach her to? Of course, she studied both music and elocution at the University of Adelaide, under the tutelage of Edward Reeves. His other famous student was, of course, Lionel Logue, of *The King's Speech* fame, and there is not a single person here who has not seen that movie and marvelled at it.

Of course, the wonderful archives of the University of Adelaide, which I have referred to many times, have helped establish the Muriel Matters Society. Her name does not appear on any graduate lists, unfortunately, but perhaps I just have not found the right list yet. Another person I would like to mention is Mary O'Kane, a former vice-chancellor, who went on to become the government scientist. She has done much fine work. Of course, the university has produced many fine student politicians, and Julia Gillard, of course, our esteemed former prime minister, now returned to South Australia. In adding my very short comments, I hope that the university celebrates its 140 years of academia in fine style, and I wish them all the very best for the next 140 years, and more.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (17:44): I rise to speak in support of the motion that has been brought to the house by the member for Hartley, and I congratulate him for doing so. I am very sad to hear about his allergy to penicillin. I hope that they have other—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: We will remember that. I hope that there are alternatives to penicillin that you are able to take. One of the things that I found very interesting when having a look at this was the statement that was made by the University of Adelaide at the time of its commencement 140 years ago, on 6 November, and that was:

...to prepare for South Australia young leaders shaped by education, rather than birth, in a settlement free of any social or religious inequalities of the old world.

I find that to be a very good and noble statement. As we have been discussing, on 6 November 2014, the University of Adelaide commemorated a significant milestone, the 140th anniversary of its establishment. The University of Adelaide is one of only four universities established before Federation. Since the first graduate received his degree in 1879, more than 160,000 students have graduated from the university, including students from more than 90 countries, and I happen to fall into that category: I am one of the 160,000 students.

The University of Adelaide has also been a leader of social reform, both in South Australia and the nation. It was the first university in Australia and, at the time, only the second in the world to admit women into academic courses, in 1881. A year later, it awarded the first science degree in Australia. Its first science graduate—indeed, the first woman graduate—graduated in that year, and it was a woman who graduated in the field of science during that time. The university has produced more than 100 Rhodes scholars—I can safely say that I was not one of those—including Australia's first Indigenous Rhodes Scholar, in 2010. I think that we all remember—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, and she is still a constituent of mine, Rebecca Richards. I was so proud that day she was announced as Australia's and South Australia's Rhodes Scholar from the University of Adelaide. The university has five Nobel laureates among its alumni, including father and son William and Lawrence Bragg, and everyone knows about the work they have done. In fact, unlike other things, that is something to brag about, the fact that they are a very famous Nobel prize-winning pair, along with winning scientist Howard Florey, who, as we mentioned earlier, is the co-discover of penicillin. I do not want to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, he was the perfecter of the manufacture of it.

The Hon. P. CAICA: The manufacture, not the co-discoverer?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No.

An honourable member: He enabled its production.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's correct; he enabled its production.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, he enabled its production.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As we all know, Louis—

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am very thankful for that correction made by the member for Florey. If there is anyone in this house who knows anything about Florey, it should be the member for Florey. I apologise to the house for almost misleading the house, but I thank her for the correction she has provided. The tradition of excellence goes on, with many more distinguished alumni of the university making significant contributions to the world of politics, the arts and humanities, law and medicine. Believe it or not, Deputy Speaker, eight premiers of this state, including our present Premier, are graduates of this eminent institution. In fact, I think the Deputy Premier might even be a graduate of—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And the deputy leader.

The Hon. P. CAICA: And the deputy leader. The list goes on and on. The University of Adelaide has a lot to answer for! I will leave it at that. We can be very proud of the significant contribution—

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I did mention the Premier. It has made a significant contribution in a variety of areas. This year, the University of Adelaide took home four of the nine categories at the 2014 South Australian Science Excellence Awards, including Professor Anthony Thomas being awarded South Australian Scientist of the Year.

Aside from these honours, the university has contributed to the architectural and aesthetic beauty of the city, with landmark heritage buildings on North Terrace helping to create one of Australia's most memorable precincts. One only has to walk down North Terrace to see one of the good things that the Public Works Committee did a long time ago: approve the project that opened up that vista. All visitors to South Australia marvel at the architectural and aesthetic beauty of that particular precinct.

On the matter of research—and it was touched on by the member for Hartley—I know that the university has a very proud history. For a while I was the higher education and science minister, something I was very proud to be. I look forward to the university continuing in those areas of research and collaborating with the other two fantastic universities in our state, continuing to research areas of individual interest as well as joint interests.

One of the things that universities do not do that well, and Adelaide is no exception, is, if you like, transitioning from research to the marketplace. I think it is important that the university takes a more active role and hones its skills, as we have seen in American universities, particularly in Boston, transitioning from research to the marketplace. The university (in this case the University of Adelaide) and the state in which it is located will benefit by marketing that research.

It has been a significant 140-year history for the University of Adelaide. On behalf of this house, and certainly this side, I congratulate the university on this milestone and wish it continued success as it moves towards its 150th anniversary in 2024.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:51): I think there are probably dozens of members who would want to speak on this motion if they had the chance, but with eight minutes before the house is due to rise, I will have speak very briefly, certainly for those on this side of the house, those alumni, those graduates who appreciated the opportunity to study at the University of Adelaide, in addition to the member for Hartley. On their behalf I would like to say that those who studied at the University of Adelaide have a lot to be grateful for. The opportunity to have this world-class institute that punches above its weight in so many ways here on our doorstep, just next door to the building where we are, is magnificent.

I was able to study under amazing academics, such as Bryan Coughlin, David Hester and Wayne Cristaudo in particular, and I know that most students who take the opportunity to graduate from the University of Adelaide had similar extraordinary experiences. 140 years is a significant milestone. The Canberra Press Gallery, the parliaments of Australia, the research laboratories of Australia and around the world are well and truly over represented by University of Adelaide alumni, and it is a testament to the fine institution that it is, along with all sorts of professional fields, all sorts of places that people can be proud of. I commend the member for Hartley for bringing this motion to the house. He is a fine member and does a great job.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:52): I add my congratulations to the 140 successful years of the university. Much has been said about a number of the graduates. I do not have a lot in common with Julia Gillard, but we are both graduates of the university. Importantly, she was present at the 140th celebration dinner of the university just recently and spoke fondly of her appreciation of her time at the university. She has an acknowledged honorary position, I think a doctorate, from the university and, as a former prime minister, that is fitting.

I did note that she was pleased to be back in South Australia and paying taxes to ensure the government was kept fully flushed with funds and support. She was scathing, of course, of the emergency services levy that night in the presence of the Premier. I am sorry that he did not take much notice of her, obviously, but, in any event, she seems to be a willing and gracious resumed resident in South Australia and she is happy to make her contribution generally. As I say, she was not too happy about the emergency services levy.

I want to place on the record my thanks to all of those who have served on boards in the time that I have been here in the parliament, including Robert de Crespigny; former Justice von Doussa; more recently Robert Hill, a former senator from South Australia in the federal parliament; and former governor Kevin Scarce, who has recently been appointed as Chancellor. I wish him well in that regard. I give notice to any of the chancellors or board members that, if they attempt to sell assets that are bequeathed, I will be on their case. I have never been happy with the sale of Munduney, Moralana or Martindale, and my attempts here to require cabinet approval for the sale of assets will be reintroduced at every opportunity should they act in that manner.

I am proud to be a graduate and very proud of the work they do in contributing to the academic advancement of South Australians and across the world in the academic services they offer, but they should be thinking twice before they sell off any assets otherwise I, among others, will be on their case.

Motion carried.

Bills

FAIR WORK (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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) (17:56): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fair Work Act 1994. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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) (17:57): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Fair Work (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2014 amends the Fair Work Act of 1994, as well as making consequential amendments to abolish the statutory office of the Employee Ombudsman and to make changes to the requirements for constitution of the Full Commission of the Industrial Relations Commission. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Employee Ombudsman

The Office of the Employee Ombudsman consists of the Employee Ombudsman and staff appointed to assist the Employee Ombudsman in the performance of functions under the Fair Work Act. The Employee Ombudsman is appointed by the Governor pursuant to section 58 of the Fair Work Act and is not subject to control or direction of the Minister responsible for the Fair Work Act.

The statutory functions of the Employee Ombudsman are set out in section 62 of the Fair Work Act and were designed to operate in the context of the former industrial relations system, whereby the State had responsibility for the private sector and the Employee Ombudsman was considered necessary to protect the rights of non-union represented workers in the private sector. This is no longer a state responsibility since the referral of the private sector industrial relations regulation to the Commonwealth.

Due to recent changes as a result of the Commonwealth's development of a national industrial relations system, the functions of the Employee Ombudsman have been limited to public sector and local government employees. This has reduced the workload of the Employee Ombudsman. In its annual report for the 2012-13 financial year the Employee Ombudsman reported less than 2 900 requests for assistance, with only 22% of these queries being from the public sector. The remaining 78% of requests were from private sector—employees for which the Employee Ombudsman has no statutory function.

Statistics were not provided by the Employee Ombudsman in the annual report for the 2013-14 financial year, however it was noted that again more inquiries were received from the private sector than the public sector.

Residual functions of the Employee Ombudsman with respect to the public and local government sector are already performed by SafeWork SA (a business unit of the Attorney-General's Department) as well as by representative unions (Public Sector Association and Australian Services Union—SA & NT etc.), removing the need for a dedicated and separately funded the Employee Ombudsman and office. For the most part, the role of the Employee Ombudsman is a duplication for public sector and local government employees. The Commonwealth Fair Work Ombudsman is responsible for providing a similar service to private sector employees. In addition there are various free or low cost legal services available to all public and private sector employees.

This Bill will reduce the financial burden to State Government of providing services that are provided and funded by the Commonwealth for private sector employees through the office of the Fair Work Ombudsman.

The decision to abolish the Office is in no way a reflection on the efforts of the Office's staff members but is a decision taken based on the changing landscape of the industrial relations system in recent years.

Full Commission of the Industrial Relations Commission

The Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia is established under the Fair Work Act. It has jurisdiction to approve enterprise agreements, to make awards regulating remuneration and other industrial matters, to resolve industrial disputes and, among other things, hear and determine matters arising from an industrial matter.

The Full Commission of the Industrial Relations Commission has original jurisdiction in minimum standards applications (e.g. remuneration, sick leave, severance payments), adoption of Fair Work Australia principles and unreasonable conduct applications as well as appeals and references from single members and applications by the Minister for review.

The Full Commission consists of three members or the number of members (more than three) as directed by the President. Section 39(3) of the Fair Work Act requires that the Full Commission consist of one or more Presidential members and one or more Commissioners.

The Bill will amend the Fair Work Act to remove the requirement in section 39(3) for the Full Commission to include one or more Commissioners. Instead the Full Commission is to be constituted of one or more Presidential members and such number of Commissioners, if any, as directed by the President of the Industrial Relations Commission.

This will provide the President of the Industrial Relations Commission with greater flexibility in constituting the Full Commission.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal

Part 2—Amendment of *Fair Work Act 1994*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause removes references to the Employee Ombudsman from the interpretation section and is consequential on the repeal of Chapter 2 Part 6 Division 1.

5—Amendment of section 7—Industrial authorities

This clause is consequential on the abolition of the office of the Employee Ombudsman.

6—Amendment of section 39—Constitution of Full Commission

This clause amends section 39(3) of the principal Act to remove the requirement that the Full Commission consist of 1 or more Commissioners and to instead allow the President to direct the required number of Commissioners (if any).

7—Repeal of Chapter 2 Part 6 Division 1

This clause repeals Chapter 2 Part 6 Division 1, which constitutes the office of the Employee Ombudsman, sets out the appointment and conditions of office of the Employee Ombudsman and the functions of the Employee Ombudsman.

8—Amendment of section 64—Who are inspectors

9—Amendment of section 75—Who may make enterprise agreement

10—Amendment of section 76—Negotiation of enterprise agreement

11—Amendment of section 79—Approval of enterprise agreement

12—Amendment of section 80—Extent to which aspects of negotiations and terms of the agreement are to be kept confidential

13—Amendment of section 150—Proceedings to be in public

14—Amendment of section 153—Intervention

15—Amendment of section 219—Confidentiality

16—Amendment of section 223—Discrimination against employee for taking part in industrial proceedings etc

These clauses are consequential on the abolition of the office of the Employee Ombudsman.

17—Transitional provision

This clause makes it clear that the person holding office as the Employee Ombudsman will cease to do so on the commencement of this clause.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

ELECTORAL (HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY CASUAL VACANCIES) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

EVIDENCE (JOURNALISTS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

Returned from the Legislative Council without any amendment.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Tuesday 2 December 2014 at 11:00.