

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 26 March 2015

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

Bills

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (VOLUNTEER CHARTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I first introduced this legislation in November 2012. I remember the day well. It was a day of extreme fire danger. It was a day that reminded us all of the dangers that we face in South Australia from natural disasters, particularly bushfires. Part of recognising the dangers of bushfires and emergencies in South Australia is recognising those thousands and thousands of volunteers who leave their families, and their communities in some cases, and risk their lives doing the job of a CFS or SES volunteer.

This bill will enshrine in legislation the SES and CFS volunteer charters, not in regulation, as the government is proposing to do. The Victorian government has done this and it works exceptionally well. Both the SES Volunteers' Association and the CFS Volunteers Association support this coming into legislation—not regulation—and certainly the volunteers deserve to have it enshrined in legislation.

This bill is a relatively small change, and I will go through the changes to the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005. I just hope that the government sees the light, particularly after the minister's performance in the last week or so. He really does need to get some brownie points with volunteers.

I should put on the record that I am a life member of the Country Fire Service and a current serving member with the Meadows and Kangarilla brigades, as are the members for Hammond, Stuart, Finniss, MacKillop and Chaffey. I don't think I have missed any others. Scott Kennedy, who is in the whip's office, is a lieutenant in the Norton Summit-Ashton brigade. We do not do it for any particular reason other than to help our communities—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: The member for Finniss reminds me that he has been in the CFS for 48 years. He must have started when he was three. The need to provide and encourage volunteers for both the CFS and the SES is something that we need to be cognisant of all the time because we cannot afford to allow volunteer numbers to continue to decline, as they unfortunately have. We need to make sure that we have the resources to respond to emergencies, as we saw recently in the Sampson Flat fire.

I will just remind members about the CFS and the SES. The CFS currently has 13,500 professionally trained volunteers. They are serving 434 communities and are based in 434 stations around the state. Some of those may only get two or three call-outs a year, but others are getting hundreds of call-outs. In my time as captain of Happy Valley Country Fire Service, I think that year we had over 300 call-outs working with the MFS at O'Halloran Hill and St Mary's in a very cooperative way.

The CFS volunteers put in over 300,000 hours attending incidents, according to the latest annual report that has been put out. On top of that, there are over 250,000 hours in training, hazard

reduction and community advice, all done by volunteers. The CFS volunteers, according to the 2012-13 report, attended over 8,500 incidents, including bushfires, building and vehicle fires, road crash rescue, hazardous material spills, and many more.

The CFS is supported by other government agencies, particularly the MFS. They do work exceptionally well with the MFS and certainly on many occasions, particularly with storm and other related incidents, with the SES. The CFS also work well with SA Water, ForestrySA, and SA Police, plus the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources.

The SES is a smaller organisation, but an extremely vital organisation and has served South Australia very well right across the state, particularly in the metropolitan area with storms and storm-related damage which is when we see them the most. The SES has 1,680 volunteers, according to their latest annual report of 2012-13, 14 flotillas where they are involved in everything from swift water rescue to other water-related rescues and incidents, and they are based in 67 units.

The roles of the volunteers in the CFS and the SES have expanded greatly, the demands on them have expanded greatly, and we need to make sure the volunteers are not only valued, but continue to be motivated by seeing the support that they deserve from all of us in this place and particularly from this government. The best way we can do that in this place is not only through budgets obviously, but through recognising the volunteer charters. The two charters I am talking about here are the South Australian Country Fire Service Volunteer Charter, and the South Australian State Emergency Service Volunteer Charter.

The charters were set up a number of years ago and were relaunched in 2013. Former premier Mike Rann was the premier who launched the initial charters, as I understand. The signatories on the current CFS Volunteer Charter are the Premier; the then Minister for Emergency Services, Michael O'Brien; the now Minister for Emergency Services who was then Minister for Volunteers; Mr Tony Harrison, the chief executive who would come in under that committee's safety directorate launch that was going on at the time; Mr Greg Nettleton, who is the chief officer of the South Australian Country Fire Service; and Mr Roger Flavell, who is the president of the CFS Volunteers' Association. Just to remind the house, this is very strongly supported by the volunteers' association.

The State Emergency Service Volunteer Charter is signed again by Premier Weatherill; the then minister, O'Brien; the then Minister for Volunteers, Minister Piccolo; Mr Harrison, the chief officer of the State Emergency Service; Mr Chris Beattie; and the president of the SES Volunteers' Association, Mr Warren Hicks ESM.

The charters themselves have various obligations in them. They have undertakings by the government of South Australia. I will just read the first paragraph and this is common to both charters:

The Government of South Australia supports and recognises the role that emergency service volunteers play in our community.

I hope they do. I really sincerely hope they do because there are issues going on with the current restructure which I will not talk about now. There are issues going on there and I just ask the government to slow down and rethink some of the things that are going on at the moment because as it says in the first paragraph of the government's obligations under the charter:

The Government of South Australia supports and recognises the role that emergency service volunteers play in our community.

We cannot do without them. It is so important. The charters are vital documents, very significant documents because they express obligations on behalf of the government, the South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission, the Country Fire Service and the State Emergency Service. The responsibilities also then overflow into the volunteers in return for having signed this charter. They realise their obligations to do what they can do to make sure these two services are held in the highest repute and that they do whatever they can to serve the people of South Australia in their volunteer capacity.

Those in both the SES and the CFS are highly trained professionals but offer their services as volunteers. We need to recognise them in this charter, and that is what I am asking here: that the small changes to the legislation be supported by this government. The changes are to section 58 of

the Fire and Emergency Services Act to insert section 58A, which talks about the parliamentary recognition of the SACFS volunteer charter, and there are a few new subsections. Under section 107, we are inserting 107A, which introduces parliamentary recognition of the SASES volunteer charter.

This is not a complex piece of legislation. It is inserting what the government wants to do in regulation into legislation. It is a common-sense thing to do. It will show that we value our volunteers. It will show the deep respect this place has for our volunteers and the acknowledgment that they need to be recognised not just in regulation, which can be disallowed at any stage if somebody had the mind to (I hope that is not the case) but in that higher level, in legislation.

I put the bill to the house for its consideration, and I hope members will speak to it in this place and recognise the value of volunteers, and I look forward to the strong support of the government and the swift passage of this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. P. Caica.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RIGHTS OF FOSTER PARENTS AND GUARDIANS) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March 2015).

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (10:43): I rise with great pleasure to speak to this bill today and commend my good friend the member for Hartley on bringing this matter to the parliament's attention. The bill seeks to provide for an offence for a person who, in relation to an application for access to an agency's documents, directs a prescribed officer of the agency to make a decision or determination for the purposes of this act that the person knows, or ought reasonably to have known, is not a decision or determination that the office should, in the circumstances, make.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before you continue, the table has brought to my attention that you have actually spoken on this before; is that your recollection?

Mr KNOLL: Not since the parliament was prorogued. It was reintroduced last month.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It was 19 March they are saying you spoke on this.

Mr GRIFFITHS: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe, unfortunately, the member for Hartley's freedom of information bill was adjourned, and that was not the intention. Are we talking about that or the Finn's law bill?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! We did adjourn FOI; that was the first thing he stood up for. That was adjourned, and now we are on to foster carers.

An honourable member: No, we adjourned foster carers.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, on my list, No. 1 is freedom of information. Can we rescind? An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (10:46): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to rescind a motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: I move:

That the adjournment of private member's bill, orders of the day No. 1, be rescinded and take precedence over No. 2

Motion carried.

*Bills***FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March 2015.)

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (10:47): It is with great pleasure that I continue my remarks and thank my good friend the member for Hartley for bringing this bill to this place. It is a very simple bill that seeks to make it an offence for someone to improperly direct an officer of the agency making a determination under FOI. I think it is a very common-sense measure.

Can I say, as a prolific FOI-er, my experience has very much been that the FOI officers and their processes are very good. My office and I have been learning to traverse the 'rocky path', as we are calling it, to be able to get FOIs in and seek the information we are after without unnecessarily burdening FOI officers trying to compile information that we do not want. As always with these things, the devil is in the detail.

But I do want to make this point: for all the good work that the FOI officers do, they do seem to be obstructed from further up the chain, most notably from officers of chief executives. We have found very much from our experience that there is an obstruction by departments. Indeed, it almost seems that the FOI officers are good people who are on our side and trying to comply with the act and do the right thing, but they are seemingly hamstrung by departments and their chief executives.

This bill has come about as a result of the Ombudsman's report late last year. I am going to list what the Ombudsman found in his audit because it is interesting how many of these experiences we have had in our office. The audit found that the act is outdated and that its processes belong to pre-electronic times. It is interesting that in only the last couple of months we have woken up to the fact that email exists and that we do not have to send hard copies of reams and reams of paper out to the wonderful Schubert electorate office.

The audit found that agencies' implementation of the act is wanting and demonstrates a lack of understanding or commitment to the democratic principles which underpin the act, and that is very much our understanding from what we are seeing of it. Most agencies are not coping with the volume and complex nature of recent FOI requests. Can I say that I believe that those FOI requests are very much a response to the obfuscation and the obstruction that is happening. The more obstruction that happens, the more complex and wideranging the FOI requests become, as opposed to dealing with this in a more sensible manner.

Six of the 12 agencies failed to determine over 50 per cent of access applications within the time frame required by the act. That is very much our response. We spend a lot of time following up FOIs. It seems sometimes that we know that we are on the right track with the FOIs and the information we are seeking to get by how long the FOI application is delayed. The applications that are fairly benign are dealt with reasonably quickly, but the ones that actually help us to get a better understanding of this government's processes are the ones that do tend to take quite a bit longer.

It is common practice across all agencies to provide copies of FOI applications, determinations and documents to the minister to get the green light. Whilst the act permits this, evidence provided to the audit strongly suggests that ministerial or political influence is brought to bear on agencies' FOI officers, which is exactly what we are seeking to try to redress today.

The agencies' chief executives are not providing FOI or pro-information disclosure leadership. In nine out of 12 agencies there is no directive at all from the chief executive. Again, this is very much our experience and very much the vibe that we are getting back from departments as to the way that they are dealing with these things. Finally, the audit found that only one agency stated that it has ever released an exempt document, despite the discretion to do so under the act. So certainly, even though discretion is there, discretion is not always taken.

The government's response to the Ombudsman's report was to get up in this parliament and say, 'Well, unless you can come to us with some specific examples of where the act has not been followed, we can't do anything.' I find that answer frustrating and I find that answer disingenuous,

because that is exactly what the Ombudsman is set up to do; that is, to be able to deal with things in a confidential manner, to be able to report honestly without fear or favour so that the parliament can deal with these things in the abstract as opposed to in the specific, so that we can actually get to a better FOI process.

I would like to talk about another example in a different sphere of government where this same situation happens. That is in regard to the ACCC's investigation into Coles and Woolworths with regard to improper practices when dealing with suppliers. Exactly the same can be true. Coles stands up and says, 'We can't deal with complaints unless people come forward.' Now suppliers are not going to come forward because they are scared of losing their contracts, in the same way that people within departments would be scared of losing their jobs.

So what the ACCC said was, 'Well, we'll take some evidence confidentially. We ascertained that there was enough evidence to do an inquiry, and then what we did do is we forced companies across the board to tender evidence.' By doing that, they took this away from being specific complaints and individual complaints to being more abstract, more holistic, which meant that Coles was not able to take action against any individual company or punish any individual company.

The Attorney-General, for much of the latter part of last year after this report came up, stood up and said, 'Well, how am I supposed to be able to deal with things if I don't know the specifics of a case? We'll go back and we'll have a look at things, but unless we have some hard evidence, how are we supposed to deal with that?'

I find that attitude disgusting—absolutely disgusting. If this government was committed to free, fair, transparent and open government, it would not question the Ombudsman's report. It would take the 33 recommendations that the Ombudsman put forward and it would enact them. It would say, 'We are committed to the process of open and fair government and we will enact the 33 recommendations that the Ombudsman put down.' What have they done to date? Absolutely nothing.

Mr Tarzia: Nothing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could I just ask the member for Hartley to stop the running commentary or I will get the book out? It is a bit early to start, wouldn't you have thought?

Mr KNOLL: He needs to make up for lost time yesterday, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No need to be smart. Just do it.

Mr KNOLL: I do find it extremely disingenuous. I find it extremely frustrating. When the member for Hartley, doing the good work that he is doing, brings a piece of legislation that helps to enact merely one part of the Ombudsman's recommendations, this government seeks to see this as something other than enacting open democracy. It is an absolute disgrace.

I welcome and champion the member for Hartley's bill in this place, because it goes to the very heart of what people in South Australia want to see. At a time when sometimes, as has been pointed out by other colleagues, our conduct leaves a little bit to be desired, at a time when the standing of politicians amongst the wider community is not at its highest ebb—it is nowhere near at its highest ebb—we have an opportunity to tell the people of South Australia that we are going to be open about the way we do things, that maybe they can trust that their politicians are going to tell the truth and that, when questions are asked, they are going to be answered openly and faithfully and with the understanding that sometimes we make mistakes, but we are going to cop to those mistakes and move on.

In order for people to have faith in their politicians and to have faith in government institutions and in the institution of the parliament, we should be able to bring forward bills like this that should seek and receive bipartisan support so that we can get on with showing the community that we do more than just muckrake in this place, that we do more than just heckle across the chamber, that we are indeed committed to providing the best government that we can, and that the South Australian public should have more faith in politicians and should think better of us. In that quest, I very much support this bill, and I urge the government to support this bill on those grounds.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (10:56): Fine words, member for Schubert, and indeed a fine private member's bill I believe from the member for Hartley. I do not intend to speak very long on this, but there was an example yesterday of a response from the Treasurer that convinced me of the need for this bill.

The member for Schubert, as part of his contribution, reflected upon the fact that it is a common practice for ministers to be advised of FOI applications that have been lodged. I can respect that, but the Treasurer, in response to a question from the member for Stuart, reflected upon details contained in the FOI, the request for information sought and the information that was provided in response to the FOI, so it is obvious to me that the minister was aware of it and that he presumably gave a direction to his staff (or it is a policy that exists within his staff) to ensure that, when an FOI is lodged, the minister receives, as part of their preparation information for parliament, information that assists in the response to be given.

I am a very strong believer that education empowers us, but information empowers us just as much. From an opposition perspective, the only way in which we can do our job in the best possible way we can is to possess as much information as possible, so that we understand and appreciate the issues occurring, the good and bad aspects of things, how the decision has been informed, what the basis of it has been, what level of concern has been raised and what the data is that supports the decision that has been made. That is where the FOI process is such a key one.

The legislation, as I understand it, has existed since 1991. It is used by some people differently to others. In my own case, it is based sometimes upon community individual requests for a specific set of data. Most times, it is based upon particular interests that I have and information that I require for my shadow portfolio to act as best as I can, and my responsibility as a local member to possess information I need to inform the community. It is there for a reason: to assist in the information that members have available to them.

I have looked at the member for Hartley's bill. It ensures that the process is as (and this is a loose word) clean as possible to ensure that no direction has been given, that there are no delays resulting from that and that the information flow allows scrutiny to occur on how decisions have been made. There will be a lot of support from the opposition on this. We very strongly support this bill. It is based upon recommendations from other levels for changes to occur.

It is very sad, upon reflection, that the government has chosen not to do anything on this yet, and it is completely appropriate that the member for Hartley, with a particular interest in this area, having only been here for 12 months, has identified what he is concerned is a deficiency and an improvement opportunity and has put this bill before the house. I do fully support it, and I hope that the government recognises that it is an improvement opportunity and support it also.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (10:59): I rise today as well to speak on the Freedom of Information (Offences) Amendment Bill put forward by the member for Hartley and commend him on the work he has done in this area, and also commend the words just spoken by the member for Goyder and the member for Schubert. Interestingly, the point the member for Goyder raised was one of the issues I would like to raise in conjunction with FOIs. I noted the same point he did yesterday when the member for Stuart asked a question of the Treasurer and quoted part of an FOI that he got back. I know there are a lot of FOIs that go in that are very slow to come back to members.

In quoting a section of that FOI, the Treasurer was very quick to jump up and ask the member for Stuart to read out the entire FOI, which would really suggest that he knew exactly what was in that FOI. As was pointed out, it is fair and reasonable that the minister gets to be advised on what the FOI is but, as the member for Goyder said, you do not want a minister influencing the information that is or is not given in that FOI.

As a journalist in a past life, that is one of the things that I know is extremely frustrating, that is, when you submit an FOI to find out some information and you do not get the return on that information which you think is fair and reasonable. While there are paths to go down, it is long, it is convoluted and it is delayed and there is no efficiency or effectiveness, sometimes, in this process. That is an extreme frustration, as I said, for both journalists and members of the opposition.

From my experience, you feel like you are being railroaded. You do not want to feel that ministers would be influencing the information that you are seeking and the pace at which that

information is delivered. Again, a few of the FOIs that I have put in have taken quite a lot of time to get back and, lo and behold, in any conversations that are had with a minister or ministerial staff, they tend to know exactly what I am talking about before I have received the FOI. That is quite frustrating. Again, you do not want to believe that this information is being circumvented by ministers but, just the way the Treasurer spoke yesterday when the member for Stuart asked him a question, was very alarming from where I sat in the chamber.

The other thing I have noticed, revisiting my journalistic life, is when I have done some FOIs for vision. The member for Schubert made a very good point that technology is moving, and I note that we have to submit a letter and sign a piece of paper and forward them to the appropriate FOI department. In this day and age, with technology moving, perhaps that could be streamlined and made electronic and far more efficient and far more effective. The time in which I am getting FOIs back is quite excessive and it is a very hard way to pursue information if you want something in a timely manner, and to be efficient and effective in making a point or finding some information.

I mention from a journalistic point of view, too, getting FOI vision. There was some vision that I was seeking under FOI, and that vision was found and I was told by the FOI officer that they had that vision but, through the lack of a very simple computer program, they could not wash over people that were in that vision, although distant, just to protect their anonymity. I understand them wanting to do that. They could not pixelate the people that were not involved in the incident that we were looking for.

Because they did not have that very cheap piece of software that is very easy to use for people who work in this area, they could not pixelate out the people who did not need to be referred to in the vision and, therefore, I could not get the vision. They were happy to wipe their hands of that and that was all I am told can be done. Again, it is just another way that the process is inhibiting what we are meant to do here.

I would like to see that brought forward. I would like to see the technology improved and upgraded so we are not signing pieces of paper and going slowly through snail mail and old methods along those lines and we can maybe electronically put in requests to make it a whole lot easier, quicker and more efficient. Likewise, let us start moving into the modern age.

There are a lot of security cameras around and a lot of vision is recorded and that can also be requested under FOI, and we should be able to access that quite easily. You can email a video clip quite easily these days and, as I said, with these programs you can pixelate out people who are not relevant to the information you are seeking. I think that is something that also could be looked at within the whole concept of getting FOIs, because it is very frustrating.

I have spoken on this before, and I stand by those comments. It is a very inefficient system, and I know that a lot of the members on our side feel that way; in fact, probably all of them do. Again, I know that the member for Schubert has said that as well.

The member of Schubert raised a couple of really good points as well, with regard to this being looked at by the Ombudsman and 33 recommendations being made to change the system. I suspect, as I suggested, it needs to move into modern times to make it more efficient and more effective. To see that the government has enacted none of the 33 recommendations is a real indictment that perhaps the government does not want to move into modern times and to make things more efficient and effective, which is what we realistically what we are about here as a government, that is, being efficient and effective to service the people of South Australia in the best way possible.

As I said, I really hope that the flow of information in a timely manner can be made easier through this process. I commend the member for Hartley for bringing this bill before the parliament, and I also commend the contributions made earlier by the member for Schubert and the member for Goyder. I hope that in the very near future we can make this system a whole lot more efficient so that it can help us service the people of our community.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:06): I indicate my support for the bill introduced by the member for Hartley. Unfortunately, in this state freedom of information seems to have become freedom from information. It becomes a frustrating task. I use freedom of information requests regularly, both at a government level and at a local council level. I get annoyed that there are obstructions put in the way

on a regular basis. I get annoyed also not so much at a government level but at a local government level when snide remarks are made by people in local government about the fact that the member puts in a seemingly endless run of freedom of information requests. It is a simple rule of democracy that freedom of information is something that should be there. We are not a communist dictatorship in this state—not quite, anyway. It is something that is critical to the information flow to both sides of the chamber.

I recall that the Speaker, the member for Croydon, I believe, put in a freedom of information request on someone a year or two ago, so it is used on both sides. But, inevitably, it is used a lot more by members of the opposition than by government members; however, government members avail themselves of it from time to time.

The member for Hartley has put forward this bill in an effort to speed up and perhaps to make a lot more visible the requirements of freedom of information. I think that it is a good bill and that it should be supported by both sides of the house. I have no doubt that when members opposite are in opposition, they will be pretty keen to put in a lot of freedom of information requests themselves. With the mess that is around the place at the moment, they can expect that the opposition will be continuing to put in freedom of information requests on a regular basis and, indeed, this applies to members in another place. One member in particular in another place is always sprouting information he has got from freedom of information requests. I look forward to the passage of the bill, and I wish the member for Hartley all the success in this regard.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:08): I rise to speak on the Freedom of Information (Offences) Amendment Bill 2015 introduced by the member for Hartley, and I thank him for doing so. He had prosecuted this matter last year, but the proroguing of parliament interrupted the conclusion of the matter at that time. I feel at a loss as to why we had to prorogued, nevertheless we did and that means that persons such as the member for Hartley had to start all over again. The member for Hartley brought to the attention of the government one of the most critical criticisms in the Ombudsman's report provided to us in May 2014. The former ombudsman, as he now is, Mr Bingham, prepared a comprehensive audit of the state government department's implementation of the Freedom of Information Act and gave a very significant report back to us as a parliament, and there were deficiencies across the scale.

One of the matters that was raised, and I think very concerning, was the suggestion that there had been ministerial interference with the processing matters of freedom of information applications. It is the object of the Freedom of Information Act that there will be disclosure, that there will be transparency of government, that if persons or entities have records kept in respect of their information they should have access to it, that they should have the right under the act to correct it if it is incorrectly recorded, and there are processes upon which they can do that. The public at large, whom the government and the parliament are here to represent, have a very clear entitlement under that act to expect from the government, who is the keeper of the records, to make that available, and similarly for local government.

A number of entities are exempt, like the Director of Public Prosecutions. His or her office is exempt for good reason, and we do not take any issue with that. However, the Ombudsman, after more than 20 years of operation, said that there were some very significant defects with this legislation. The government has done nothing, not one single thing, since May last year. We are coming up to the 12-month anniversary.

There is a very condemning report of the alleged conduct of the government, and they have done nothing to deal with the legislative reforms recommended. They have not come back to the parliament with any indication of what they are prepared to do or accept. When questioned about whether there had been any matters raised with the Attorney-General or members of the government in respect of these allegations, they basically said, 'We haven't had any complaints.' Well, hello! Of course they have not had any complaints.

The people who have spoken in confidence with the Ombudsman about the behaviour that has occurred of course are concerned for their jobs, they are concerned for what repercussions it will have. You only have to read the report to appreciate that they are nervous enough about making a complaint; they do not want their names disclosed: of course they do not. The Attorney-General, who is supposed to be the first law officer of the state, is just ignoring this because he has not had

any specific complaints. Hell will freeze over before that happens, of course. I just say to the government: you are avoiding your responsibility under the act. You are under scrutiny, you have been exposed to very serious allegations, and you have done nothing about them, and that is shameful.

The member for Hartley has addressed some of the recommendations that seek to introduce an offence that would apply when there are circumstances of ministerial interference and also to 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. We have had a process for a long time for ministers to be apprised of the nature of applications that come in that have some power to present further material if they are privy to that. As ministers of the Crown, there can be circumstances where that would be reasonable.

My personal view is that the only way to stop this oppressive, unjustified and unacceptable conduct that is allegedly going on in this government is to allow them to have notice of a freedom of information application determination by an FOI officer, perhaps a 48-hour time frame, to act on that and to present a submission to the FOI officer or the director of the department, whoever is doing either the primary application or the review, and that at the expiry of that time the document is to follow the normal process of release or rejection, whatever the determination is, and of course it can follow an appeal process separately.

That is the only way that we are going to deal with this, to protect the interests of a government in those very rare circumstances where there may be information they have to hand which justifies some intervention, and they should follow the proper course. There should not be this holding onto documents sitting in ministers' offices for months at a time and rejecting them or just ignoring them altogether and then expecting the appeal process to roll along, and that being ignored in its time limits, taking up the Ombudsman's office time, having to issue directions, and going through the privacy aspects; months and years can pass.

The Hon. Mark Parnell in another place and I are pretty regular litigants down in the District Court, I can tell you, sadly, because we have to fight for information to be disclosed about government contracts. One of the most mischievous that I found was that the government would not even release an enormous number of submissions put in on the Mount Barker redevelopment. Ultimately, some went up online, but this matter of making applications went on for years. We finally got a determination in the District Court and finally we got to see them.

Do you know what one of the excuses was for my not being given a submission for a Mount Barker proposed development? That it might cause marital discord. Presumably, a husband and wife had put in separate proposals, one was supporting it and one was not, and if they found out that the other one knew about it there might be hell to pay in the house. I have never heard of that before: that was one of the absolute rippers.

We had another where it was claimed that it breached some privacy around some Indigenous material or cultural practice that would be offended by this (and we had this before over the Hindmarsh Bridge matter, with the secret women's business and the like), where there was a piece of information that was of cultural significance it might offend. I immediately wrote back and said, 'In no way do I wish to cause any concern about any breach in that regard if this applies. I am asking that the matter be reviewed.' Guess what? Within a few days, I got the documents.

You have to fight every inch of the way to get legitimate access to documents on behalf of the people of South Australia. It is disgraceful that the government has not acted on this damning report and come back in here with a comprehensive amount of legislation to properly review the matter and take heed of what the Ombudsman has said. The new Ombudsman, as I understand it, has recently given his views on a number of matters. It appears that under the new Ombudsman's regime he is happy to continue to search for transparency and accountability of government through this process. I wish him well in that because at the moment clearly the Attorney has just slapped the office in the face by refusing to act on this at all.

I applaud the member for Hartley for coming in here for the second time with an attempt to at least give some protection to the people of South Australia in a process to ensure that they have access to material. It will become an offence if this is passed, as recommended by the former

ombudsman, if there is any improper direction or influence and to make it an offence if someone knows about it and they do not report it. That is the only way that we can really give protection to the genuine, hardworking public servants who have been appointed as FOI officers in these departments and in the local government agencies so that they do not fear retribution in any way for ringing up a minister's office and begging to send the documents down.

I have to say that there have been many times when I have rung and asked, 'How are you going with those documents? If there is some genuine reason, that you are still finding something or you want to check something or have a look at it—but six months have passed.' With one the other day they said, 'We need to get Crown Solicitor's advice.' I said, 'Fair enough, that usually takes a fair while. I understand that.' The reply was, 'No, we only just sent it off a few days ago.' So for six months it was sitting in the minister's office. This is just shameful; it is disgusting. The people of South Australia have legislation that is supposed to protect their access to information and it has been shamefully concealed and only produced under duress.

Time expired.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we continue I would like to acknowledge our guests in the Speaker's Gallery this morning, a group of wonderful—I am sure you are all wonderful—South Australian midwives who are the guests of Ms Annabel Digance. We hope you enjoy your time here with us today. Most of you look far too young to have been of any help to me when I had my two children; nevertheless, I am sure you are all most welcome in the time you are here today.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, ma'am! It is the member for Elder; you referred to the member for Elder by her name.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You're so smart. Thank you so much. The member for Elder.

Mr Pengilly: Well, we get pulled up for it all the time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I don't think I've ever called you to order for that.

Motions

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE MIDWIFE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:20): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises International Day of the Midwife on 5 May 2015;
- (b) acknowledges the focus of this year's theme 'Midwives: for a better tomorrow', which is part of an ongoing campaign highlighting the important role of midwives;
- (c) recognises the critical role of UN millennium development goals 4 and 5 addressing infant and maternal mortality; and
- (d) congratulates all South Australian midwives for their promotion of woman-centred care, their dedication and professionalism to the health and wellbeing of women and babies, and indeed families.

I speak to the motion recognising International Day of the Midwife which this year will be on 5 May and which is celebrated annually. As a midwife of many years' practice in policy, teaching and as a clinician in hospitals and community settings, I have been privileged to work with and experience the spectrum of continuum of care of women, babies and their families. I am pleased today to have the opportunity in my role as a politician to pay tribute to my colleagues and peers who have joined me here in the chamber.

Today in the Speaker's gallery are my guests—many passionate, professional and experienced midwives from Child and Youth Health, Flinders Medical Centre, the Lyell McEwin, Mount Barker hospital, Women's and Children's Hospital, UniSA, Flinders University, Australian

College of Midwives and the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation as well as some eligible midwives. Welcome. Today, I am your voice in parliament with your message, and I thank Liz Newnham for her input into my speech today.

Annually, 5 May is International Day of the Midwife, a day to celebrate the work that midwives do around the world. This year the theme is 'Midwives: for a better tomorrow', as increasingly there is global recognition of the importance of midwifery care for all pregnant women. It is a day for the rest of the community to stop and say thank you and appreciate the important work you all do.

Midwife simply means 'with woman'. The highly-skilled, professional and intimate practice of midwifery is just that, with women central to all you practice. Midwifery care during pregnancy and birth is recognised internationally as key in reducing maternal and neonatal mortality and improving health outcomes.

In 2010, the World Health Organisation developed a set of global health outcomes known as the millennium development goals, with targets of achievement due for revision this year. Maternity features in these goals at Nos 5, 4 and 3, being to improve maternal health, reduce child mortality, promote gender equality and empower women, respectively. This has highlighted the crucial importance of the role of the midwife in improving maternal outcomes. Indeed, it also highlights the importance of maternal outcomes for the health of societies.

In 2011, the United Nations Population Fund with the International Confederation of Midwives and the World Health Organisation collaborated to produce a report titled, 'The state of the world's midwifery'. This inaugural document looked at the global presence, influence and effects of midwifery care. Countries such as Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Sierra Leone were identified as having little or no organised midwifery training, with women having very little or no access to midwifery care.

This report highlighted the importance of a visible midwifery profession to advance the health of nations, with dedicated government funding and accredited education systems. In support of this view, the report states:

In countries all over the world, retrospective studies attest that quality midwifery services are a well-documented component of success in saving the lives of women and newborns as well as promoting their health. A strong midwifery workforce brings indirect benefits too, contributing to the advancement of gender equality and women's rights and empowering women to take care of themselves, their families, their communities and their nations.

The report also found that, in many countries, midwives are not able to work to their full scope of practice due to lack of relevant resources or resistance by the medical profession and policymakers.

In Western countries, the issue of midwives working to their full scope of practice varies. In some European countries, midwives have a long history of autonomous practice in collaboration with their medical peers, which occurs in a culture of mutual respect, resulting in low maternal and neonatal mortality rates.

In Australia, the midwifery profession has historically been controlled by medical models and its scope of practice significantly reduced and medicalised. The peak professional body representing midwives in Australia, known as the Australian College of Midwives, has worked hard (both nationally and internationally) with organisations such as the International Confederation of Midwives and the World Health Organisation to positively influence policy in this country.

As identified in the National Maternity Services Plan of 2011, it is time to give Australian midwives the occupational autonomy and respect—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I could call members to order; there is a lot of noise on my left. Thank you.

Ms DIGANCE: —that is so highly significant to maternal health and to locate birthing services where women live. It has been identified that midwives who are educated and regulated to international standards can provide a significant 87 per cent of the essential care needed for women and their babies. Investing in midwives is definitely a best buy in public health outcomes, and it is estimated that there is a 16-fold return in health savings, including reduction of caesarean section

rates. Investing in midwives also frees up medical personnel to attend to the healthcare needs of those who most need it.

There is a story of a doctor discussing an Australian research report that showed a decrease in caesarean section rates using midwifery-care models. The doctor is known to have said, 'If midwifery care were a pill, all women would be getting it.' It is time to move beyond professional boundary staking—a proportion of which is financially based—and implement this essential service for all women for the good of their care and the care of their babies and their families.

An increasing concern in developed countries like Australia is the high intervention rates during labour and delivery—a result of the overmedicalisation of an essentially normal physiological function. While midwives would be the first to recognise the importance of having emergency measures in place, the midwifery philosophy and models of care that emphasise 'keeping birth normal' are known to reduce intervention rates. There is now clear demonstrated evidence that shows the importance of midwifery-care models and its associated better-health outcomes with its reduced use of what, over time, has become routine intervention. Evidence also demonstrates a more efficient use of resources.

Overmedicalisation is emphasised by the experience in Brazil where, recently, there has been heavy investment in midwifery-led birthing units as a focus strategy. The strategy is in response to their exorbitant caesarean section rate, which is at a high 52 per cent across sectors, and increasing, unbelievably, by 300 per cent in private sectors.

A high rate of Australian women (being 97 per cent) give birth in hospital labour wards. Notably, women receiving private obstetric care are at an even greater risk of medical intervention. Case in point are low-risk first-time mothers. Statistics of birth intervention of this cohort show disturbing rates of intervention with private hospital-care percentages being higher than that of public care. Alarming, in the private system, it has been found that there is nearly triple the rate of induction of labour and a twofold increase in the use of epidurals. There has also been a significant increase in instrumental birth, caesarean section and episiotomy. These worrying statistics should be a signal for change—they highlight the need for change.

Labour and delivery is, in the main, a normal, physiological process that does not require intervention. A UK study has shown that with midwifery-led births, women are at a lower risk of intervention with higher proportions of normal births, lower caesarean-section rates and no increase in adverse outcomes. It is recognised, though, that first-time mothers may have a higher transfer rate to a hospital, and this is manageable.

Birth centres and homebirth models need to be integrated into surrounding maternity services in an atmosphere of mutually-supportive teamwork between midwifery and obstetric services with timely emergency referral systems in place. Although there is a lot of importance placed on pregnancy and birth, postnatal care is very often overlooked. Postnatal care is important for attachment, bonding and fundamental development. Midwifery models of care are more able to provide the much-needed support, encouragement and information so necessary to families in this time of transition.

In Australia, place of birth remains a concerning problem. Indigenous women in many remote areas are required to leave country in order to birth their babies. This poses a significant risk to spiritual health, as birthing on country is an important connection to ancestry, not to mention separation of the woman from the extended family. Maternal and neonatal morbidity and mortality rates remain strikingly high in both urban and rural Australian Aboriginal populations, and this must be addressed as a matter of urgency. The training of Indigenous midwives must be a priority of governments and could be encouraged by the provision of more scholarships for this purpose.

The recent guidelines from the National Institute of Clinical Excellence in the UK recommend that women with low risk pregnancies be counselled so that they are aware of the higher risk of intervention in obstetric units, including public labour wards. They should also be advised that birth centre or home birth settings result in higher rates of normal birth rates with no increased risk of adverse outcome.

The current South Australian Transforming Health initiative is the perfect opportunity to expand and further develop midwifery services. This opportunity exists on a number of fronts being,

firstly, incentivising eligible midwifery and ensuring that local health networks work with eligible midwives to facilitate admitting rights and, secondly, to increase publicly funded birth centre and home birth models. Ideally, all women in South Australia should have access to a known midwife in a continuity model of care. Women who present with or develop complication could be referred to obstetric and medical specialists as required with the midwives still providing the necessary antenatal, labour and postnatal care. This is aptly acknowledged by the mantra, 'All women need a midwife, some need a doctor, too.'

To achieve the Transforming Health ideal of 'Best care. First time. Every time.' in the maternity sector, midwifery care should be implemented as the primary maternity care model. Transforming Health values are centred on six quality principles: patient-centred, safe, effective, accessible, efficient, and equitable. All these principles run in parallel to those values of midwifery care. To this end it is promising to see that midwifery models of care are being prioritised in the next steps of the Transforming Health agenda. However, the infrastructure must be in place and cultural change supported for this to come to fruition.

Transforming Health also identifies that health needs have changed and that the historical purpose of hospitals does not fit with our community needs of today. Technology has advanced and changed as now we can monitor our health and record and communicate electronically without being in the same location as our treating professionals. We have improved clinical practice and recovery time frames. It is also recognised that there are too many procedures performed with an unnecessary and unsustainable expense. It is widely known that the health budget is under considerable strain and cannot be supported on the trajectory as it currently stands.

True midwifery driven care and practice can arrest and address many issues of the challenges identified in the Transforming Health process. Midwives are ready to step up, ready to embrace the challenges, ready with solutions, ready to deliver midwifery driven care. Midwifery is a profession in its own right. Medicare recognises the eligible midwife as a highly educated, experienced and practised professional. In a recent edition of the prestigious and well known medical journal *The Lancet*, the authors claim:

Midwifery is a vital solution to the challenges of providing high-quality maternal and newborn care for all women and newborn infants, in all countries.

This is a significant progression, admission and support of a concept whose time is now.

In closing, I thank all midwives in their many roles and capacities who every day in South Australia make our state a better place with their professional care of women, babies and families. I invite us all to celebrate the importance of midwives on 5 May, and invite politicians, policy makers, obstetricians, health managers, fellow midwives and the community to work together to help provide South Australian women with midwives for a better tomorrow.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:35): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to support this motion. I want to talk about a number of aspects of midwifery. I have a daughter-in-law who is a practising midwife in a rural community. The member has just talked about Transforming Health. My reading of the Transforming Health document is that it is much more about controlling the health budget than delivering high-quality service.

I will use the example of what has happened in my electorate: the Keith community and the Keith hospital are in my electorate, and we saw over recent years what budgets and bean counters did to that particular community and their hospital; they caused a huge amount of anxiety. Closer to where I live, in the southern part of my electorate at Millicent, we have seen the birthing unit at the Millicent hospital close down.

The member talked about the problems faced by Aboriginal communities. I can assure her that most country communities face not dissimilar problems, where young mothers have to travel long distances to a birthing unit, often hours away from their home, putting untold strain on their families. This is common practice in country communities and it is unnecessary.

At the Millicent hospital, before the birthing unit was closed down, every expectant mother who approached the hospital or the local medical clinic with the birth of their first child was automatically told that they would have to go to the Mount Gambier Hospital for the birth of that child,

just because it was their first child. It was deemed by our Department for Health that, just because it is the first child, it is automatically considered a complicated birth.

Mr Pengilly: Ridiculous.

Mr WILLIAMS: It is a nonsense. I have another personal experience, in that my youngest daughter gave birth to her first child on 8 February this year, and that birth occurred in New Zealand. In New Zealand—and I have talked on this matter previously in the house—the delivery of obstetrics treatment is quite different from here in Australia. Indeed, it is what the member has been talking about. Midwives in New Zealand are at the forefront, and it is only when it is confirmed that an expectant mother may present some complication that there is a referral to a specialist doctor. Otherwise, the totality of the expectant mother's birthing experience is handled by a midwife.

That is the circumstance that my daughter has just been through. When she became aware that she was pregnant, she visited her local GP, who certainly confirmed the pregnancy and explained to her that she needed to contact the midwife. The GP explained to her where she could get a list of midwives who were available in the local community. She went through that process; she had regular visits to a midwife, whereas here in Australia she would have had regular visits to her obstetrics-trained GP or a specialist obstetrician.

At the appropriate time, my daughter contacted the midwife to say that she had gone into labour. The midwife gave her further advice over the phone and again, at the appropriate time, she got herself to the local hospital, where the midwife caught up with her, and they went through the rest of the process.

I can say with some confidence, because my daughter-in-law is principally involved in postnatal care, that the postnatal care that has been reported to me by my daughter in New Zealand is much more intense than what happens here in Australia. The midwife visits a minimum of once a week, depending on need, for a minimum of six weeks. If there is any further care, attention or help needed, that is also provided.

The previous speaker spoke extensively about intervention, and it is no revelation that intervention is rife amongst obstetric service provision in Australia. I think we have the highest intervention rate of any country in the world and, again, it is unnecessary. Not only is it unnecessary but it is damn costly. I come back to Transforming Health: the reason I think it has more to do with trying to manage the budget than providing high-quality care and service is that there does not seem to be any move within Transforming Health to do things better.

I am convinced that the scenario my daughter recently went through in New Zealand is, for a whole host of reasons, better than she would have experienced if she had been in Australia. I am convinced of that. I know that the procedures and the processes involved in the birth of her son cost the health system in New Zealand only a fraction of what they would have cost the health system if she had had that birth in Australia.

For that reason alone, the Transforming Health process should be looking at these sorts of examples. It should be bringing best practice from places like New Zealand, where the outcomes are just as good as we experience here and where the cost, I would argue, is only a fraction thereof. If the Minister for Health were fair dinkum about best care first time, every time, he would be doing more than just having the accountants run through the books of his department. He would be getting experts in a range of fields—in this case, in obstetrics—from those places where they do it differently and, I would argue, do it better.

There is no doubt in my mind that midwives perform a fantastic duty and service to our community. They do it with great professionalism and they do it very well. We have allowed probably the strongest union in Australia, the AMA, to demand that we have specialist doctors undertake duties which are just unnecessary. It is the power of the medical union that is driving decisions about the way we deliver medical services. It is not about the outcomes, it is not about the treatment and the service received by the individuals: it is about money, at the end of the day. That is the problem we have and it is a problem I think the current minister, and the current government, in his Transforming Health project has failed to understand and certainly failed to do anything about.

I support the motion as it is brought to the house, and I support the sentiments of the member and what she said about it. I just wish that her government would do more than pay lip service and indeed recognise how much better our system could be if we utilised midwives to their full potential in South Australia. I commend the motion to the house.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (11:44): I rise to speak today in support of the member for Elder's motion recognising the work of our midwives. It is truly an honour to be able to stand in this place and raise awareness of the incredible and inspiring work, which is so physically and emotionally gruelling, done by thousands of practising midwife professionals around the world. Welcome to my nursing and midwifery colleagues in the gallery today. I have shared much joy and also heartache with several of you. You are wonderful professionals, and I am very proud to call you friends and so privileged to support your work.

This is not an easy subject to speak on. The journey of motherhood is not always easy. Since becoming a parent so easily in my early 20s, I experienced many losses and had the frustration of 13 cycles of IVF until getting it right, so to speak. All throughout this journey I have been supported by the most incredible people, the midwives.

My story though is not unique. The journey was not impossible and the final chapters have been very happy. This is not always the case with parenting journeys. Midwives are the keepers of secrets and bearers of burden. They absorb the emotion and pain like sponges, with little complaint, and continue to display kindness and care against the odds. When I asked one of my friends about the ups and downs in the day of a midwife she had a few thoughts about how to balance this, and she did two things. Firstly, she shared her deeply personal story, which I am going to share with you today:

Who am I?

I am a midwife.

I work with women, I am one of the first people they tell they are pregnant, I am one of the first to feel their immense joy and excitement, I am privileged to be let into their lives and share this news.

I share their despair when their pregnancy is unwanted and they need to work through the detour in their life plan.

I get to see women grow, not only the baby growing inside them, the family grows, and relationships grow stronger and develop.

It is a privilege getting into my car when there are no cars on the road, everyone is asleep. I share in the journey of labour and birth with this woman, the excitement, the despair, the tears, the joy...I gave birth to a beautiful baby girl in 2003.

In 2006 we were extremely excited to be expecting our second child. But it didn't feel 'right'.

Once again I was completely supported by midwives, they reassured me, supported our family, they shared when I felt movements, they got excited by my scans, but this baby was not meant to come...When I birthed my baby halfway through my pregnancy, a midwife was the person who gently cradled our baby, who gave her to us, who shared this treasured time with us but also enabled our family to grow, love and grieve.

Our third daughter was born in 2007, I was cared for by a midwife, who left her home at 11 o'clock at night in the middle of winter, to come and be with me and my family. I was privileged to have her with us, I appreciated the sacrifices she made for us...There are times when I miss important days in my life, I've worked Xmas days, I missed one of my children's first steps, there are times when I make school lunches at 2am then kiss my children goodbye while they are fast asleep and leave a 'hope you have a great day at school' note, but I get to go and share amazing things with amazing people.

This amazing and very brave midwife then pointed out a short clip on the internet, which I watched about half a dozen times last night. The clip is played to the very deep music of Cold Play's *Yellow*. It is very emotional and it is a teaching tool for student midwives and also the public. It helps to show the amazing contrasts of this wonderful profession, where 'Being a midwife is not just a job, it is a lifestyle.' The video goes on to urge the watcher to check their work/life balance, to look after themselves, to have 'me' time. I am possibly not the best person to preach this, but anyway, please do as I say, not as I do.

As a government, we must look after these clinicians who bring life to our community. We need to do this by ensuring safe work practices and by listening to them. The ICM slogan is that

midwives save lives. Women and their babies in South Australia need to have equitable access not only to qualified midwives but to a range of models of care that support safe and effective options for women that meet their needs when they need it.

It is not right that a woman living 12 kilometres from another woman has different access to midwifery services, depending on their birthing journey. A key example of this is a woman who needs a caesarean section in her first birth but is not able to have what lay people would know as a normal birth cared for by a midwife for the next in hospital A, but this normal birth may be offered in hospital B, and just because she lives another 12 kilometres away. Even further away she has to be separated from her family for an extended period of time for fear of her going into normal labour. This is a terrible burden to our rural and metropolitan families. We are obliged to ensure that all women have access to continuity of care models regardless of risk and geography.

Transforming Health actually does use clinical experts. The needs of this are ongoing. Transforming Health needs to become the norm, an ongoing process with health care and all challenges must be considered. My friends, my colleagues, I thank you and I commend this motion to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Colton.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:49): Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker, and I will prove to the house that you do not have to use your whole 10 minutes, which was also the case with my very good friend the member for Fisher. Firstly, I want to commend the member for Elder for bringing this motion to the house. I have had little experience with midwives, save except for the birth of my two children, and I can tell you right now that there is no doubt in my mind that the midwives that we had would have been able to perform the whole function during that birthing rite, instead of seeing—and I am not being disrespectful to those experts in the area of medical birthing—the obstetricians, how do you say it, who came in on the gravy train at the end of the process when all the hard work was done.

There is no doubt that even with our first child, James, who required a ventouse and who came out looking like a cone head, and I was very frightened at that stage, but it was not the doctor who calmed me down, it was the midwife who was still there, saying, 'Everything will be alright. It will flatten itself out pretty quickly,' and it did within a few minutes. Notwithstanding that, I just saw a woman out in the chamber, Kim, the member for Goyder's personal assistant, who has just had her second child—

Mr Griffiths: Staffer.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Staffer; a very nice person. She said, 'That was easy,' because I had told her, 'I think the second one is generally easy.' Not that I would know because I do not think there is anything ever like an easy birth from the two that I have witnessed, but she said that it was easy. In my experience there is no such thing as an easy birth.

The point I am trying to make and I do not want to be too long winded is that, in my view, there is no doubt that the midwives were not only the first port of call but could have continued through that whole process and delivered the baby with the skills that they have. I commend the role and the function that midwives play in the birthing process in South Australia and long may it continue. Not just long may it continue, but I hope it becomes more entrenched in the process.

I do want to recognise that the member for MacKillop said some good things in his contribution in recognising the role of midwives, and the example in New Zealand, but a significant majority of it was codswallop. He should be brought to task on that particular matter because, whilst the opposition wants to politicise and make hay, if you like, out of Transforming Health, the very basis of the Transforming Health process is, in my view, to adopt the midwifery model and to embed that into Transforming Health, and not just in the midwifery model but in all aspects of what nurses can provide that is currently being provided by doctors.

The member for MacKillop would be better off getting a better understanding of what is the thrust and the genesis behind Transforming Health—and I know we are in a political environment—instead of attempting to politicise a process and he will come to the realisation that those things that

he wishes would occur under Transforming Health are going to occur. So open up your eyes, clean out your ears, and become a little bit more positive about this particular process.

Mr Gardner: You are the only one making this personal.

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, I'm—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I bring the member for Colton back to finish his remarks.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I said I would be very brief and I am going to be, Madam Deputy Speaker, but I think the record needs to be corrected when statements that have been made are incorrect, and that is what I am doing. I commend the motion and I thank the midwives for all they do in South Australia. I urge them to continue to play their role in ensuring that Transforming Health achieves what I think it is going to achieve with respect to the role of midwives in South Australia. Thank you for your outstanding work.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:54): I would like to thank the member for Fisher for her contribution. I would also like to thank the member for Colton for his wise words in correcting the record. I would like to thank the member for MacKillop, and I will take his remarks as supportive of the profession of midwives. Today is not a one-off conversation and representation; it is a beginning of more dialogue to come, of a continued dialogue, and I take this opportunity once again to acknowledge such a wonderful profession, the profession of midwifery, and I wish all of you well on 5 May.

Motion carried.

ANZAC DAY

Ms COOK (Fisher) (11:56): I move:

That the house—

- (a) recognises that ANZAC Day, 25 April 2015, commemorates the centenary of the landing of Australian and New Zealand forces at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915;
- (b) pays its collective respects to the 416,809 Australians who enlisted in the Australian Imperial Force and the millions of others who fought and supported the defence efforts of this country since; and
- (c) remembers all Australian service men and women, support personnel and animals that have been injured, traumatised or killed in action.

I am honoured to move the motion commemorating the 100th anniversary of Australia's engagement at Anzac Cove. One hundred years ago tens of thousands of Australians went away for king and country to Gallipoli Cove in now modern Turkey, then the Ottoman Empire. Tragically 8,709 men were killed in the engagement. ANZAC Day is how Australia has come to celebrate the commitment not just of the soldiers at Gallipoli but of all the men and women who have gone to defend our nation, as well as to mourn those we have lost. However, why ANZAC Day? Why has it become the day on which we choose to honour fallen Australians?

On 25 April 1915 Australians first landed at Gallipoli Cove. For all intents and purposes our engagement at Gallipoli Cove was a failure. The operation was decided upon by the British government, who viewed Australian and New Zealand forces, as well as the armies of all their other colonies and dominions, as an extension of their own army. They deployed Australian troops in Turkey, a nation halfway around the globe that presented no real threat to Australia, and Australian forces were deployed at the bottom of cliffs against a well-armed Ottoman army. The odds were stacked against a successful operation. The soldiers, having made no strategic gains, barely made it past the beach. The mission was a complete failure.

This mission, however, was the first time we saw Australian troops deployed on a mission on their own. There were no other British forces with them, just Australians and New Zealanders. It is the day that Australia stood on its own two feet and demonstrated to the world that we are here, we are a nation, and that we have a part to play in the world. We showed our bravery, our resolve, and we were respected. It is also a day that demonstrates the futility of war. Thousands of men fought and died against a nation that was no threat to Australia. ANZAC Day has come to be a day that we

celebrate the bravery of those who did fight, whilst also reflecting on what has often been the pointlessness of that fighting.

Throughout our engagements it is not just the sacrifice of our soldiers that we need reflect upon, but also of the thousands of people who have supported our troops. Thousands of nurses and medical practitioners have been sent away with our soldiers, and they have been sent to some of the most dangerous places on this planet and have worked in some of the most desperate of situations. They decided to assist Australians fighting, and put their own life at risk to ensure that Australians remained healthy and able to do what they were sent to do and to fight for.

I note that there are so many stories that have come out of World War II. I want to share a story of a veteran from Clarendon, Seaman Merton Loud. His story is not unique; however, like so many other veterans, his life, his story, is extraordinary. Merton completed his schooling in Clarendon and worked at Norton Summit, but his sole ambition was to be a sailor. Merton volunteered in May 1940 at the age of 17 and entered the Navy in 1941. After training, he became a leading seaman and was involved in 13 naval engagements between May 1941 and January 1945.

Merton, or Mert as was his nickname in the Navy, wrote many letters home to his brother Lindsay and sister-in-law Nita. From these letters we find a bit of an insight into the life of a young man who had many of the qualities we associate with the ANZAC culture. The letters also demonstrate that he had vision beyond this journey as a soldier. In one such letter he wrote:

I hope you are both well and enjoying married life. I am not quite enjoying life at present but it is not bad enough to complain about.

He went on to say:

There are a lot of weddings in Clarendon lately, you must have started a craze and what are not getting married are in the AIF.

He went on to write:

Thank Nita very much for offering to knit me articles. Well at present I have two spare pairs of socks, 2 sets of mittens and a scarf, 1 pullover which Joy Nichol's knitted and it will be a long time before I would want one of them. But what I would like is a Navy Service pullover but sleeveless and very close knit. I don't know if she has a pattern or not but they're just like a bag with holes for arms and head cut in it.

In another letter home in April 1943 Merton observed:

There has been a lot of changes since I have been home lads getting killed etc. others married and a lot of old people died and young ones born so I will have to mind my step or I might be making a date with someone's wife... According to Mother's letters there are not too many of the local lads left at home now, girls are scarce aren't they. I see by the Chronicle that one of the Flat 'Lines' is now engaged to a lad in the AIF so I had better not go out with her again.

Leading Seaman Merton Loud was killed while serving on battleship *Australia* on 5 January 1945. He was only 21 years old.

When we reflect back on the wars that Australia has fought in, I think it is helpful to not just look at the numbers but remember that those who died had families, friends and communities. It is important to remember that people who made the ultimate sacrifice had lives just like ours before they went away to fight.

There was also a considerable effort made by those who remained on the home front. During the first two world wars, women, who traditionally were homemakers, tended to their families. However, when war came around, these women stepped up to fulfil their roles that they were usually told they could not do, whether that was farming, working in factories or providing support for troops. Their losses shaped their communities differently forever.

One hundred years on, Australians need to remember all the sacrifices that were made for them and reflect on how this has made our lives the enjoyable and peace-filled lives that we have today. I commend this motion to the house.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:03): I am very pleased to rise to support this motion today. It is unfortunate that the house will not be sitting on or around ANZAC Day this year so that we can share a bit more about our feelings, particularly commemorating the centenary of the Gallipoli landing

in the Great War, the war that was supposed to end all wars, the war in which over 60,000 Australians were killed. Wars continue to happen. The irony is that the war that was supposed to end all wars did not end them and, a generation later, they were back at it, in 1939.

It is pretty personal for many in this place, I suspect, and it is very personal for me as well. I suspect that many in this place did have members of their family who fought in the first war. Being born when I was, both my grandfather and my godfather were First World War veterans, and I had two great aunts who never married because there simply weren't enough men around the place after the war, so this matter is very relevant to me.

I mention particularly my grandfather, the late Harry Morris, 9th Light Horse, who fought in the last cavalry charge of Beersheba and came back safely. In fact, all members of his family—I think there were three brothers and a cousin—came back safely. His cousin was actually P.K. Morris who had the service station with all the bowsers at Murray Bridge which many of us remember from crossing the bridge before the freeway was built.

My grandfather was a big strapping man and he certainly was a great character. I remember him well. The sad part is that I never spoke to him about the Great War. It just did not occur to us at that age to discuss those things. I was 21 when he passed away, quite suddenly, but we still have memorabilia of his, and his photo is still up in my house, my sister's house and the houses of various family members and we will not forget him.

Likewise my godfather, Donald Redding—I bear his surname as my second name—actually fought in World War I. His father brought him out here to work on a farm in Western Australia when he was about 12 and he went into the first war in the 1st Light Horse. One of his brothers was actually killed on one of the trains that Lawrence of Arabia blew up. He saw such horrors in World War I that he actually became a Church of England minister after the war and then he went back and did World War II in the Middle East, Kokoda, Borneo, etc. He was quite a remarkable man. He won the MBE for his service in World War II.

We grew up with all of this and these men who we thought were old in our youth who by that stage were 50-odd, a similar age to some in this place, but not as old as some, I might add. It was a war that really made Australia and, of course, the Gallipoli landing is something that really introduced Australia to dreadful conflict. We did have many Australians in the Boer War, but as a federation, as a country, Gallipoli was really the birthplace of a huge amount of service before they went on to France and other fields of conflict.

I take the time every year to sit down and watch the dawn service from Anzac Cove on ANZAC Day as I think it does the soul good to do that and it reminds people of what we should be remembering. I always feel quite emotional when I watch that and I particularly feel quite emotional watching the young people who are there. I would dearly love to be there this year in some ways, but in other ways I would rather go there in my own time to walk around and have a good look at Anzac Cove and the area around Gallipoli.

Kemal Atatürk, the great Turkish leader, told the mothers of those Australians who were killed there that they were now sons of Turkey and that they would be looked after. To this day they still are and I think that is rather amazing where we have gone in that relationship.

It is also my generation that grew up with our fathers, including my father, fighting in the second war, so it just does not go away and it will never go away. There are many in this place who have similar stories, so it is nothing new.

Recently, *The Islander* newspaper on Kangaroo Island has been running a series of stories about those from the island who were actually lost in the first war. The copy that I have only just received today talked about two brothers from the Burdon family on Kangaroo Island. The mother lost both her sons and it was such a huge strain on the parents that the mother died at the age of 54 from the stress of losing her first son. She never actually knew, from my reading, that her second son had died as well. Those are horrendous stories, and I commend *The Islander* newspaper for the way it has been portraying these stories over the past few weeks and will continue to do so in the lead up to ANZAC Day.

ANZAC Day this year will be special for everybody. I get highly irate when it is referred to by some as the 'celebration' of ANZAC Day. I get highly annoyed and correct them very rapidly. It is a commemoration, not a celebration. We never celebrate war: we always commemorate it in honour of the fallen and those who came back. Some need to spark up on that.

It has been significant that in the schools in my electorate and in others that the education department has sent out a series of information packs and displays that have helped teach our children at school more about World War I in the lead-up to the centenary of ANZAC, and that is a good thing. I note that the Australian War Memorial now has a travelling roadshow, and I would dearly love to see it. I am of the view that every Australian owes it to the fallen and to those who served to go to the War Memorial in Canberra and spend a significant amount of time walking around just to learn what they may not know. I try to do it every three or four years; I think it does the soul good to go and do that.

I am very cognisant of the importance of ANZAC Day every year, but particularly this year. Next Monday, the Governor is rededicating the Soldiers Memorial Park gates in Kingscote, something which I will attend. It is something the state government has put money into, and I am pleased about that. The federal government has put in a lot of money. At Victor Harbor, the bureaucrats have interfered with the ability to put some new plaques, which received funding, on the memorial down there: the ridiculous bureaucrats in the heritage area are saying that we cannot put on the plaques because they are not heritage and because it is not appropriate to put them there. I think they are damn fools, quite frankly.

The loss was so great to multitudes of towns that if you drive around Australia every single small town you go through has a memorial, particularly to those who died in World War I. The enormous grove of Norfolk Island pines at Victor Harbor, near the entrance to Granite Island, is indicative of one of those memorials. It does not matter where you go, they are everywhere. If you stop at Second Valley, just around the corner off the main road is a tiny memorial to the sons who went—and they were all sons who were killed. I support the motion.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (12:13): I rise as the Minister for Veterans and as the member for Waite to commend the motion. World War I marked, in a way, a period that is almost unfathomable in current times. To think that from a population of less than five million we raised an army of more than 400,000, of which some 330,000 were deployed overseas, is truly remarkable. At one point, Australian forces held 20 per cent of the Western Front: a country this size, almost one-fifth of the line. At war's end, over 60,000 had been killed—5,565 South Australians or, put differently, nearly one in five of those deployed overseas.

I should remind the house that a large number died in the years after returning from the conflict, either by their own hand, through wounds or other suffering. I also pay tribute to the efforts of the families who had to care for those who returned. It is a story we do not often hear, but at a time when we did not understand post-traumatic stress or psychology very well at all, these boys came home to their mothers, their wives, their children or their families and had to be managed, helped and assisted along the way. We should remember those in the families who helped after the war as much as those who suffered through it.

Compared to Australia's modern-day population, our contribution to World War I would roughly equate to 240,000 Australians being killed in a world war, should it occur tomorrow. Can you just imagine the impact that would have on families and communities all over the nation? If we had been able to see what was going on on the beaches of Gallipoli, and in fact on the Western Front on all sides, in our family lounge rooms, as we could today, the whole war might have come to an end far sooner if the full shock and horror of it had been brought home to people, but of course these were different times.

The First World War touched the lives of nearly every Australian and South Australian family, and many of the impacts are still with us today, as we have heard. One of the most tragic South Australian stories of sacrifice I am aware of comes from one of our most beautiful locations in the state. Four brothers and one cousin from the Watherston family of Port Lincoln made the ultimate sacrifice for their country.

Frank Watherston died of gunshot wounds he sustained at Gallipoli in July 1915. Frank's brothers—Cyril, Edward and James—all subsequently died within four months of each other in France during 1916. The brothers' cousin, Sidney Watherston, was killed in action in August 1918 while serving with the 50th Battalion. What an extraordinary sacrifice for one family. Could we just take a moment to remember what that must have been like for the parents. It is just too difficult to imagine.

The sacrifice made by all the South Australians who fell will not be forgotten. The South Australian government will soon be announcing a program of commemorative events throughout the next four years to signify especially our remembrance of their sacrifice. I had the great pleasure on Sunday of awarding travel vouchers, jackets and other packages to 22 young schoolchildren who will be our representation at the ceremonies on 25 April in Turkey at Gallipoli. We felt it was appropriate to send a group of teenagers, with their supervisors and representatives of the RSL, to act for us at that commemoration, rather than a group of dignitaries.

As we go through the commemorations of the next four years, the government would very much like to ensure that they are local, that they involve country communities in every town across the state and local government jurisdictions and local communities here within the city of Adelaide, rather than becoming a commemoration of large signature events attended principally by dignitaries. We really want to activate the local stories and the local family histories.

We really want country communities to be able to go to that memorial, look at those names and ask themselves: who were these people? Who were these families? Where did they come from? Who is still in the region from those families? What did it mean for them? What does it mean for us? What is my connection? We think that, by activating those local histories, we will be able to tell a story. I commend the RSL for its virtual memorial, where people can now log on and download their own stories and have them retained forever.

As these families fade from memory, as these people fade from memory, as those who knew them directly start to go as well, there is an opportunity to make sure that the stories are recorded for future generations through capabilities we now have like the RSL's virtual memorial. The service and sacrifice rendered by all these families is etched in history, along with that of many others—not only on the World War I honour roll in various country towns across the state but in every town and suburb which has been affected one way or the other.

During the ANZAC Centenary period, all Australians will be encouraged to reflect upon and learn more about our military history, its costs and its impacts on us as a state and as a nation. The government of South Australia is proud of the more than 400,000 Australians who enlisted and served their country during the First World War, particularly those who made the ultimate sacrifice. We should remember that, while 25 April 2015 marks the centenary of the Gallipoli landings, we should never forget the service and sacrifice of our servicemen and women and their families, carers and loved ones who have served the country in all conflicts over the last century.

I was particularly proud on Saturday to welcome home the veterans from Operation Slipper, the many thousands of them, many of them still in uniform. It was encouraging to see the age of the young veterans. It was good to talk with the parents of some of the five South Australians who were killed during Operation Slipper, one of them from Kangaroo Island. It was good to meet the Larcombes again on Saturday. These sacrifices, more recently, by younger veterans carry the light from those who went before them on the beaches of Gallipoli, in the deserts of North Africa, in the skies over Europe and on the oceans of the South Pacific during World War II from the Army, Navy and Air Force.

It is a great motion. The house will not be sitting again before ANZAC Day, but every member of the place will be involved in their own commemorative activities and it is wholly appropriate that we will be debating this on the last day of sitting before we go in to that very commemorative and important period to us all.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:20): I also rise today to acknowledge that ANZAC Day, 25 April 2015, will commemorate the centenary of the landing of the Australian and New Zealand forces at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915. I too pay my respects to the over 416,000 Australians who enlisted in the Australian Imperial Force and the millions of others who fought and supported the

defence efforts of this country since. I also pay tribute to all Australian service men and women, support personnel and animals that have been injured, traumatised or killed in action.

Courage, mateship, sacrifice: these are the sorts of words that come to mind and continue to have meaning and relevance for our sense of national identity when you talk about ANZAC Day. It goes beyond the anniversary of the landing on Gallipoli in 1915. It is the day on which we certainly remember Australians who have served and who died, not only in the First World War but in all wars, conflicts and also peacekeeping operations.

In 1914, reports from Europe gave an increasingly desperate forecast, when you see that Europe was teetering towards war in a conflict between an increasingly strong and powerful Germany and the rival British, French and Russian alliance. As Britain returned to work after the August bank holiday Monday, war was declared on Germany, and the declaration involved the whole British Empire. Australia's prime minister, Joseph Cook, said at the time, 'If the old country is at war, so are we.'

It goes without saying that this First World War took an enormous toll. It took an enormous toll on the young Australia of the time. Before I get to that, I also want to mention that the member for Morphett did want to speak this morning. He was, unfortunately, called to an urgent private function, but he commends the motion to the house as well. He is certainly very passionate about this and I would like to think that my contribution reflects his intent as well, as does the member for Finnis's.

Total enlistments at the time, from 1914 to 1918, are said to be over 400,000. It is interesting to note that between 1914 and 1918, the Australian population was about 4.9 million. That is about 10 per cent; it is massive. This war had a huge impact. Out of the around 420,000 Australians enlisted for service in the First World War, 38.7 per cent was of the male population aged between 18 and 44. Of course, this is why in years after this Australia had to 'populate or perish', because this war had a massive impact on the productivity of Australia. Australia made a massive sacrifice for this war. When you look at the enlistments by force or service, 412,953 were part of the Australian Imperial Force; 3,651 were part of the Australian Naval and Military Expeditionary Force; 2,861 were part of the Australian Army Nursing Service; and 1,275 were part of the Royal Australian Navy.

ANZAC is intensely connected with its origins at the Gallipoli landing but also subsequent Australian experiences in the First World War and conflicts since. It is interesting to note that the military events from which ANZAC originated and those which have since nurtured it have also occurred mostly outside of Australia. ANZAC is iconically represented through the stereotype of the digger, initially the volunteer civilian foot soldier of the First World War. You will find many of these warrior-type figures across much time and space, but in the modern era these have tended to become very diverse. The Australian equivalent is the digger, whose powerful image was based on the volunteer civilian foot soldier of the 1st AIF and, since then, the term has come to apply to all Australian military personnel.

Although the ANZAC has traditionally been considered a secular concept, ANZAC certainly has very strong overtones of the sacred. It is a commemoration, but also a celebration. The need for commemoration of the war dead, particularly in this conflict, has always been matched by the need to celebrate the birth of a nation, because this is what this conflict did: it saw the birth of a nation.

I have alluded to the centenary of ANZAC committee, which I have been part of in my local electorate. It has been an absolute honour and pleasure to be part of that and to at least do what we can in this day and age to contribute to the memory of those who have served before us. I do pay tribute to the Kensington Park RSL, St Martin's Anglican Church, Campbelltown City Council, St George's Church Magill, Payneham RSL and Glynde RSL, who continue to do fantastic work to recognise the important tradition that is ANZAC. I commend this motion to the house.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:26): Of course, I rise to support the motion and everything it speaks about. ANZAC Day is a special day for so many people because, as was said earlier today, so many of us have connections to this dreadful war. For me, one of the connections to the First World War came through my research on Muriel Matters, who, as you all know, is someone I spend a lot of time researching.

The very first piece of handwriting I found from Muriel was the letter she sent to the British Red Cross to thank them for advising the family about what had happened to her beloved brother, Charles Adams Matters, who was born in Port Augusta on 28 October 1885. He enlisted on 4 September 1914. He was a veterinary surgeon, had a sweetheart and was well loved by everybody in his family, and it was a large family. He went away in the 6th Battalion and rose to become the colour sergeant major. When he arrived at Gallipoli as part of the reinforcements, he was part of the second push in August that year.

The field report speaks of the regimental sergeant major being tall and heavy with a black moustache, aged about 25, but in actual fact he was around 28. He goes on to say that he was:

...in the charge on the German Officers' Trench between Johnston's Jolly and Check Board on the 6 August. The first attack was made at midnight just after they reached the Turk's trench. He fell mortally wounded.

After some intelligible words, the field reporter goes on to say:

...the next day, through the periscope, it was noticed that the Turks were seen to be throwing out the bodies, Matters being picked out owing to his heavy moustache. He appeared to have been stripped and witnesses did not observe the Turks burying the body.

Of course, that was the terrible fate for many of our soldiers: their bodies were never returned or never found. Many of their names appear on the Australian memorial at Lone Pine, and of course that is where Charles Matters' name is, along with his fallen comrades.

We always support all our fighting people, but it is the actual wars themselves that we must question, and that is why it is of great interest to me that the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom talks about wearing white poppies along with our red poppies on the days of remembrance—white poppies to signify the futility of war and the red poppies, of course, to remember those who have fallen and made sacrifices. It is not only those who go overseas—and we know the terrible price that is paid, people lose their lives—but also those who are injured and come home; the families must also help to support those people when they come back and try to pick up their lives, as so many of them had to do after the First World War. Another point that was made by another of our members this morning was millions of women never married or had families of their own because of the loss of so many men.

I know, sir, that you have a great relationship with the Tea Tree Gully RSL, something that you were very kind to share with me. I want to put on the record the names on the Roll of Honour from the First World War at the Tea Tree Gully RSL. They are: W. Lucas, W. Lewis, A.V. Phillips, E.L. Angove and E.R. Elliott. I will have the great honour of being in London on ANZAC Day this year and will lay a wreath at their dawn service to commemorate our brave soldiers from the Tea Tree Gully RSL and, of course, all the other Australian soldiers. We commend the motion to the house.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:30): It is also a pleasure for me and, indeed, a humbling experience to talk in support of the motion. I do not profess to be an expert on the history of World War I or the wars. I think war, by definition, is terrible because the result is death and the tragedy that comes with that; but it does bring out, in many cases, the absolute best in people.

Many of my vintage would have watched the images, read about it, talked to people who are veterans and had family members who were veterans and tried to understand some of the issues that they have dealt with in their lives, and it is humbling for us who have lived in relative peace. My brother is a navy veteran of 20 years and when I have spoken to RSL groups I have said I have been blessed in my life and been lucky enough to be elected to parliament but my brother, by virtue of having served his nation, is the high achiever in my family and I will never resile from that. I believe it very strongly.

It is amazing that a nation of 4.9 million people committed as it did, and Australia should be very proud of its World War I efforts. I commend the member for Hartley for referring to a detail that is often not talked about enough and that is the number of men between the age of 18 and 44 who served. He has quoted, I think, 38.9 per cent, to be very precise. When I talk to people in general terms I use 40. It is like four people out of every cricket team served their nation. It is hard to equate to that level of commitment that was given. The member for Waite (the minister) referred to the 5,505 people from South Australia alone who died in World War I, and it is such a sobering thought.

The images that are with us are of the futility of it. There was the comradeship, the spirit, the teamwork and obeying of orders even when there must be a level of wondering what the hell these orders are about and what the result is going to be. We should try to put ourselves into the places of those men who were waiting in the trenches ready to go over the top. The whistle is about to be blown and they have seen their comrades go in front of them and many fall within metres of going over the top, and they think, 'Why the hell am I going to do this?' Their thoughts must be with their families.

In the movies and in the documentaries we see the many bits that were left behind, being the last scribbled notes of the last thoughts going through the mind of those people. They want to be consumed not about what they are about to challenge and face but what potentially they are leaving behind. Sadly, so many of them did, but they still did it. It is something that we have to be respectful of at all times and not just use important days, such as 25 April or 11 November, as the days for us to remember the sacrifices that are made but we should consider it every day.

When I have spoken at ANZAC Day functions, I have challenged the younger generation. Sadly, too many do not have respect for or a belief in our veterans but I ask them to consider the fact that many older people of the age of 80 or above, now (or, indeed, the many Vietnam veterans and younger veterans who are returning from other conflicts), when they see them walking down the street and they might be stooped over and struggling a bit, probably did serve; and we have the quality of life that we do because of the effort and sacrifice that was made.

I put on the record my appreciation of the minister (the member for Waite) who visited my area probably about four months ago, and a significant part of that trip was to meet with RSL groups. That has created some funding support for a significant event on Yorke Peninsula, coordinated by the RSL clubs from across the peninsula, on 18 April. Some might question why it is a week beforehand but it was done deliberately to pay respects to the importance of 25 April and to give the local RSL groups and those who wish to go to other functions to march a chance to do so on the traditional day and for the collective effort of many in the community to come together in the one place on 18 April. That will be a significant event on Yorke Peninsula, and it is one I am proud to be part of. I am also proud to be helping to launch a book written from the diaries of the veterans from Middleton who passed away.

This is an important motion. It is a motion that expresses our pride and it is one that Australia as a nation can reflect upon and consider the implications of it in our everyday lives and in everything we decide to do and the way we act, because we have to be respectful of those who have gone before us and what they have done. I commend the motion.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:35): I rise to support the motion. ANZAC Day, on 25 April, is a day of national remembrance. It marks the anniversary of the first major military action by Australian and New Zealand forces during World War I, when soldiers of the Third Australian Brigade were the first ANZAC troops to set foot on the Gallipoli Peninsula.

Historical sources reveal that these men, many of them carried in Royal Navy ships, were woken in the early hours of the morning, fed and marshalled into rowing boats. They were then towed towards the beach en masse, and they themselves rowed the remaining distance to the shore. It was about 4.30am on Sunday 25 April 1915. It was the wrong position, and those men, many barely out of their teens, came under fire before even setting foot on the beach. The waves of soldiers from Australia and New Zealand that followed that initial small fleet were subjected to heavy bombardment. Some dug into trenches and others tried to scale the cliffs.

Over eight long months, Australia suffered 25,000 casualties, including 8,700 deaths, and New Zealand lost 2,700 of its men. Sons, fathers, husbands and brothers lost their life, causing immeasurable suffering to their families, many of whom lost whole generations of men. Of all wars, the First World War caused the greatest suffering in terms of death and casualties for Australia. From a population of fewer than five million, 416,809 men enlisted; of those, 61,522 were killed and thousands were wounded.

Although the Gallipoli campaign failed in its military objectives, the Australian and New Zealand actions during the campaign left us with the creation of what became known as the ANZAC legend, an important part of the identity of both nations. ANZAC occupies a unique place in

our national memory. Let's take this year's centenary anniversary and those that follow as opportunities to consider that which forms our national character, to remember all those who made the ultimate sacrifice in World War I and also in World War II and in the many wars where Australia has answered the call, and also to lend our support to those men and women who are presently in war zones or on peacekeeping missions overseas: they are all keepers of the ANZAC flame.

I look forward to again this year paying tribute to our ANZAC legend at the dawn service at the Gilles Plains and Hampstead RSL sub-branch memorial, which will be followed again by the traditional gunfire breakfast and a casual lunch of pie floater and bangers and mash at noon.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (12:38): I also rise to speak to the centenary of ANZAC motion and commend the member for Fisher for moving that motion today. The centenary of ANZAC is a moment for deep reflection in our communities about the meaning of service and sacrifice, not just at Gallipoli. In my own electorate of Davenport, an ANZAC vigil will begin at 6.30pm on Friday 24 April, and services on ANZAC Day will be held at Blackwood, Coromandel Valley and Flagstaff Hill.

The Coromandel Community Association and the Blackwood RSL will also host Rebecca Watt and her jazz band, who will play war songs, and the National Trust of Coromandel Valley will erect information boards and a space for children and adults to learn about the history and meaning of the ANZAC ceremony. The Blackwood Freemasons and the Coromandel Rotary Club and Lions Club and many others have made funding or in-kind contributions for this special day.

ANZAC Day is an opportunity for us all to show our gratitude for the freedom we enjoy and to recognise that our freedom comes as a result of the extreme sacrifice that men and women from Davenport and from other places in our state and nation have made. Over 60,000 Australian men were killed and over 156,000 men were wounded, gassed or taken prisoner in the Great War.

Recently, the vice president of my local RSL in Blackwood, David Matthews, gifted his father's medals to the Australian War Memorial. Captain Lionel Matthews' story is deeply moving, and I wish to share it with the house today. Captain Matthews was taken prisoner by the Japanese in Borneo and interred in the Sandakan prisoner of war camp. At Sandakan, he became leader of the underground resistance movement. He was executed by the Japanese on 2 March 1944.

As is well known to this house, Sandakan is often regarded as one of the worst of the Japanese prison camps. At the end of the war, some 2,345 allied prisoners had died at Sandakan in the death marches or through torture, malnutrition or through mere exhaustion. Only six Australians survived the camp, all of whom escaped.

Captain Matthews was awarded the George Cross and the Military Cross. Japanese Lieutenant-Colonel Tatsuji Suga said, when executing Captain Matthews, 'I have just executed the bravest man I know.' Before he was executed, Captain Matthews was brutally tortured, and official war records show that during the ordeal he steadfastly refused to make admissions that would implicate or endanger the lives of other men. The dedication on the war memorial in Blackwood reads: 'Their name liveth for ever more.' Lest we forget.

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (12:41): I rise to support the motion of the member for Fisher, and congratulate her on moving it, to commemorate the centenary of ANZAC. At dawn one century ago, young Australian troops landed on the Turkish beaches to fight in the First World War. The sacrifice made by those young soldiers was both tragic and heroic. The Gallipoli campaign cost over 8,000 young lives, but these brave men did not fight in vain. This historic event marked the first time Australian soldiers fought for Australia, as its own nation, on the world stage—a moment that helped define us as a nation.

I look forward to joining the veterans and thousands of community members at the Port Noarlunga Christies Beach RSL branch on ANZAC Day this year to help commemorate this special day. I commend the members of that RSL for the hard work they do in the community, including talking about the history of ANZAC in local primary schools. I would also like to particularly note the work this year of the Fleurieu Peninsula Family History Group, who have been busy for months collecting and reporting on the stories of local ANZACs, which they will be publishing in a book next year.

This group has been supported by an ANZAC grant, supported by the federal member for Kingston, Amanda Rishworth. I had much pleasure in meeting with Kath Fisher from the group recently, who shared with me some of the stories of local ANZACs in the local Kaurua electorate, and one of those was of William How of Port Willunga. He enlisted in 1916 for the First World War and provided engineering services with the Australian Tunnelling Company in the far north of France. One can only imagine the horrors faced in terms of the tunnelling and engineering services during that trench warfare.

During the war, he developed a lung infection and became hospitalised in England, returning to Australia in 1919 after serving for three years. He was awarded medals, such as the British War Medal and the Victory Medal, for his service. While he settled back in Port Willunga and set up a dairy farm, I am informed that after the war he suffered shellshock for many years. It is when thinking about these people from your own community who took up the call for service for their country and served in the Great War that the huge sacrifice that was made becomes all the more real. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (12:43): I also rise to speak on and support this motion that recognises ANZAC Day, 25 April 2015, commemorating the centenary of the landing at Gallipoli and also remembering all Australian service men and women, support personnel and animals that were injured, traumatised or killed in action. I will be brief because I know a lot of people want to speak on this, and many people before me have spoken about the history of World War I. It has been mentioned, and I do concur with the sentiments they all shared.

Whenever I speak on ANZAC and our service men and women, I always like to start with 'Thank you.' I do not think there is much more that we can say than thank you. I have no RSL in my electorate; in fact, they spread far and wide around. I would like to also thank the people of all the RSLs who work very hard to keep the memory of the ANZACs alive with a respectful recognition of all our service men and women. I have been to a number of these services across the way—whether they be Remembrance Day services or ANZAC services—and sometimes I have just called in to an RSL for a cold one of an afternoon.

I would like to recognise the Marion RSL and Trevor Chapman, the president; Bruce Wright, the secretary; and the rest of the team for the wonderful work they do; and at the Brighton RSL, Trevor Whitelaw, the president; Paul Spencer, the secretary; Terry Howard, the treasurer; Jim Nicholson, the senior vice president; Graham Bulger, the junior vice president; Barry Coad, the assistant secretary; and the rest of their team and committee members. They do an outstanding job. In Morphett Vale, which takes in the southern part of my electorate, the president is Frank Owen OAM, and the secretary is Gordon Curtis; again, those two gentlemen and their team do a marvellous job.

This year, with some great support from the member for Bright, there will be a Hallett Cove memorial service on the beach. I commend the member for Bright for the work he has done in making this happen. There will be a youth vigil at Hallett Cove, which again is another great initiative to remember the ANZACs. There was one at Edwardstown last year, which I attended and which was very much pushed by the former mayor of the Marion council, Felicity-ann Lewis. Those youth vigils are great recognition of our ANZACs and another superb way for us to say thank you.

Australian defence personnel are made up of men and women who are prepared to put their life on the line for our democracy and freedom of speech. I am proud of our veterans—heroes all—who put themselves at serious risk in the defence of Australia and for the freedom we all enjoy. We must never begrudge this support and never forget their sacrifice. As many as 62,000 Australians were killed and 152,000 wounded in World War I. It is a fact and a memory we should all take with us, especially on ANZAC Day. ANZAC is a large part of the fabric of our nation and, again, I say thank you to all the service men and women past and present.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:46): I rise to support the motion that this house:

- (a) recognises that ANZAC Day, 25 April 2015, commemorates the centenary of the landing of Australian and New Zealand forces at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915;
- (b) pays its collective respects to the 416,809 Australians who enlisted in the Australian Imperial Force and the millions of others who fought in support of the defence efforts of this country since; and

- (c) remembers all Australian service men and women, support personnel and animals that have been injured, traumatised or killed in action.

Noting the time we have today and the many members who want to speak, I will try to be brief. What this country went through was just amazing. Nearly 10 per cent of the population enlisted to fight in the Great War, as it was termed at the time—the 'war to end all wars'. It was a fantastic—probably 'fantastic' is the wrong word—

Mr Gardner: Fantastic in the true sense of the word.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes. It was unbelievable to think that so many people would put their life on the line. We note that 60,000, sadly, never came back to these shores. Quite frankly, I am not sure if everyone knew what they were quite in for when they left.

I want to quote from some letters. It is amazing that I have copies of letters from the Somme in 1917-18 from my great-uncle Joe and another friend of the family. I will read an extract. The letter says it is from 'somewhere in France', and I am pretty sure it is dated 5 November 1917. Writing to my grandparents, he says:

Dear Len and Dos,

Your letter reached me just over a week ago. A good long time in the line I had received no mail at all for some time. I said to a mate as we were edging out, 'I hope there's good mail waiting for me'. Imagine my delight on receiving 13 at once, as well as a parcel from home.

Well for the life of my I don't know what to write about as we are not supposed to mention military matters. All we're doing lately has been near the line, so there's nothing to say.

Obviously, there was plenty of action. It continues:

Just at present we are not having a bad time, but of course you never know what will follow on tomorrow.

A family friend had a bit more to say and got a bit more past the censor. Again, this was from 'somewhere in France' but is dated 13 July 1916. The letter says:

Dear Mrs Pederick,

I must say that I was very pleased indeed to receive such a nice pair of socks.

I am not exactly in the firing line at present but I have had a good share of it. I hope to be in it again in four days' time. I have had some very narrow escapes, one of which only my hat saved me. Several times I have been covered with mud from big shells firing close, that within a few yards a little piece of shell went straight through my trousers and cut my knee, not serious but made it sore for a while. I had my own thoughts on war but I now know different because I have been in one myself. A party of us were ordered to raid the enemy's trenches, not a very safe job. The roar of the artillery and bursting shells was a night one could never forget. You didn't know what part of a second you might be blown to pieces with a shell or run through with a bayonet or shot with a revolver or rifle. There are lots of ways to kill a man in an instant in war.

It's miraculous how many of us got back, but get back we did, nearly every one of us. One of our chaps got blown to pieces right alongside of me with a bomb. That might give you an idea of what we have to go through at times, but my word, our lads are game!

I would just like to recognise my family members who have been in the military over time: Uncle Joe in the First World War; Uncle Oz and Uncle Les in the Second World War; Uncle Les again and Uncle Royce in the Korean War; and my brother Chris served for 23 years in Rwanda, which was upgraded to war service from UN service, and served in Iraq in 2005-06.

I visited France and Belgium in 2010. You really have to go there to get an eye for what has happened. What really amazed me was the fact that we were attacking uphill most of the time against fortified trenches because, obviously, the Germans had dug in to defend. It really brings home the loss. There are 3,500 cemeteries in France and Belgium, and you really get a picture of the true loss and what our people went through. I was fortunate enough to find the grave of my brother-in-law's great-uncle. That was quite a moving moment.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:51): I rise to support of the motion. I have observed with interest for many years while attending dawn services at the beautiful memorial gardens in Unley the numbers growing to over 1,000 on ANZAC morning. I am particularly encouraged by the numbers of young people attending services, including groups from local schools and scouting organisations.

We know that over 8,000 Australians died in the Gallipoli campaign and, for Australia, as for many nations, the First World War remains the most costly conflict in terms of deaths and casualties. From a population of fewer than five million, over 60,000 were killed and 156,000 wounded, so on average, 38 members of the Australian armed forces died every day during the 1,560 days of the war. More recently in Afghanistan from 2002 to 2013, Australia tragically suffered 40 battlefield deaths, along with 262 wounded and significant numbers suffering post-traumatic stress disorder.

And although 25 April marks a century of the war and wars in which Australia has participated, our involvement in conflicts overseas as Australian representatives of our various colonies stretches back further still to the 1860s—the Maori Wars in New Zealand, the Sudan in the 1880s, the Boxer Rebellion and, more notably, the Boer War from 1899-1902

In fact, when the colonies federated in 1901, large numbers of Australians were on active service in South Africa, serving with both official contingents from their respective colonies and the various irregular Imperial units raised for the increasingly brutal second phase of the war. The Australian Commonwealth Horse of the Australian Army was formed for service in South Africa in 1902 and it was the first expeditionary military unit established by the newly-formed Commonwealth of Australia following Federation in 1901.

It was therefore the first truly Australian military force to serve overseas. Over 4,400 men enlisted in this new national force. It is now generally thought that about 16,000 Australians fought in the Boer War. This figure includes those who enlisted in Australian units, as well as the many raised locally in Africa. Of those, 282 died in action or from wounds sustained in the battle, while more again died from disease and other outcomes of the war.

Six Australians received the Victoria Cross in South Africa, and many received other decorations. Many Australians who served in the Boer War would subsequently serve in the First World War and at Gallipoli, including General William Bridges, who commanded the Australian 1st Division at Gallipoli, and the commander of the ANZAC Mounted Division, Harry Chauvel.

The bronze plaques of our own impressive Boer War Memorial, just across the road from parliament, list the names of 59 South Australians who died in the conflict. However, as many as a further 16 South Australians died in relation to the Boer War. Many of these were South Australians who paid their own way to the war and served in various colonial and imperial units. Adelaide Council records show that the omission of these 16 names were casualties of the fact that they were missed out on the original cast, and it cost too much to add them.

One of those fatalities not included on the plaque was George Dundas Kerr from Burra who served with various mounted units, including the Bushveldt Carbineers, and was later killed in action in the Transvaal while enlisting as a scout for British field intelligence. As one of the South Australians not commemorated on the Boer War memorial, he has since been recognised by the Australian Army as being the first Australian ever to be killed while officially engaged in military intelligence-gathering duties.

Several nephews of George served in the First World War. One nephew, Robert Kerr, served at Gallipoli with the first Adelaide-raised 3rd Light Horse Regiment. It is important to remember the Gallipoli campaign and make special note of this 100th anniversary. It is equally important that we continue to recognise it and honour the sacrifices of all Australian service personnel: past, present and future.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:55): Much has been said, and there is very little I can add that would be original or novel. I mainly thank the member for Fisher for bringing this motion to the house. I add my support of it and my gratitude to those who have served this country—overseas and domestically—over a very long period of time. I am particularly interested in the contribution given just now by the member for Unley and his discussion of the often-forgotten South African conflicts, noting, of course, that it is far longer that.

ANZAC became the time when our contribution became so large that it entered popular consciousness. Prior to that, there was the Boxer Rebellion when Australians served overseas as colonial forces rather than Australian forces and other things. It is an excellent motion, and it is an important time to remember it. The 100th anniversary is an important anniversary, and I commend the motion to the house.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:56): I rise in support of the motion. Gallipoli does not represent a military win, nor does ANZAC Day represent a single event or location. ANZAC Day is a collective of people who represent an ideal. News of the battle for Gallipoli had a significant impact on Australia as a nation, and 25 April soon became the day on which Australians remembered the sacrifice of those who had died in the war. During the 1920s, ANZAC Day became established as a national day of commemoration—and I checked that after the member for Finnis made his comments earlier.

For the 60,000 Australians who died during the war, in 1927, for the first time, every state observed some form of public holiday on ANZAC Day. By the mid-1930s, all the rituals we now associate with the day—dawn vigils, marches, memorial services, reunions, two-up games—were finally established as part of the ANZAC Day culture. With the coming of the Second World War, ANZAC Day also served to commemorate the lives of Australians who died in that war. In subsequent years, the meaning of the day has been further broadened to include Australians killed in all the military operations in which Australia has been involved.

ANZAC Day to me is a time to reflect on those who have died for us and our nation and for what we have today. I reflect on my grandfather, Clifford James Bell, who fought in the Second World War, in Egypt and Papua New Guinea, on the infamous Kokoda Track.

I was going to talk about the establishment of ANZAC Day, and I can point the house in the direction of a fantastic article by the Australian Army. If you put that into Google, it goes through a very good commentary on why 25 April is remembered as ANZAC Day. That article certainly contains a number of very good points. In closing, I pay my respects to the RSL members of Mount Gambier and Port MacDonnell and for the fabulous work they do in supporting each other and other members of our community in this ongoing way. With that, I commend the motion to the house.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (12:59): Thank you to everybody who has spoken to my motion today supporting ANZAC Day. What people have brought to the table are some very personal and very real stories that mean a lot to them and us as we have created such a beautiful rich history in Australia around a theory of mateship which is about looking after each other and supporting our friends. With that, I would like to commend the motion to the house and thank everyone.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Condolence

GRIFFIN, HON. K.T.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:00): I move:

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the recent passing of the Hon. Kenneth Trevor Griffin, former minister of the Crown and member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his long and distinguished service and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Today the house pays its respect to the memory of the Hon. Trevor Griffin, one of South Australia's longest serving attorneys-general. Trevor served the state as an extremely diligent and thoughtful member through his 24 years as a member of the Legislative Council. For almost half of this time in parliament he served as Attorney-General while also serving as Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council from 1979 to 1982 and deputy leader of the Liberal Party in the Legislative Council between 1982 and 2001.

During his time here Trevor held the great respect of many in this building, extending to those on both sides of politics. Indeed, I asked my father about Trevor and he said that, despite the fact that he did not drink to excess or gamble or smoke, which raised concerns in my father's mind, he regarded him as a thorough gentleman who was always extremely helpful to other less experienced members of parliament such as my father.

Since his passing it has been clearly demonstrated that the friendships with so many of the long-term staff here, built over decades, remain incredibly strong. It is noteworthy that enduring

loyalty was shown by his staff with, as I understand it, Lynne Stapylton, Pam Huntley and David James all remaining in his office for almost his entire second term as Attorney-General.

This loyalty was perhaps won through his clear appreciation for the efforts of staff and public servants, something he always paid respect to. One sign of this is that he and his wife, Val, invited staff who worked closely with him to a lunch, originally at the family home at Marino but then at their farm at Kuitpo. These lunches came to be known as the 'annual farm day' with the tradition continuing long after Trevor was Attorney-General. The last one was held in 2013.

Trevor always took the role of Attorney-General seriously. He saw it as a privilege to serve as the state's Attorney-General and to serve in his other ministerial capacities. Through his time he delivered some important reforms for the state, including increased rights for victims of crime and the state's first specific legislation targeting domestic violence. While continued progress needs to be made to stamp out this awful blight on our society, we will continue Trevor's work. Trevor's 1994 domestic violence legislation created the ability to recognise and drive reform in areas of society that need attention and leadership from government.

Trevor will be remembered as someone who always sought to be courteous and respectful, even when under extreme pressure, and I think that is the mark of the character of a person. It is fine to be cheerful when all is going well but when things become difficult to remain respectful to those around you is a mark of character.

His conscientiousness was coupled with a very strong sense of duty and propriety. It was clear that in reading documents he not only considered the policy imperatives underpinning the proposal but also the detail. In this particular trait, sir, he shared something with you. There are examples of large reports being put to cabinet for public release where Trevor would have considered the contents but also picked up typographical and grammatical errors, such was his attention to detail. On leaving his position as minister, he advised in a note to justice staff that:

While I have always worked to achieve positive outcomes it will be for others to make a judgement of our level of success. Suffice to say that I'm proud of what I believe we've achieved.

I think those remarks are worthy of reflection, not just because of the pride he had in his work, but the way he saw this as a collective enterprise with those with whom he worked. My thoughts today, and I am sure those of all in this chamber, are with his wife, Val, their sons Mark and Tim, and their extended family. I express my condolences to the house.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): I rise today to second the condolence motion proposed by the Premier and to pay my respects to the memory of the Hon. Kenneth Trevor Griffin, a distinguished politician, an outstanding servant of the South Australian Liberal Party, and a great community-minded individual. On behalf of the entire South Australian Liberal parliamentary team, I extend my sympathies to his wife, Val, his two sons and their families during this most difficult time.

Mr Griffin served as the highest legal officer in this state, serving as Attorney-General not once but twice, first in the Tonkin government, and later under premiers Dean Brown and John Olsen. He was also the Liberal leader in the Legislative Council, and served the people of South Australia in this parliament for 24 years.

Mr Griffin passed away two weeks ago, and there have been many people in this house and in the other place who have had an opportunity to reflect upon the outstanding legacy that he has left South Australia. Overwhelmingly, it has been seen as a legacy of prudential and fair legislation, and of a reasonable, measured and respectful man who was well liked by all members, irrespective of their political persuasion.

Mr Griffin was first and foremost an outstanding legislator. As one of the only ministers with experience in government when Dean Brown won office in 1993, his guidance to the younger and more inexperienced cabinet members was vital. At the time, he assisted a young Rob Lucas to learn the ropes, and also clearly taught him the secret to parliamentary longevity. The Hon. Mr Lucas recently reminisced on Mr Griffin's sharp mind and unwavering commitment to the parliament, saying:

He took the business of bills in parliament seriously; he would meticulously go through each and every clause in a bill, finding problems in drafting that even parliamentary counsel couldn't pick up.

I had a chat with Mr Lucas prior to us resuming parliament this afternoon, and he said this was not only for his own legislation; Mr Griffin would meticulously go through other members' legislation and make helpful suggestions on how the legislation could be improved.

Trevor Griffin achieved much in the parliament. He was most proud of the role he played in ensuring the passage of the Roxby Downs indenture bill in 1982, and in securing the land rights of the Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara people through the APY Land Rights Act. These two pieces of legislation are some of the most important passed in this parliament.

Trevor also had a keen sense of justice, and his reforms were about making South Australia a safer and fairer place to live. Mr Griffin introduced legislation that required pawnbrokers to record the information of people selling goods, and also mandating that all items must be held for a minimum of three days before sale in order to allow stolen goods to be identified. This legislation was credited with completely changing the way stolen goods were traded in our state.

Mr Griffin introduced legislation that established a register of convicted sex offenders, which is something that remains an important part of policing and parole conditions today. He participated in the Tonkin government's reforms, including the removal of significant taxes like death duties, gift duties and land tax on the family home. I particularly wish to highlight the introduction of the 1994 domestic violence legislation in South Australia, which the Premier has also highlighted to the parliament today.

Mr Griffin was an outstanding legislator. He was a gentleman and a friend to many. In his maiden speech, Mr Griffin spoke of his initial shock at finding himself in parliament, filling a vacancy created by the untimely death of the Hon. Frank Potter. He said:

...to find oneself one week quietly going about one's own affairs and profession and the next week to be sitting in this place is somewhat bewildering, and requires a considerable adjustment in one's affairs if one is to take a responsible part in the work and deliberations of this Council...I have no illusions about the difficulty of the task or of the adjustments I shall have to make to cope with it.

It was this deep understanding about the importance of his role as a legislator and parliamentarian that made Trevor Griffin such a formidable political mind. In his entire 24 years in parliament, he never lost sight of the fact that well-crafted and sound legislation has the ability to benefit all South Australians. Trevor Griffin was never one for complacency.

I would also like to acknowledge in the parliament today his outstanding service to the St Andrew's Hospital board, where he served as a board member for an outstanding 44 years. He was also a longstanding trustee of the Liberal Party, a position that he served in up until his death. Of course, he served as our party president in South Australia during the period 1973 to 1976, which were particularly tumultuous times, and his skill as the party president was absolutely crucial during this period.

I have previously said that the mark of a great politician is one that leaves the state in a better place and in better shape than the time when the member first entered the halls of this parliament, and I think we can all agree that Trevor Griffin was such a politician. On behalf of the Liberal Party I extend our very sincere condolences to his widow, Val, and to his family and friends. Vale, Trevor Griffin.

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (14:11): I would like to join in making a few remarks on this occasion. Although I knew Trevor Griffin a little, unfortunately I did not have the opportunity of knowing him as much as I think I would have liked to have known him in his professional capacity. That said, I do have some idea of the demands of the job that he performed. It can be quite a demanding position, not just because of the parliamentary scrutiny one is put to but also because of the sheer volume of material that one needs to deal with.

Over the years I have been in this place, and certainly since I have occupied the role of Attorney-General, I have met many people who have worked with the Hon. Trevor Griffin and, to a person, they are all extremely complimentary of him in every respect. They are complimentary of his courtesy. They are complimentary of his work ethic. They are complimentary of his decency. Quite

simply, they have nothing but fine words to say. To occupy a position as a minister of the government for as many years as he did and to leave behind a group of people who still, after many years, speak in the most glowing terms of the opportunity of working with him I think is a great tribute.

During the period of time that the Hon. Trevor Griffin was Attorney-General, like the Premier I was a practising member of the legal profession. I think I can say without any fear of contradiction that amongst members of the legal profession, irrespective of their political views, Trevor Griffin was held in very high regard. He was regarded as a man of principle, a man who was respected by all of the profession and man who was seen as being a very competent and appropriate first law officer.

Also, on occasion I confess that I have reflected on the fact that it has been my lot, for better or worse, not to have had the privilege of being able to work in some legislative context with the Hon. Trevor Griffin in the other place. It has fallen to me to have what I think is described in the other place as 'improvements'—and I use that term in inverted commas—supervised by people other than the Hon. Trevor Griffin. For that, I feel personally to have been short-changed, but there is nothing much I can do about that.

If I can say, from my own personal point of view, that Trevor Griffin did an outstanding job as Attorney-General and I would like to extend my condolences to his family and friends.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (14:14): I rise to speak to this condolence motion on behalf of the many people in the communities that I represent who knew the Hon. Kenneth Trevor Griffin. In particular, I bring to this chamber the condolences of members of the Liberal Party in Bright who shared local membership with Mr Griffin and who worked on his campaign when he contested the seat of Brighton in 1970. Mr Griffin lived in Bright at Marino for much of his time in the ministry, and he remained a member of the Bright branch of the Liberal Party until his passing earlier this month.

Trevor Griffin enjoyed a notable political career, serving in the Legislative Council from 1978, when he was elected to fill a casual vacancy following the death of the Hon. Frank Potter, the president of the council. He continued serving the people of South Australia at the most senior levels of government until his retirement in 2002, almost a quarter of a century later.

Mr Griffin's time in office included two significant reforming stints as the state's Attorney-General during the Tonkin government and again in the Brown-Olsen era. During a career which spanned 24 years, he held various portfolios, including police, corrections and emergency services, and led the Liberals in the upper house from 1979 to 1982.

Mr Griffin's involvement in the Liberal Party began in the 1960s and led to him being a candidate for the then Labor-held seat of Brighton in the 1970 state election. While a more inland-leaning seat than coastal Bright, the seat that Mr Griffin contested in 1970 covered much of the territory which is today found within the seat of Bright.

Mr Griffin was at the forefront of progressive lawmaking in South Australia, helping position the governments he was part of as drivers of well-considered, timely law reform. As one of South Australia's longest serving attorneys-general, his legacy will be in the laws he left us with, in particular those laws which creaked open the door in this often conservative state to new ways of thinking and conducting legal affairs.

He was pivotally involved in crafting some of the state's most significant pieces of legislation, including the APY Land Rights Bill, the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill and the state's first piece of legislation on domestic violence. His work in this area saw the state's first legal definition of 'domestic violence' enter law and saw the creation of specific domestic violence restraining orders, as well as the legal recognition that the protection of victims of domestic violence was a vital consideration for courts when bail decisions were being made.

Mr Griffin also led the way in providing government support to those who find themselves victims of crime. I note that the South Australian Victim Support Service has placed on its website:

Trevor was a strong supporter of victims' rights, as well as the work and growth of the VSS during both his terms as Attorney-General. The victims of crime review in 1999 was initiated by Trevor, which led to the implementation of the Victims of Crime Act in 2003. Between 1993 and 2001 the level of funding dedicated to victims' services in South Australia more than doubled under Trevor Griffin's watch. For VSS this culminated in the expansion of our services to Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, the riverland and the south-east.

From reading about Mr Griffin, and from talking to his peers and friends within the Liberal Party, it is clear that he managed to achieve a special thing in politics: trust, respect and friendships on both sides of the house whether he was in government or in opposition. In preparing to deliver this condolence speech, I spoke to a number of people who knew Trevor personally. One friend, Jan Smith, summed things up in a way that I feel is worth sharing with parliament today. Jan said of Trevor:

He was courteous and civil to everyone and kept to the issues, not personality. He was a man of principle, character and integrity and maintained his strong political resolve. He was on the St Andrew's Hospital Board, the Film Review Classifications Board and was a mediator—all roles that reinforced the values he upheld in his personal life and political career. Always highly respected and loved in his personal community of friends...someone who knew how to be a friend and how to have a friend.

To Mr Griffin's wife, Val, his sons, his extended family and friends, please accept the sincerest sympathies of the Bright SEC and those in the Marino community who knew and respected Trevor. Vale, Kenneth Trevor Griffin.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:19): I also rise to support the motion and to commend the addresses of the other speakers, particularly that of the member for Bright. Trevor was born in 1940 and, as we have heard, was a Bachelor of Laws and Master of Laws at the University of Adelaide. His wife, Val, and sons, Mark and Tim, will miss him terribly. As we have heard, he contested the seat of Brighton in 1970 and won a seat in the upper house in 1978. He was Attorney-General in the Tonkin, Brown and Olsen governments and, I must say, having served with him, a very, very good one. Apart from the acts we have heard already on the APY lands and Roxby Downs, he also introduced the Correctional Services Act in 1982 and the Liquor Licensing Act in 1997 and a host of other initiatives.

Can I just say that he was a wonderful source of advice to a newly arrived backbencher in 1997. I know that was felt right across the parliament, but particularly in the Liberal Party at the time. You could always rely on Trevor to have time for you, to explain his bills and proposals before they went into the party room. I remember speaking on a number of his initiatives here in the house. He guided me wonderfully through those very complex issues. There is one thing I will say about Trevor: he was a very steady hand who resisted populism in law and order and in particular was a very strong advocate for the separation of powers and in particular the independence of the judiciary, resisting in particular mandatory sentencing and various other things that he thought would diminish our system of justice.

He left in late 2001, when newly installed premier Rob Kerin made the very brave decision to freshen up the front bench and was replaced by Robert Lawson, but he left the position of Attorney-General with the undying respect and admiration I know of everyone within the Liberal Party and everyone within the house when he finally stepped aside as Attorney-General. He was a wonderful member of parliament, a great politician, and someone who we can all look up to.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:21): I note that other speakers have spoken at length about the incredible contribution that Trevor Griffin made to the legislative framework as Attorney-General. I want to spend a little bit more time talking about his incredible contribution to the Liberal Party over a number of decades, but I do note that Trevor Griffin would almost certainly hold the record as an Attorney-General who served the people South Australia in four decades: the 1970s, the 1980s, the 1990s and 2000s. With all due respect, I hope that that is a record that is not met any time soon.

The contribution that Trevor Griffin made to the Liberal Party was extraordinary and over a long period of time. In the 1970s, he was president of the party in what was a very challenging time, but what was the critical moment was that, when the Liberal Movement and the Liberal Country League reformed, he was there to help heal those wounds and made an extraordinary contribution, along with David Tonkin in particular, in binding together the party and putting them on a platform where David Tonkin was subsequently able to be elected premier of South Australia.

I know that when I was vice-president of the Young Liberal Movement and subsequently president, I organised the first four David Tonkin memorial dinners with Prue Tonkin. She was so happy to be sitting next to Trevor Griffin at the first David Tonkin memorial dinner, in recognition of his contribution to that government and the people of South Australia through that work, but also

through their incredibly important connection in bringing together the modern Liberal Party of South Australia.

The respect with which Trevor Griffin was held by the Liberal Party membership in South Australia I think is clear through the fact that he was elected every year as trustee of the Liberal Party and was unopposed after his first election up until his passing. The other opportunity that the Liberal Party membership had every year to show the high regard that they had for Trevor Griffin is that the Liberal Party preselections are subject to an appeals tribunal, which is elected every year by our state council of five members elected. It is a tribunal that is invariably only people who are held in high regard across the party, who are trusted and considered to be legally responsible, fair, impartial, judicious and thoughtful. They are the sorts of people who are elected.

I have been involved in the Liberal Party for nearly 20 years, and I do not think there has been a year since Trevor's retirement from parliament where he has not either been the first or second person elected to that tribunal. The Liberal Party state council will terribly mourn his loss. With the respect in which he was held, he was someone who was held in very high regard in the party. I met him on a number of occasions, and I remember him to be a man of dignity, I think is the word that would most describe him. We will mourn his loss. We pass our condolences, very sincerely felt, to the family.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:25): It is with significant sadness that I rise to contribute to the motion moved by the Premier in memory of the late Trevor Griffin. Trevor Griffin served this parliament in a distinguished manner, as has been pointed out by many of his achievements, serving as Attorney-General for an extended period under two separate governments. Trevor Griffin was known and noted for his integrity and for his meticulous application to all the matters that ever came before him. There was great respect for him right across the political divide, and that was due to the way he conducted himself and the way he handled matters of state.

As the member for Waite pointed out, as a new member coming into the house his advice was always both keenly sought; it was sage and taken very seriously. I will not go through the list of achievements of Trevor Griffin. They are many and a lot of them have already been mentioned. One memory comes to mind. As a new member of the house—and I was not in the Liberal Party at the time—I happened to be walking through the city when I bumped into Trevor. I said, 'Attorney, by the way, there's a matter I wanted to discuss with you. Do you have a moment?' He said, 'Sure.' I told him about the matter, and it was an issue to do with the Liquor Licensing Act, that we had changed some legislation and that it had an unintended consequence on the cellar door outlets in my electorate. I told him what the concern was and the implication that it had for cellar door outlets.

Trevor went through and explained to me the legislative change and why it was enacted, etc. We parted ways and I thought, 'Maybe I could have attacked that issue a little bit differently. Maybe I should have made a formal appointment with him and written a letter, etc.' Anyhow, I went about my way. A little while later, maybe a week or two, I got a phone call from Trevor. He said, 'Oh, Mitch, I just wanted to ring you to let you know how I've solved that problem for you.' I will never forget it. I must admit, parting from him that day, I thought, 'Oh, well, as a new member one of the things I might be able to fix up I've blown it.' Trevor never missed an opportunity to do the right thing by the people of this state. I have the utmost respect for him. To his wife, Val, and his family, my deepest sympathy. Vale, Trevor Griffin.

The SPEAKER (14:28): I shadowed Trevor Griffin for about eight years and I always found him a very, very decent person. He certainly resisted populist clamouring such as mine and that of the leader of the opposition, Mike Rann. He was politically courageous in a quiet way. Earlier in his life he had been an accomplished sportsman. He retained a very strong physique, which was not immediately obvious because of his small stature. He had a very strong handshake.

He was conservative not just in politics but in temperament and outlook. As members have noted, he had very good manners. He was cautious with his files and cabinet submissions. He was across all the detail, which was a virtue in an Attorney-General, and he was quite a policy dynamo in cabinet. Not only had he meticulously prepared all his own cabinet submissions but he had read everyone else's on Monday morning and so was able to contribute to the debate. He could go toe to toe with his principal political foe, the Labor Attorney-General, Chris Sumner. If one reads the

Hansard at that time, they barely each of them get a sentence out before the other interrupts, so that debates are one sentence from Sumner, one sentence from Griffin and so it goes for pages.

He was, as I think has been noted, a teetotaler but he turned a winemaker in his retirement and that reminded me of the scriptural passage about the ideal life: 'But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid...' I was very pleased that that turned out to be Trevor Griffin's retirement. I offer my condolences to Val and their family. Vale, Trevor Griffin.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:31 to 14:40.

Ministerial Statement

WHOOPIING COUGH VACCINATION

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:40): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Today, I announced that the pertussis (whooping cough) vaccine will be free for all women in South Australia during the last trimester of pregnancy to help protect young babies against this deadly illness. The government's decision to provide free vaccination follows the tragic death last week of a four-week-old baby in Western Australia. I note that the father of that child particularly welcomed the South Australian government's move on this particular matter.

Research published last year found that maternal vaccination is the best way to protect babies from whooping cough during the first few months of life. As we saw last week, whooping cough is a very serious illness that can have devastating consequences for those who have not been fully immunised. Infants under six months of age are not able to complete the required series of vaccinations, so they remain especially vulnerable to whooping cough. By giving the mother a whooping cough vaccination in the last trimester of pregnancy, this immunity is transferred to their baby providing over 90 per cent protection.

I want to see as many families as possible take advantage of this protection, so we are going to provide the vaccine free to all pregnant mothers during their third trimester. My department will be working with GPs, maternity hospitals and obstetricians over coming weeks to organise a vaccination program to prevent further tragedy from occurring.

Whooping cough is a serious respiratory infection which is particularly dangerous in very young infants. The illness starts like a typical cold but is usually followed by long periods of dry coughing which can sometimes produce the signature whooping sound. While whooping cough numbers are still relatively low in South Australia, the cyclical nature of the illness means an increase in cases is likely in the near future, so it is important we prepare ourselves now.

There have been 119 cases of whooping cough in South Australia so far this year compared to 92 at the same time in 2013 and 127 in 2012. During the last outbreak in 2010, there were 7,520 cases of whooping cough in South Australia with more than 1,000 cases occurring in the first two months alone. Vaccination is the best way to prevent whooping cough; however, many people do not realise that immunity wanes over time and they may need a booster. I encourage anyone who is unsure of their immunisation status to speak to their doctor about getting a booster shot, particularly if they are pregnant or have contact with young children.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

South Australian Health System Performance Review—Four-Yearly Report 2011-14

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

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Charter

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Freedom of Information Act—Notices of Determinations

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Act 2005 and the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Advisory Board—Annual Report 2013-14

Murray-Darling Basin Authority—Annual Report 2013-14

Natural Resources Management Act 2004—Administration and Enforcement of—
Report 2013-14

Natural Resources Management Board—

Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Annual Report 2013-14

Eyre Peninsula Annual Report 2013-14

Kangaroo Island Annual Report 2013-14

Northern and Yorke Annual Report 2013-14

South Australian Arid Lands Annual Report 2013-14

South East Annual Report 2013-14

Natural Resources Management Council—Annual Report 2013-14

South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board—Annual Report 2013-14

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:44): I bring up the 514th report of the committee.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

FAMILIES SA CAREWORKERS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Will 180 Families SA careworkers going on strike affect the government's ability to protect and care for our most vulnerable children?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:45): I appreciate the question as this is a very important area of service delivery. My understanding is that the industrial action being undertaken by the family careworkers will not affect the services to children.

FAMILIES SA CAREWORKERS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary, sir: can the minister explain to the house how it is possible that 180 careworkers going on strike will not have an effect on the care and protection of our children?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:46): Certainly. My understanding, and I am relying on what has been relayed to my office by the union, is that the term 'strike' is an inappropriate one, that it is industrial action that will not affect the services that they are providing to children.

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:46): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house about the progress the government has made to deliver on the 2014 election commitments?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:47): Indeed, it is a happy day today. It is, in fact, 12 months to the day since we were sworn in as the new government.

An honourable member: Great day.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. Cheers to us. Can I say that since that period of time we have—just as we did during the election campaign—decided to put all of our commitments in full view of the public. We thought we would take a novel approach during the election campaign. We thought, 'The hell with it, we will actually publish all of our policies on the first day of the campaign,' which stood in stark contrast to those opposite.

I announce that one year to the day since we were sworn in we can now provide details of the progress we have made, and we have done this by publishing in full view 44 pages worth of detail online, so you can go to that if you would like to. Those commitments are not just the ones we made during the election campaign but indeed the 14 policy documents that were launched in the six months leading up to the election campaign, including the commitments that were negotiated with minister Brock, so they are all there and we have set them out.

The SPEAKER: Premier, you shouldn't refer to the minister's surname.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Sorry; the member for Frome. Of the 367 commitments for the four-year term of government, 103 are completed already, including: the delivery of a new return-to-work scheme, saving South Australian business \$180 million per annum; the establishment of 19 marine parks; the securing of the redevelopment of the Nyrstar smelter at Port Pirie; supporting auto workers through the automotive diversification program; holding three country cabinets, with a fourth happening this Monday in Peterborough; increasing the maximum energy concession by \$50 for vulnerable people; increasing the Regional Development Fund to \$15 million per annum; increasing investment in new advanced medical equipment in metropolitan and country hospitals; establishing a major event bid fund; and ensuring that we provide additional resources into our health and education systems.

Delivering on these commitments has been a task that has to occur in a difficult financial environment and a difficult political environment, given the obstruction that we have seen by the other place of our transport development levy that has meant that funding for some of the infrastructure upgrades has had to be put on hold unfortunately. But we have pressed ahead.

As part of the commitment we have made to regional South Australia, through the Minister for Regional Development, we have also funded the James Morrison jazz school in Mount Gambier, a fantastic new initiative at that level. I made it a commitment at the last election that I would govern for all South Australians, that I would stand up to the Abbott government and that we would keep on building South Australia, and on each of those commitments we have delivered.

We have stood up against the Abbott government on cuts to health, on cuts to education, we have stood up for pensioners and we will continue to fight for jobs at the Australian Submarine Corporation and hold this commonwealth government to account. We made commitments, we are delivering on those commitments and we intend to continue to keep building South Australia.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will medical and surgical training opportunities be reduced as a result of the government's downgrades of emergency departments?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:51): I welcome the opposition's sudden interest in training positions for medical staff in our hospitals. It is something on which they have been strangely silent. Of course, we will work with universities and medical colleges

to ensure that we continue training health professionals across our health system, whether they be nurses, whether they be medical staff.

There is one thing which has happened which I cannot help, but perhaps the opposition could help me if they had a bit of backbone. Last year, the federal government cut the PGPPP scheme, the scheme whereby the federal government provides funding to provide training places. Where do these training places predominantly go? Somewhere I would have thought members of the opposition, if they were really interested in regional South Australia, something they would be particularly interested in, because these training positions—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The member for Mount Gambier may be the exception to the rule in the opposition. He is someone who is in touch with his community. The simple fact is the Abbott government cut PGPPP funding which predominantly provides training places in regional South Australia to ensure we have a pipeline of medical practitioners who will go and work in regional South Australia. We have enormous challenges coming up in terms of an adequate medical workforce in regional South Australia and PGPPP provided training opportunities in rural areas because we know that practitioners who have done their training in rural areas are likely to continue a career in those rural areas. It is absolutely critical—

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I ask that you instruct the minister to return to the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: No, I disagree with the leader. I think the Minister for Health is being germane. The leader asked the question and now the minister is answering it, but I do thank you for the pause during which I can call to order the members for Schubert and Heysen, the deputy leader and the member for Chaffey. I warn the member for Heysen the first time. None of those arise from the opposition's merciless heckling of the Premier on the first Dorothy. The minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The PGPPP scheme has been very important to ensure that in regional South Australia we have a pipeline of medical practitioners willing to go out and do the work in those rural areas where sometimes it can be extremely hard to recruit a general practitioner. What did the Abbott government do? Cut it. Simply cut it. I would have thought that an opposition seriously interested in health, and particularly interested in looking after—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister is debating. This is absolutely nothing to do with reduction of places in emergency departments, particularly when he starts talking about what he would have thought an opposition would or would not do.

The SPEAKER: We do have a federal government, and the minister is allowed, in answering, to criticise a decision of the federal government. Perhaps the minister could move on from tying the state opposition to that federal government.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I would simply say, Mr Speaker, that if the Liberal Party were serious about training positions in health in our state they would have said something when the federal government cut the PGPPP scheme last year.

The SPEAKER: I specifically asked the minister not to do that, so I uphold the member for Morialta's point of order. The member for Napier.

The Hon. P. Caica: What a shame; we wanted another one of your questions, Steven.

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

The Hon. P. Caica: Sorry, sir.

NYRSTAR

Mr GEE (Napier) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for State Development. Can the minister provide the house with an update on work being carried out by Nyrstar on its Port Pirie redevelopment plan?

The SPEAKER: Is the Treasurer in a position to do that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:55): Happily, yes, sir. I thank the member for this question and for their keen interest in this major investment, not only for Port Pirie but for the people of this state. It is almost a year since I stood with the Premier and the member for Frome at Port Pirie to announce an agreement that had been reached with Nyrstar to allow the redevelopment of its smelter to proceed; in fact, sir, I will be celebrating tonight with a ham and pineapple pizza myself.

I am delighted to inform the house that significant progress has been made on the more than half a billion dollar redevelopment—a project that is expected to create about 1,000 jobs during construction. Nyrstar—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: You're a fixer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I'm a fixer. Nyrstar has informed the government that piling work is well advanced. About 150 piles have been drilled at the site since November to an average depth of 12 to 16 metres. The old workshop, one of the oldest buildings on the project site, is being demolished, with asbestos removed and the creation of more than 1,000 tonnes of scrap metal, which has been earmarked for recycling. An old high-voltage cable has been replaced and other work is being carried out to reroute 60 metres of a gas line.

Our Industry Capability Network is working closely with Nyrstar and businesses to ensure a strong flow of contracts to local employers. I have previously informed the house that Nyrstar has reached an agreement with France's Air Liquide for a €60 million investment in a new oxygen plant, bringing the total investment to almost \$600 million. Demolition of buildings and the removal of services are underway in an area that has been identified for that new plant.

Contrast this with the situation 12 months ago, Mr Speaker. A changing government in Canberra led to the situation where, rather than supporting investment in a key regional industry, they could not run away fast enough. An in-principle agreement between the commonwealth, the state and Nyrstar we had worked so hard together to finalise for more than a year was in real danger of unravelling because of the intransigence of the Abbott government, even with their 'fixer' doing all he could to step in.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The South Australian government held its ground because we knew that this was a deal that needed to be done to secure the people of Port Pirie. At the urging of the local member and now Minister for Regional Development (member for Frome), we restructured the agreement with Nyrstar and forged ahead without the commonwealth playing a part in the guarantee required to unleash this investment. We did this because, like the member for Frome and unlike the commonwealth government, we understand the importance of this agreement to the future of South Australia.

Let us not forget that the aim of this investment is to improve the health and environmental outcomes of the people of Port Pirie. I look forward to providing further updates on the significant investment in the future of Port Pirie and of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Morialta and Hammond, and warn a first time the members for Chaffey, Schubert and Morialta.

MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on the government's plan to close the Motor Accident Commission?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:59): Yes, sir: it is coming along very nicely. We have commercial advisers in place. We are not closing the Motor Accident Commission, like the Leader of the Opposition has said: we are privatising it. We made a point of saying that at the last budget. We are not trying to mince words here, but we don't believe the issuing of insurance is an essential service provided by the

government; we think it is something that the private sector can do and probably do better. What surprises me is that there are people in the Liberal Party who think that we should be offering insurance and that we can do it better than the private sector, but perhaps that is the new radical left of the—

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. I know that the comrades opposite are very keen for us to maintain government ownership of—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Socialisation.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Socialising insurance within South Australia, but we on this side of the house believe that the private sector can do it, and do it better. I am very pleased with the progress it has taken. People would have seen in the Mid-Year Budget Review an update of the progress and I look forward to updating the house in the budget.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I note members interjecting why it was not announced before the election. In my discussions with insurance companies, in their discussions in the lead-up to the last state election, they seemed to have quite a lot of knowledge about potential sales or privatisations of the Motor Accident Commission that had not come from the incumbent government. I do not have any hard evidence of where that came from, but if it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it is a duck.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, the leader.

MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): Can the Treasurer confirm that, once the Motor Accident Commission is privatised, the government will impose a new tax on compulsory third-party premiums to fund road safety advertising campaigns?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:01): I do not think it is a new tax. There is a current levy in place now on the premiums issued by the Motor Accident Commission. We have said all along that we want the Motor Accident Commission to remain and have a very keen role in road safety awareness. I will get a more detailed answer for the Leader of the Opposition, but it is my understanding that that already occurs. If it is not right I will come back and correct the record, but that is my understanding.

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, the members for Heysen and Chaffey are warned for the second and final time, and the member for Mitchell is called to order. The leader has a supplementary.

MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Can the Treasurer advise the house how much the government intends to collect each year by taxing the CTP premiums to fund the road safety advertising campaigns?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:02): One, we already do that. We already have duties in place on a number of insurance policies and they are indexed at the same formula or way that the opposition used to when they were last in government, last century, and we continue that policy. The Motor Accident Commission's premiums are already, I understand, levied. I do not anticipate that changing dramatically unless there is some dramatic movement in the CPI index, but I will find out and get a more detailed answer for the Leader of the Opposition. I welcome his interest in the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission and I look forward to his strong support.

MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Further supplementary: the Treasurer has previously advised that the Motor Accident Commission will be privatised or wound up by 1 July 2016. Can he update the house as to whether this is still the case?

Ms Redmond: So they can steal all the money.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen, if her lips move again outside standing orders, will be leaving us. The Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:03): In the last budget I said '1 July 2016 or sooner', so once the commercial advisers finalise their work, I will have more information for the house.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is called to order. The leader has had three supplementaries. The member for Newland.

RETURNTOWORKSA

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the minister inform the house about the changes ReturnToWorkSA is making to the premium system for employers, and has he fixed it?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:03): I thank the member for Newland for that question. I would not go so far as the member for Sturt, but I believe we have fixed it.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It's in the budget.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is in the budget, and this bit is not a surprise. ReturnToWorkSA will be using a new and simpler insurance premium system from 1 July 2015. This is in response to feedback from employers in relation to the complexity and volatility of the current experience rating scheme. The new calculation is a simple formula which is easy to explain to employers and to members of the opposition. It is easier for employers to understand and therefore allows them to influence the amount of premium they pay through effective return-to-work strategies by providing suitable employment and minimising income support costs paid to workers with injuries.

The premium system will apply to all registered employers so that even small employers will have the opportunity to receive a reduced premium, if they minimise their claims and support their injured workers to return to work. As I have previously shared, the ReturnToWorkSA Board has set the average premium for 2015-16 at 1.95 per cent plus the work health safety levy fee. This is the lowest rate in the scheme's history.

ReturnToWorkSA's general manager for insurance and deputy general manager have been out on the road presenting information about the new premium system to employers. These sessions have been run with the claims agents, namely, Employers Mutual and Gallagher Bassett, to share information with employers about the changes coming with the new return-to-work scheme and give them an opportunity to ask questions. I am advised that over 1,000 employers have now attended one of these sessions. They have been held in the CBD, at Mawson Lakes, Tanunda, Murray Bridge, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Riverland and Mount Gambier, with more sessions being arranged.

I am told that the employers' response to the new premium scheme has been overwhelmingly positive. Employers have told ReturnToWorkSA that they are pleased to see that their concerns with the previous model have been listened to. They have said that they understand the system and that they understand what they can do to influence their own premium payment. The feedback has been very, very enthusiastic.

The benefits of the face-to-face service strategy are also paying off for the industry and the scheme. All employers will receive information about their 2015-16 premium payment in their regular end-of-year premium pack that will be sent out in June of 2015.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is called to order and warned a first time, and the member for Adelaide is called to order. Leader.

COMPULSORY THIRD-PARTY INSURANCE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): Thank you very much. My question is to the Treasurer. What impact will the introduction of compulsory third-party insurance policies issued by private insurers have on the premiums paid by South Australian motorists?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:06): Far be it from me to lecture the Liberal Party on the involvement of the private sector in offering competitive arrangements in insurance, but I would imagine that a competitive rate would be offered. Again, I have to say that this idea that somehow the government can do it better than the private sector is a little bit disturbing coming from the Leader of the Opposition but, again, I am sure that the comrades opposite are very keen to make sure that the government is involved where the private sector fails. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition believes that the private sector fails in the insurance area and that the government should absolutely be in this space.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr PISONI: The Treasurer is not responsible for what he allegedly claims the Leader of the Opposition could be saying or not.

The SPEAKER: No, there has to be some scope for a minister to compare and contrast the policies and, in this case, the fundamental ideologies of the parties. I don't want him unnecessarily to dwell on the merits or otherwise of the state opposition, but he is allowed to refer to the Liberal Party's fundamental ideology of believing in the private sector compared to the Labor Party's trust in the public sector. We couldn't say very much if we couldn't say that. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. If I have offended 'Tovarich' Marshall, I apologise, but I am always fascinated when I hear the Leader of the Opposition claiming the government can issue third-party premiums better than the private sector, and I will be incorporating that in all my speeches now to the business community.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: Now, clearly this is debate. The question was very clearly about what impact there would be. He may say it could be better, it could be the same—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

Ms CHAPMAN: —it could be worse. That's the question: what the impact will have on the premiums, not the comparing of what's to happen. At this stage, there is just a tirade of—

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is talking about premiums.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, he is not.

The SPEAKER: Yes, there was a reference in there to premiums. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. Look, before the election, we were told to take the handbrake off. We have, and now they are upset that we have and are allowing the private sector to get involved. Now, they want us to put the handbrake back on. I don't believe for a moment that opening up compulsory third-party premiums to the competitive private sector will push rates up. If the Leader of the Opposition has evidence that the private sector will push rates up, please provide it to the house.

I note that the opposition is very uncomfortable with the private sector involving itself in third-party premiums. They are very upset about the government's plans to privatise the Motor Accident Commission. I have let industry know what the opposition's views are. I have let the insurance industry know that the opposition do not believe that they can do it in a more competitive way. I say to the younger members of the opposition: it is time to take back your party from the socialists.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: I think the Treasurer has finished. That would obviate the need for the member for Stuart's point of order.

COMPULSORY THIRD-PARTY INSURANCE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): Supplementary: will there be any ongoing regulatory role from the state government's perspective with regard to CTP insurance premiums?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:10): That is actually a very good question: will there be a very high level of regulatory oversight in this? The government is contemplating this, and we will make sure that there is a high level of regulatory oversight. The important thing about allowing this bit to be open to the private sector for competition is, if you don't have strong oversight and strong regulation, you can get outcomes that are not necessarily beneficial to consumers. But there is nothing that says that strong regulation and private interaction can't work and work well and give a good outcome, not only for those who regulate, but those who we seek to regulate.

I think what we are going to see here is a good outcome for consumers, who will be given more choice. That is a good thing. We want to offer families choice of their insurance provider and we want to make sure that there is strong regulation there to protect families from increasing costs. It is an important part of the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission, and I will look forward to bringing more information to the house as we get to a solution closer to 1 July 2016, or sooner, depending on when the final transition occurs.

STATE GOVERNMENT CONCESSIONS

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. Minister, how is the government supporting pensioners and low-income earners with the cost of utilities?

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) (15:11): Can I thank the member for that question. Our government understands how important it is to support pensioners and low-income earners who need assistance when managing the household budget. While our government is proud that we have consistently been recognised as an affordable place to live and raise a family, we understand that some South Australians are doing it tough. That is why our government committed at the last state election to introduce a range of measures aimed at supporting South Australian families, particularly those on low or fixed incomes, with the cost of utilities. I am pleased to report on the progress of implementing these election commitments for South Australians.

Our government committed to increasing the energy concession by \$50 to a maximum of \$215 each year, and from 1 July 2015 more than 205,000 South Australians are benefiting from this increase to support them with the cost of energy bills. This builds on our proud record of delivering concessions, and this latest increase will mean we have more than tripled the energy concession since coming to office, from \$70 in 2002 to \$215 in 2014, investing around \$10 million each year to support Australian families.

We are also committed to rolling out our Utilities Literacy Program by investing \$780,000 each year to help households manage their utility usage and debt, because we know that many families may not understand their utility usage, how their utilities are calculated, or where to seek assistance to manage their bills. I am pleased that, through our government's investment, more than

130 financial counsellors and support workers have been trained to deliver utilities literacy support to clients across South Australia and more than 4,300 people have accessed either community education or intensive case management support and assistance for families struggling with utilities-related financial issues last year.

We are also committed to expand the Emergency Electricity Payment Scheme by investing more than \$577,000 each year, which provides extra payments on top of concessions to people facing utility debt. The program is a voluntary, free and confidential service to people who are experiencing personal financial difficulties due to unemployment, sickness, credit overcommitments and family breakdown.

This financial year, more than 550 applicants have been approved for the EEPS payment. One of those applicants was a mother of three children who had recently separated from her partner due to domestic violence. Due to the extreme nature of the violence, the individual had been put in an out of hospital, and her debts were mounting. The approved EEPS payment assisted in eliminating almost the entire electricity debt and enabled the energy company to set up a manageable payment plan.

This is just one of the many examples of people who have been assisted by our government investment in assisting South Australian families. I am proud of our government's commitment to supporting those most vulnerable in our community.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Given the minister's comments yesterday regarding the leadership of Ambassador Exploration and Ambassador Oil and Gas and what he characterised as positive business arrangements which transferred the rights of petroleum exploration licence 570 through successive corporate agreements, is he aware of the Australian government Takeovers Panel's findings against these directors?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:15): Mr Speaker, yesterday the member for Stuart asked me a series of questions regarding the granting of a petroleum exploration licence to Ambassador Exploration, which is now a subsidiary of Drillsearch. He referred to a number of documents that he received via a freedom of information application and questioned the process conducted to assess the bids for the licence and the process by which the variation of the licence was granted.

Bids for petroleum exploration licences under this government are assessed independently of the minister by a bid team, which is now the Department of State Development, but at the time was the department of primary industry and resources. As has been stated, a number of criteria were used to assess the bids, one of which was the 'adequacy of the financial resources and the technical expertise available to the applicant'. During the assessment period, the bid team often seeks further information from bidders to allow a detailed assessment to occur. In this case, Ambassador, whose work program was scored higher than all the other PEL applications based on work program criteria, was asked to provide further information about their financial resources. This was provided to the satisfaction of the bid team. In terms of financial capability, Ambassador's key personnel have demonstrated experience—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I'm getting to that. I'm getting to that point as well.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The question was about the Australian government Takeovers Panel's finding.

The SPEAKER: Could the minister come to the substance?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I just thought I'd take the opportunity to answer some of the questions from yesterday as well.

The SPEAKER: Well, that isn't contemplated by standing orders.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In terms of Ambassador's key personnel, they had to demonstrate experience in raising capital in respect to the oil and gas sector at a time when the share markets were relatively receptive to upstream petroleum capital raising. In terms of the technical capacity, Ambassador Exploration was represented by Mr Guglielmo, who had many years prior extensive experience in the oil and gas sector, including 20 years at very senior levels with Santos and Stuart Petroleum. Further, John Davidson, as I said earlier, had 25 years experience at senior levels at Exxon. In regard to variations permitted in the licence conditions after Ambassador Exploration had been granted PEL570, I can inform the house that the variations enabled the licensee to optimise its work program whilst sustaining its work program above other bids for PEL570.

To the question that the shadow minister asks, I have full confidence in my officials. I have full confidence in their ability to understand how to work with the industry without compromising their integrity. I have detailed as many answers as I possibly can.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Whatever the findings of any external panel are, I have full confidence in the bid team that assessed the bid. If the opposition have any evidence, anything that brings into doubt the capability of the bid team, table it and provide it.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Stuart.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:19): Supplementary, sir: I ask again, can the minister advise the house whether he was aware of the findings of the Australian government's Takeovers Panel?

The SPEAKER: Before the minister answers, I warn the deputy leader for the first 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) (15:19): Mr Speaker, I do not follow the personal legal goings-on of every single person who applies for a PEL in this state. What I do is have confidence in our bid teams.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am answering the question, and again I say to the Leader of the Opposition: I have stated my full confidence in the department that assessed these bids—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and I am answering these questions.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And I say to the Leader of the Opposition to have the courage to get up and make an accusation. The only person being evasive about this is the Leader of the Opposition because he does not have the courage of his convictions to get up and make an accusation. I think it sends a terrible message to the industry and our public servants that the opposition, without any facts, is calling into question their integrity.

The SPEAKER: The minister will not dwell on the opposition. Is there a further supplementary?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Supplementary, sir, yes.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:20): Can the minister advise the house whether he had ever met, or had any association with, the directors of Ambassador Exploration, Mr Kleo Hatziladas or Mr Tom Kotsimbos, prior to his public announcement of 11 April 2011 that the PEL 570 had been awarded to them?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:20): I think I had met them on an occasion at a trade fair in either Adelaide or Sydney, I can't remember where, and I think that was after the bid team had publicly announced the assessments, but I can't remember, so I will go back and check. But again I say to the opposition: these operations are not awarded by the government. They are done independently by a bid team. If the opposition have any evidence about anything untoward towards the bid team, say so.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, sir, another question.

The SPEAKER: In that case, the member for Little Para.

SPORTS VOUCHERS

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Can the minister provide an update to the house about the government's sport vouchers program?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:21): I thank the member for his question and his keen interest in sport at all levels. I am pleased to update the house about the Sports Vouchers program announced by the Premier in March last year ahead of the election, something that was very popular with people throughout South Australia because we know we have a lot of young people who aren't participating in active sport, and the earlier we can get them involved in sport the better.

We have so far seen a lot of interest. I wrote to all the sporting clubs and the sporting groups in December last year, and 1,336 clubs have now pre-registered. Out of those, 830 clubs across more than 50 sports have since completed the full registration process and are now listed as sports voucher providers.

We have also been advertising through social media, and I am pleased to say that the promotion has reached more than 194,000 South Australians. Since 1 February, the sports vouchers website has been receiving an average of 4,203 views per week, with more than half of all visitors to the website using tablets or smartphones and 29 per cent having been directed there via our social media campaign on Facebook and other forums.

After a club has been selected online by the parent or guardian or caregiver, they can enrol their child and receive a \$50 discount off the membership fee. The club recoups this amount online from the Office for Recreation and Sport. On 5 March this year, the Para Hills Gymnastic Club, located in Ingle Farm in the member for Playford's electorate, was well prepared and became the first provider to claim a redemption for 62 sports vouchers. As I said at the outset, this is something that is open to all primary school children right across the state. Para Hills has also played an important role in securing an exciting sports—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The member for Playford will be—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: They're not my children, no.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No, not all 62—just about 10 per cent. Para Hills has also played an important role in securing an exciting international sport event for Adelaide which was confirmed last night at the brand-new Convention Centre.

The World Hapkido Championships and leaders seminar will be held in Adelaide in 2017. I must say I learned a lot about hapkido last night. It is taekwondo with weapons and it is very big overseas. It is a self-defence based martial arts system with a huge international following, and its South Australian base is at Para Hills.

An honourable member: What sort of weapons?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Swords, knives, sticks—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, it's good. I shook hands with a bloke—a bit of a karate chop. But the world championships will attract more than 2,500 participants to come to Adelaide of whom 2,000 will come from overseas. The event is likely to take place in May 2017; it is a three to four-day competition and its estimated economic impact will include 10,000 bed nights and more than \$5 million in spend in South Australia.

I commend the work of David White, the president of the Australian Hapkido Federation, the Adelaide Convention Bureau and the Events South Australia team in securing this event. I also acknowledge the Grand Master Don Oh Choi, Grand Master Ali Modiri and Master Yong Kim who came from Korea to do the presentation.

Ms Chapman: They didn't get a voucher?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No, they made me an honorary black belt, and this guy had to put his knee up on my guts to get the black belt on, and then we had to cut it off with the jaws-of-life because my head was turning purple. However, it's a great honour to be an honorary black belt in this wonderful sport.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:25): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Does the minister stand by his comments yesterday that it is appropriate for senior public servants to undertake strictly confidential internal assessment of companies' applications prior to those applications being submitted to the government in the name of cutting red tape?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:26): Yes, I do, and I do so because I think it's important that we have the public servants in touch with the industry. This happens across the minerals section and the petroleum section, and what the shadow minister is showing is his naivety about how this works.

Ms Chapman: He is just asking a simple question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And I'm giving you a very comprehensive answer.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think the people being insulting aren't me. The naivety of the shadow minister—he really would think that if a company contacted the department to ask about the regulatory framework that we should say, 'I'm sorry, all conversations with the department must be in writing. We can't help you with your application, we can't talk to you about your application, we can't talk to you about your project'—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has just reinforced how naïve the opposition are about the resources sector. One of the reasons we get so highly ranked in this area is that we case manage individually. We assign regulators to companies to work closely with them to manage their assessments—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Leader of the Opposition, in desperation to be relevant after not taking a mining policy to the last election and now trying to lecture us on our engagement with the resources sector, really does show a level of hypocrisy that is second to none. Yes, I encourage public servants to talk to mining companies; I encourage them to talk to energy companies and oil and gas companies about their applications to better understand what the requirements are of the regulations; if they weren't, they are not doing their jobs.

The SPEAKER: I call the leader to order and I warn the member for Mitchell a first time. Supplementary, the member for Stuart.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:28): Given what the minister has just said, why is it necessary for these internal assessments to be marked 'strictly confidential' from some staff but not others within the department?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:28): Again, the shadow minister is quoting selectively from FOIs. These are all the FOIs that we have regarding this process. I think I'll table them so every member of parliament in the chamber can see them all—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —so they can all understand exactly how the shadow minister is selectively quoting from FOIs. I find it amazing that the Liberal Party are accusing us of being too helpful to resources companies: 'You're being too nice to them.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: 'But you're helping them too much. You're getting too involved in their applications. We shouldn't be assigning case officers.' Of course we should. Of course we should be involved. It is clear from the questioning today they don't like the private sector.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: I ask you to bring the minister back to the substance of the question, which is, if it's all okay, why is it so strictly—

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. There is no need for an impromptu speech, and I warn the leader the first time and I warn the deputy leader for the second and final time—that's it. Member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Sir, has the minister finished his answer to that question?

The SPEAKER: Is there more? But wait, there's more.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I don't have that level of tolerance, sir, but I will play along, without offending the Chair in any way.

The SPEAKER: That would be good.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: he doesn't get a fresh four minutes.

The SPEAKER: No; the clock was stopped. We still have three more minutes of the Treasurer's richness.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Whenever we assign case managers for the application of regulation through permitting they are confidential, but the reality of it is that the department, who are the regulators of this, often have multiple people working on files, they have multiple people working on applications for mining licences, environmental approvals, assessments, and often there are people who have access to these files who aren't the case manager. It's entirely appropriate for the department to be working closely with a mining company. We stand by that and we won't change that, but I think the opposition has signalled a very, very different change to the way they will be regulating—

The SPEAKER: No; I think we'll just do without the opposition.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:31): Supplementary, sir: can the minister explain, given what he has already explained, why this process goes so far as providing draft letters of acceptance before any letter of application or request is submitted?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:31): Because, Mr Speaker, when companies make applications the most frustrating thing about it—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The most frustrating aspect of a bureaucracy, Mr Speaker, is to make sure that companies know in what format they should be applying for things. What the opposition is saying is they want a reversal of our red tape reduction programs. What they are saying is, how dare we be so helpful to a company as to let them know how to put in an application form, or what they should put in their application form, what they should put in their letter of acceptance, or what they should do in their renewals, or what they should do in their variances. It is because we work closely with them. Again, if the opposition has any evidence, any real evidence, table it right now under privilege.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:32): Last supplementary, sir: can the minister advise the house whether this is a process which is open to all applications or just in his departments?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:32): Mr Speaker, we have just appointed a new role of Coordinator-General in South Australia and through that process we are seeking to simplify all of the regulatory processes and approvals for projects which are over \$3 million and, at discretion, any project can be drawn into that process.

I received the most recent briefing just today on that process from Mr Jim Hallion, the former secretary of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. There are 200 projects which have been called in for consideration under that project. Many of them are becoming fast-tracked through the very intelligent and helpful advice that he is providing through that process. What he is also learning, because he also is responsible for the simpler regulation unit that we have established, are new processes and ways in which we can cut the red tape. You would have thought—it's a timely question because on this one-year anniversary of the re-election of this government this is one of the new initiatives—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Was that congratulations? No.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: He did endorse us.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley has just interjected three times. He will leave for an hour under the sessional order.

The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's disappointing, sir, I would have liked an audience for this. The particular simplifications of processes where we can speed things up, where we can anticipate the needs of applicants, where we can actually use, frankly, the department of mining and energy (with their first-class reputation in a red-free sense) to guide the way in which other agencies conduct their work, is something that we will pursue. We have already seen that in the fisheries area with the way in which we regulate the tuna industry with a 90-day project which did something which seemed elementary on the face of it, but a number of processes which were done in sequence are now done in parallel.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask you to bring the Premier back to the substance of the question which was whether other sectors of the business community can have their applications assessed before they are lodged.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is precisely what I am talking about. What we are seeking to do is to take the processes and model that are used in our excellent mines and energy part of government and actually use that as a guide and a model for other parts of the Public Service.

This is precisely what we should be doing and it is precisely what we are doing. I gave the example of another agency, PIRSA, that has—

Ms Vlahos interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —simplified the processes for the regulatory approval in the tuna industry. Instead of dealing with things in sequence, we deal with things in parallel. Instead of dealing with things at a particular time of year when they are busy, we deal with it at times of the year when they are off season where we can give—rather than it be this game of hide-and-seek and you put an application in and we will tell you where you got it wrong, we can actually assist people to tell them what the nature of the requirements are so that they can meet that requirement. This does not offend probity, this does not affect the quality or the integrity of the decision-making process, it simply amounts to a proper bias for approval that should exist. If we can approve something in the public interest, we should seek to do that and, if those opposite—

Ms Vlahos interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Those opposite are fond of describing the nature of the economic challenge in front of South Australia but, when we do something to try to address it, they are there with all their nitpicking, carping, negative observations about why nothing should ever change in this state. You are what is wrong with South Australia. They are what is wrong with South Australia.

EXPORT STRATEGY

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:36): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Can the minister inform the house on measures taken by the government to support economic growth through greater international engagement and exports?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:37): I thank the member for Colton for his question because I know that jobs are very important in his electorate and there are a number of headwinds facing the national and state economy which are concerning, not the least of which is oil, gas and iron ore prices reducing. The federal government's decision to remove support for the automotive industry is going to cost enormous jobs and growth over coming years and the threat from the federal government to buy submarines and ships overseas rather than to build them in Australia is also worrying growth and jobs, and that is why the growth in jobs in the small business sector is so important, both in the city and across the regions.

That is why economic growth and job creation through international engagement and exports are so important to the forward story. In particular, the overwhelming feedback that the government has received from the private sector and partners is that South Australia is well placed to capitalise on the benefits of free trade agreements—existing ones in the case of Japan, South Korea and in other places and those that are planned in the case of China, India and elsewhere—with a comprehensive engagement across key sectors including agribusiness and services, two of the largest beneficiaries of free trade agreements.

The cornerstone of the government's engagement with China has been our sister-state relationship with Shandong province. In May the Premier will lead a senior delegation of up to 200 representatives from the business community from the state and local governments. It will be the biggest trade mission South Australia has ever run. In August a further mission will be conducted to India, and then another to South-East Asia. We will be leading delegations to Jinan, Qingdao, Shanghai and Hong Kong. This economic activity will complement the state's involvement in Hofex and SIAL under the banner of South Australia in China Business Month. I encourage local firms to take an opportunity to register their interest in the delegation and in these trade missions. The China Engagement Strategy will be reviewed later this year.

I am also happy to report to the house early interest in the renewed Export Partnership Program, which has made it easier for business to apply for co-investment funding of up to \$50,000

from government. There have been 52 inquiries, 32 applications have commenced, and one application has already been completed as at 16 March 2015. This money is getting out on the road where it is needed to support companies to export.

I have written to all members in the South Australian parliament to encourage them to promote this program to their business constituents. I would also encourage members to get their local firms to talk to our TradeStart advisers, who are readily available to provide the practical advice to business so that they can help the state government and themselves to deliver on export targets in the coming years.

The government understands the importance of getting small to medium enterprises moving. I recently visited Thomas Foods. They are employing 1,400 people at Murray Bridge and over 2,700 across the state, exporting meat to something like 80 destinations—many containers a week. They are a wonderful example of our primary producers at work. They are bigger than Holden in terms of employment, and they are an example of the opportunities across the aquaculture, food, and manufacturing and services space that this government is activating through its engagement and export strategy.

It is an important question, and one that points to the way forward for the economy. It won't be easy, but we will get jobs through this strategy—

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. The member for Mitchell.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:41): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Given that the independent overview of the Adelaide rail electrification in June 2012 suggested a master plan be established and endorsed by the government and Treasury, was this done, and will the minister release the report?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:41): Can I thank the member for Mitchell for his ongoing interest in this matter. I am advised that once the scope of the rail revitalisation project was changed, a revised plan was produced and associated management strategies were implemented. The necessary approvals were obtained and relevant reporting requirements were carried out. As to whether we release the report or not, I will have to take some advice on that.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:41): Has the government now done a master plan or otherwise for the rescoping of the Gawler electrification project for 2017-18?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:42): As I just advised the house, the information that has been given to me by the department is that, as these projects have been rescoped, the associated works which we have just been alluding to have been carried out. But, of course, I will go back and check that with the department.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary?

Mr WINGARD: No, another question.

The SPEAKER: Well, in that case, the member for Florey.

SCHOOL RETENTION RATES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:42): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Minister, what has the government done about the engagement of at-risk school and preschool students over the past 12 months?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:42): I thank the member for Florey for her question. Looking beyond what we are already aware of with the apparent retention rate for years 8 to 12 being at 96 per cent, I can say that the Aboriginal retention rate for years 8 to 12 rose to 86.1 per cent over the last year, which is of course a very good increase from the 2009 figure of 54.9 per cent.

The retention of students in the school system is one of the most important indicators of the effectiveness of that school system in addressing the very issue that the member has asked about, which is at-risk students. The fact that that figure has gone to that point makes us optimistic that we will be able to further increase those already solid foundations made.

We have been investing at the other end, for very young Aboriginal people such as the four Aboriginal children and family centres at Whyalla, Ceduna, Christies Beach and Ernabella, and we believe that they have helped to increase preschool enrolment, which will translate into better retention across the school system. Aboriginal enrolment, indeed, in our system has almost doubled since 1999, with 1,642 students enrolled in 2014. What that means is that more Aboriginal children are getting the benefit of early education, which means that they are going to be prepared for starting school.

If we look at the other end of the spectrum—so, that related to preschool, but if we look at staying on not only through to year 12 but completing SACE: in 2014, 182 Aboriginal students completed all the requirements of SACE, which is up from 161 students in 2013 and 119 in 2012.

We also have homework centres, which are supervised after-school environments where Aboriginal children can get support to finish homework and also to run through the work they have done during school to make sure they are keeping up. In 2014, 386 Aboriginal students had the benefit of extra educational support from 12 homework centres across the state. We will keep working on our goals, which are ensuring access to quality early learning in remote communities, halving the gap for literacy and numeracy by 2018 and halving the gap for those completing year 12 or equivalent by 2020.

Other initiatives that are working to keep students more generally engaged include the Innovative Community Action Networks (ICAN). These programs are available across the state in high schools and primary schools and support our most vulnerable students, along with their families, to re-engage in learning. Over the years it has had an impressive impact on reconnecting children and young people with some form of education, training or employment, including in regional areas.

I can report that between 2007 and 2014, 6,215 disengaged students were supported to return to school or to transition to other education, training or employment pathways. On average, 70 per cent of these students successfully re-engaged each year. These young people have boosted their chances of employment and opened up new pathways for themselves, and they are participating in their community rather than being isolated from it.

Grievance Debate

BURNSIDE COMMUNITY LAND

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:46): In January this year, Burnside council advised local residents in the Rose Park and Burnside areas around the J.B. Cleland preschool and the Rose Park area known as the Gurney Road gardens that the council had determined that the community land was surplus to its requirements and was resolved to pursue the sale of the sites to the state government.

I particularly want to refer to the Gurney Road garden area, which is in Rose Park. Members may be aware that Burnside council, as indeed have a number of other inner metro councils, continues to operate an open space strategy. The importance of that is to recognise the value of open space, particularly pocket parks, where there is limited open space and public area available to residents in the inner metropolitan area of Adelaide. The specific area around Gurney Road gardens is listed as community land, and that has been the case since 1988.

Residents around the area who use the amenity, including those who use the Scouts hall on the property, of course have an interest in continuing to have access to and use of these facilities, not just as an open space but obviously to use the local hall. Indeed, the Rose Park Primary School

is adjacent to this area; they are neighbours. They have a high use of the area and they contribute to its upkeep. That is not unusual in our area, because schools and the Burnside council frequently join together in having a multi-use of public space. Burnside Primary School is a classic example where they do that, and they share the facility for both the community and the school.

What is concerning about the current circumstances is that the government, if they are to receive this land via the Department for Education, are under no obligation not to onsell it. As I said, this is land which is highly utilised by the school, the local community and the Scouts group. I have met with Grant Fergusson, the property manager of Scouts Australia, and other community residents, including people like Mrs Elizabeth Floriani, who is a local resident. These are people who are committed to their local community.

Why has the government done this? The government decided that the memorial to Constable Hyde in Leabrook was no longer needed from their point of view. They obviously indicated that to residents in Leabrook and it became widely known, including to the Police Association, that this memorial property, formerly on land owned by the state government, which was an old school that is now closed, was going to be disposed of.

There was outrage and despair. Prior to the election, minister Portolesi, the then member for Hartley and minister in the government, made a categorical statement that there was no intention to sell the property and that the memorial would be preserved. Indeed, there was absolutely no indication at that time that that was conditional upon some side deal of a transfer of property between the council and the government.

That commitment having been made, it followed that the Burnside council agreed to enter into discussions about exchange of land that each had surplus to requirements, and that is quite a reasonable thing to do. If they have both got property that is identified as surplus to their requirements that they are both willing to exchange, which has commensurate value and the like, then there is no reason why that cannot be negotiated. As part of that process, however, the council have given notice, as I say, to the community that they have determined that this land is surplus, but they have indicated that it will be subject to community feedback.

Why is there a concern? There is a particular concern because there is no protection against the government taking over this property which is, as I say, well used by the local community, Scouts and the like and the school. There is no security against that property being on sold by the government. Their refusal, so far, to accept a 99-year lease option back to the community and to the Scout hall only corroborates the concern of the local community that there is no bona fide commitment on behalf of the government that they will not sell. Sadly, when they promised to not sell the Repat Hospital, that is also now being ignored.

Time expired.

FAMILIES4FAMILIES

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:51): I rise today to highlight the outstanding work of two inspirational community groups who came together for a high tea fundraiser at the Active Elders Association at Ascot Park in my electorate on Sunday. The Edwardstown Lions Club began supporting the young and disadvantaged people of the local area more than 50 years ago. As well as assisting many schools in the nearby suburbs through a variety of projects, the local Lions have lent a physical and financial hand to a host of needy people and worthwhile causes.

Supporting people with disabilities has been high on the agenda for the Edwardstown Lions. One group they have backed since before it even had a name is the Families4Families Acquired Brain Injury Support Network. Families4Families has a stated mission to assist adults who have acquired brain injury and their families, and to build resilience and maximise quality of life and wellbeing by providing them with information, education and resources as well as social opportunities and other family-focused support, including online group discussions and phone support.

Families4Families developer and project manager Dr Jennifer Farnden was guest speaker on Sunday and gave a really moving account of the personal challenge she and her family faced as a result of her husband, Michael, being seriously injured in a car accident in 2008. Prior to the accident, Jennifer ran a jewellery design and manufacture business, showcasing and selling her art.

She was also an experienced university lecturer and researcher in business and accounting. She did not expect to become a full-time carer to Michael or that her daughters—Sydni and Cassie—would become carers at ages eight and nine.

Prior to the accident and for more than 25 years, Michael also ran his own furniture business, selling his woodwork on a retail and wholesale basis. He did not expect to have his business closed by a car accident. Michael lost a leg, had an extremely damaged ankle and, most tellingly of all, suffered a severe brain injury.

What Jennifer could not believe in the wake of this horror was that there was no existing support group for families in similar situations to be able to share their fears and their coping strategies. In 2011, Jennifer wrote a submission for a grant to start such a group. She says she somehow managed to talk Flinders University's Community Re-entry Program into being the auspicing agency for the application as well as forming a research team to take on a project as part of the setting up of the support group. The team continues to research the impact of Families4Families today.

In May 2012, the grant that set Families4Families on its way was approved. Jennifer says that the Lions Club of Edwardstown's support as she and her family relentlessly worked for the establishment of a support network was absolutely vital. The service club and family members helped the Farndens make home-made cakes, biscuits, relishes, marmalades and other produce to sell to bus tours of people visiting the family's farm south of Adelaide, to see their home, their art and hear their story in 2011.

Thanks to the money raised through raffle ticket sales, the Farndens were able to host a gathering for people interested in establishing a support group, and this led them to the formation of a management committee. Today, Families4Families has 16 local support groups that run across South Australia in locations including Glandore, Enfield, Mount Barker, Sellicks, Gawler, Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln.

I want to conclude with some of Dr Jennifer Farnden's inspirational words about her own family's experience and the underlying purpose of Families4Families:

We are not families who have had bad luck and who now live in despair. We are families who have had bad luck but who are working to turn that around. We are families who live their best lives possible with brain injury. Some days we fall off the path, but we continue with the journey.

Thank you to Dr Jennifer Farnden for sharing her family's story and to Families4Families for the important work it does, and thank you also to the wonderful Lions Club of Edwardstown for continuing to support those in need in our community and the local area.

MORIALTA CITIZENSHIP AWARDS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:56): Last week, I was undertaking a speech to recognise the winners of the Morialta Citizenship Award last year, and I did not have the opportunity to identify the achievements of all of them; I do take the opportunity now to conclude these remarks.

The winner of the Morialta Citizenship Award at Athelstone School was Aimee Pope, a year 7 student who shows exemplary behaviour and generous support to the school community. She is caring, gives positive encouragement to other students in the classroom and in the yard. She is a student who is a role model to all.

It was very unfortunate that I was not able to get to Basket Range Primary School to present this award in person last year owing to the fact that their presentations were on the same night as three other local schools where I was making presentations; theirs was the furthest away, so they missed out. However, I am very glad to be able to acknowledge Zara Baker in the parliament and record her achievements. Her passion and commitment led her to do a lot of work to help save the endangered Tasmanian devil.

With the support of her parents, she organised a school fundraiser to raise funds for the Save the Tasmanian Devil Program Appeal. She arranged for the whole school to visit Cleland Wildlife Park and meet with an education officer. That sounds like an extraordinary undertaking; it is worth noting the whole school involves 30 students. As part of the visit, students were able to dress in black and white for a \$2 donation and were sold muffins at recess. Along with

her own fundraising efforts, they raised hundreds of dollars for the appeal and Zara spoke to the school about the work and the need involved. It is a marvellous example.

Last week, I spoke about the significant achievements of Claire Coleman from Charles Campbell College, but I do not think I had the opportunity to talk about Abigail Guez, who is the winner from the Charles Campbell College middle school. Abigail is a consistently reliable, cheerful and positive member of the Charles Campbell College community, always willing to volunteer for a wide range of activities.

As well as being an exemplary academic student last year, Abigail was involved in a two-day external student leadership training course and consistently attended lunchtime meetings for student leadership and participated in new Student Voice initiatives. She is an enthusiastic student buddy for international students and was involved in Principals Australia Institute's Principal for a Day initiative. She was the most responsible and appropriate representative of the student body at the recent Council of International Schools accreditation.

Also at Charles Campbell College, in their junior years the winner was Gul Zehra. Gul is a highly committed student who strives for excellence in all that she does, proactive in volunteering, listens to feedback to improve her leadership and demonstrates initiative. She has always considered the needs of others before her own, and she demonstrates a deep understanding of the Charles Campbell College school values of respect, learning and excellence.

Last week I talked about Caitlyn Payne, the year 12 winner at Norwood Morialta High School. I am very pleased to talk about Lana Morro, the year 10 winner, whose mother does an excellent job on the school governing council which we were talking about on Monday night. The citizenship award was won by Lana Morro, who has a natural ability to engage with other students, gain their trust, and she shows genuine concern for their welfare and school engagement. Lana consistently demonstrates a mature and dedicated approach to her schoolwork, supporting her peers by offering advice when required and always being prepared to give of her time to support her fellow students. She is a caring and honest person involved in a wide range of extracurricular activities, a leader amongst her peers who is always supporting citizenship. She is a Zoo volunteer and involved in a number of conservation projects.

Darcy Strudwick at Paradise Primary School is active in school activities and sports and has been responsible for organising and helping prepare school sports teams, sports days, SAPSASA, pedal prix and carnivals. He has a commendable attitude toward sport and physical activity and computing skills and trained as a media operator to support the school and reduce the workload of teachers. He is a member of the school band and the Student Representative Council and always demonstrates a positive approach to learning and supporting fellow students.

Jordan Ciccozzi won the award at St Francis of Assisi for his significant enthusiasm and engagement as a school leader. He is focused on outcomes and no job is too great for him. His leadership is seen by staff as having a strong influence on those leaders and students around him. At St Ignatius College, it was awarded to Josh and Cassie Winkler, brother and sister in year 7, who are junior directors of their charity, Building Better Futures. They have raised money for villages in Cambodia and organised the UNPLUG fundraiser, where they involved students from the school. In the school holidays and for part of term 4, they visited Siem Reap to work at local schools. This was recognised in the Messenger.

At Stradbroke schools, Lauren Docking is involved in UNICEF. She helps in the canteen and she is a road crossing monitor, library monitor, recycling bins monitor, and she is Koonga House captain. Eden Menashe is a traffic monitor, serves in the canteen and distributes sports equipment in the sports shed. She demonstrates leadership and is a house captain and a UNICEF ambassador. Hayleigh Cameron is another UNICEF ambassador. She is a traffic monitor, helps in the canteen and distributes sports equipment. She demonstrates leadership as a house captain. Charlotte Christie at Sunrise Christian School is involved with Light the Night and the Leukaemia Foundation, raising \$500 and another \$2,000 in the City to Bay Fun Run.

Tayla Soja and Bianca Calipari at Thorndon Park excelled in a wide range of areas, demonstrating a sense of community and consistently volunteer for jobs around the school. They demonstrate leadership and reflect the great values and goals of Thorndon Park Primary School.

SEAFORD SECONDARY COLLEGE

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:01): I rise to speak on an important new upgrade that will substantially improve our education for children with disabilities in the south. Special needs units in mainstream schooling in southern suburbs schools were largely designed in the nineties for a large percentage of students with high level physical disabilities. That is definitely the case at Seaford Secondary College. These facilities unfortunately do not work as well for children with intellectual disabilities. That is why I am very pleased to inform the house that Seaford Secondary College will receive a major upgrade to its disability unit as a result of extensive consultation and feedback from the college and the community.

The upgrade will include the development of a secure outdoor area; improvements to existing bathroom areas, reconfiguration of classroom spaces to better meet the learning needs of students and a sensory or quiet area designed to enhance the learning experience of special needs children. This upgrade came about due to the ongoing efforts of the Minister for Education and Child Development as well as the work of the previous minister, the member for Wright. I would like to thank in particular Kelsey Walker, who has been campaigning on this issue, and the *Southern Times Messenger* for its efficacy on this important issue.

The Department for Education will also open a disability unit at Seaford Rise Primary School later this year, which is a much-needed development in my electorate. The new disability unit will consist of two classrooms with room for 16 children. The construction of this unit will also include a verandah, a ramp, a new access driveway for taxi drop-off, car parking for two cars and a fenced play area.

Special education is a vital aspect of our education system, and it ensures that all children have access to a first-class learning environment designed to suit their needs. While there are some who argue that disability education could only be undertaken in separate special schools, there is strong evidence to suggest that it is beneficial for children with special needs to be integrated into mainstream schools as long as there is the additional support required. Currently, 80 per cent of special needs children receive their education through integration with mainstream classrooms. I note in particular the efforts of the Hon. Kelly Vincent MLC in the other place advocating that there is an important place for special needs children to be educated within a mainstream school environment.

Although the Seaford Secondary College upgrade and the additional special school room at Seaford Rise Primary School are significant improvements to the provision of special needs schooling in the south, I believe that there is yet more to be done. That is why I am especially supportive of the audit into special education in the south, which the Minister for Education announced this month and which is expected to be completed in August. As members may know, the Christie's Downs Special School, in the member for Reynell's electorate, provides a number of special needs classes, and it came about as an amalgamation between a mainstream and a special school. Although there was never any downgrading of facilities through the amalgamation process, the state of that infrastructure definitely needs an upgrade in the future.

The upgrades to Seaford Secondary College and Seaford Rise Primary School are further examples of this government working to improve education for special needs children in South Australia. I have full confidence that the results of the audit will ensure the most effective allocation of resources for special needs children in the south.

CHILD PROTECTION SCREENING

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (16:04): I would like to talk about police checks or DCSI screenings. This issue is becoming very prevalent in my region and I have had many constituents visit my office with complaints regarding delays in getting this police check or screening approved. It has affected many industries from taxi drivers, school bus drivers, carers of children, carers of the aged and carers of vulnerable persons, to name a few. Unfortunately, these delays are leading to people being temporarily laid off or getting very close to the point where employment is suspended for a period of time until that check comes through.

We all agree that police checks and screening are necessary, but I would like to offer the government a bipartisan approach to trying to find a solution. The main issue is the turnaround time.

Although the minister's office has indicated to me time and time again that approximately 20 business days should be the norm, with some taking up to eight weeks if a name match is registered in the database, I am seeing numerous cases where it takes three, four or five months for this screening to occur. I have had many people write to me, including a principal who wrote to me just the other day. His experience is common to many:

[Dear Troy,]

This...is getting out of control

I work with children and have a teacher registration

I renewed my criminal history check in Dec 2014 as part of that registration

He goes on to say that, by February 2015, he needed another police check so that he could drive a bus. Because this involves a different part of the department, they would not accept the one that he had two months earlier. Therefore, the school had no bus driver for a period of time. He indicates in his letter that something needs to be done. That is echoed by a number of people who come into my office in similar circumstances.

I do need to give credit to the minister, Zoe Bettison, who, on every occasion that I have rung or emailed or spoken to her and said that this person is about to lose their job or this person will be unemployed as of Friday, has taken immediate action to rectify that situation. So I do thank the government and, in particular, the minister for those actions.

The issue I have is that it is becoming more and more regular and we need to find a way forward, working together. In doing some research, I researched a Queensland model called the blue card system. Basically, it is a card that you are given once you have gone through your screening checks. It was introduced in 2001. It is valid for three years and has your photo on it with the history check.

The thinking is that we would match that with a database that would not have people's names in it but would have the number of the card. As with a driver's licence and many other licences, if an offence is committed, that card is taken away or withdrawn and that is indicated on the database, so that a school or a Rotary club or a volunteer organisation could ask for presentation of this card at any stage and then check the number against a database.

This card, as I said, is for a three-year window and it mitigates many of the issues of continual police checks for varying organisations. The one card is valid for a whole range of different industries and applications.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr BELL: Yes, but the point I am trying to make is that for every different event or organisation, you need a new police check, so whether it is a bus driving licence—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You're talking to me.

Mr BELL: Thank you. I have people coming into my office saying that they had a police check on Wednesday and, because they apply for something else on Thursday, that check is not valid and needs to be redone, clogging up the system. In the spirit of cooperation, I offer that to the house and would like to work on this in a bipartisan way.

VOLUNTEERING SA AND NT

Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:09): I rise today to advise the house of the impact on service quality, efficiency and sustainability of the recent commonwealth community service tendering process by the Department of Social Services (DSS).

Our non-government sector is vital to the efficient and innovative support of many of the highest risk, vulnerable and often socioeconomically compromised groups in our community. It is by using skilled and committed volunteers that this sector manages to achieve outcomes for a price that is totally out of the government's reach if it was to try to deliver the same services itself. It is essential

that these volunteers are recruited, developed and supported by a peak body with runs on the board and the skills required to maintain standards. Volunteering SA & NT is this organisation.

Incorporated in 1982, Volunteering SA & NT is a not-for-profit organisation and the peak body representing the interests of volunteers and the volunteering sector in both South Australia and the Northern Territory. Its mission is to promote and celebrate volunteering and play a key leadership role in advancing volunteering by providing an extensive range of services, support and resources to over 2,000 non-profit organisations in South Australia and the Northern Territory annually.

Additionally, Volunteering SA & NT is a foundation member of Volunteering Australia, the national volunteering peak body. Volunteering SA & NT, other state and territory volunteering peaks counterparts and association workers are a strong collective to deliver many national state and local programs and initiatives which are both significant and relevant to the federal government's civil society agenda.

Recent research from Flinders University (Dr Lisel O'Dwyer) reports that the economic contribution of volunteering to Australian society is \$290 billion per year, which surpasses revenue sources from major industry sectors including mining, agriculture, defence and retail. The recently released Intergenerational Report appears to have ignored the very significant productivity contributions to Australia from volunteers in general, and especially older Australians who are contributing very significantly to Australia's GDP through their volunteering, albeit outside of a 'paid workforce' framework.

The DSS tender process has had a significant negative impact on the volunteering sector, people experiencing disadvantage, the broader community, and the not-for-profit organisations that support these people and their communities. This concern has culminated now in a Senate inquiry into the impact on service quality, efficiency and sustainability of recent commonwealth community service tendering processes by the DSS. Volunteering SA & NT has numerous concerns about this tender process and outcomes for the volunteering sector which include:

- lack of consultation with the sector;
- short time allowed to apply for grants (only four weeks);
- a lack of transparency about program and tender design;
- inconsistency with the objectives and disadvantaged target group specified in the guideline;
- negative impact on service users;
- inadequate quantum of funding;
- short funding terms of only 12 to 16 months;
- large amount of work required to apply for grants;
- funding excluded for some services;
- high administrative burden on tenderers;
- confusing processes for applying for grants; and
- decisions about grants that took almost six months.

Importantly, there are now major service delivery gaps in Adelaide and regional South Australia. Prior to this round, Volunteering SA & NT was funded by the volunteer management program to provide volunteer support and referral services to the whole of the Adelaide metro area, and they are now only funded by DSS for some selected suburbs in Adelaide.

Volunteering SA & Northern Territory has seen the colossal decrease of \$186,000 per annum to their funding for Adelaide alone from \$250,000 per annum to an impractical amount of \$64,000 per annum. The following areas in Adelaide are unfunded and there are service delivery gaps in Brighton, Glenelg, Edwardstown, Hallett Cove, Marino, Seaview Downs, Mitchell Park, Morphettville, Sheidow Park, Trott Park, Warradale, Belair, Bellevue Heights, Blackwood, Colonel Light Gardens,

Mitcham, Panorama, West Lakes, Henley Beach, Burnside, Glenside, Athelstone, Paradise, Rostrevor, Magill, Nailsworth, Broadview, Fulham, Plympton, West Beach, Beverley, Adelaide Hills, Aldgate, Stirling, Hahndorf, Echunga, Lobethal, Woodside, Mount Barker, the Mount Barker regional area, Nairne, Uraidla, Summertown and the regional areas of Port Pirie, Murray Bridge and regions, Clare, Barossa Valley, Mid North, Moonta, Wallaroo and Upper Yorke.

Unfortunately, Volunteering SA & NT cannot operate their existing service on this reduced level of funding unless this is addressed. With service delivery areas expanding and matched with adequate funding, they will likely have to turn people away according to the postcode they live in. Conversely, they cannot provide services to the organisations that require support. Please contact your local area.

Time expired.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (YOUTH COURT) 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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (16:15): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Youth Court Act 1993 and the Young Offenders Act 1993; and to make related or consequential amendments to various other acts. 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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (16:16): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This government is committed to transforming criminal justice and delivering a criminal justice system that is just and fair, effective, efficient and accessible. The Statutes Amendment (Youth Court) Bill 2015 is part of that program. Tantalisingly, I seek leave to insert the remainder of my second reading explanation into *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

The Youth Court of South Australia was established in 1993 by the *Youth Court Act 1993* ('Youth Court Act'). The Youth Court has jurisdiction in relation to criminal matters involving young people, as well as child protection matters. It also has jurisdiction in relation to adoption and surrogacy matters.

It is important to be clear on some of the things that this Bill does not do. The Bill does not change the jurisdiction of the Youth Court. The Bill will not change the fact that the Youth Court is established as a court of record under stand-alone legislation.

Rather, the Bill focusses on the composition of the Youth Court.

Currently, the Youth Court Act provides that the Youth Court comprises a Senior Judge, judges, magistrates and special justices. The Bill will change this. The principal judicial officer of the Youth Court will be the Judge of the Youth Court. The person appointed to the office of Judge of the Youth Court must be a District Court Judge or the Chief Magistrate. The remaining judicial officers on the Youth Court will be magistrates and special justices.

To facilitate this change to the composition of the Youth Court, the Bill also makes changes to ensure that the day to day work of the Court is able to be undertaken by magistrates. This includes by enabling magistrates to hear major indictable matters.

The *Statutes Amendment (Courts Efficiency Reforms) Act 2012* made changes to allow magistrates in both the Magistrates Court and the Youth Court to determine and impose sentences in major indictable matters where the accused person pleads guilty. The Bill takes the next step by allowing magistrates in the Youth Court to hear and determine major indictable trials.

There are a number of points that I would like to make in this regard.

First, magistrates deal with serious criminal matters on a daily basis. They manage repeat offenders and antisocial behaviours.

Secondly, in the Youth Court, there are very few major indictable matters that proceed to trial. I am advised by the Chief Justice that, in 2012-13, the number of major indictable matters listed for trial was 52. Of those, 12 proceeded to trial. In 2013-14, 28 major indictable matters were listed for trial. Of those, only four actually proceeded to trial.

Thirdly, the classification of an offence does not necessarily reflect the complexity of a trial. It is the case that there are minor indictable matters that are complex, and major indictable matters that are straightforward.

As such, I have formed the view that it is appropriate that magistrates in the Youth Court who specialise in youth justice should be able to hear and determine major indictable trials.

The Bill makes other changes that will enable the work of the Youth Court to be shared amongst the magistrates of the Youth Court. These include:

- allowing magistrates to impose a sentence of detention of up to three years. This is the maximum period of detention that can be imposed when sentencing a person as a youth under the *Young Offenders Act 1993*. This change is in line with the position in the Magistrates Court, where magistrates can impose sentences of imprisonment of up to 5 years; and
- allowing magistrates to hear applications for extensions of time on an investigation and assessment order under the *Children's Protection Act 1993*; and
- allowing magistrates to hear applications under the *Adoption Act 1988* and the *Family Relationships Act 1975*.

I now turn to the details of the Bill.

Clause 4 makes changes to section 9 of the Youth Court Act, which relates to the Youth Court's judiciary. It provides that the Court will comprise the Judge of the Youth Court, magistrates and special justices. At least two magistrates appointed to the Youth Court must be members of the Court's principal judiciary. This means that they are to be predominantly occupied in the Court. This will help to ensure that there are magistrates in the Youth Court who have expertise and experience in dealing with youth justice and child protection issues.

Clause 4 also makes changes to section 10 of the Youth Court Act, which will now be headed 'Court's principal judicial officer'. Section 10 will provide that the Judge must be a District Court Judge or the Chief Magistrate.

The Bill removes any requirement for the Judge of the Youth Court to be predominantly occupied in the Court. The Bill allows the Judge of the Youth Court to delegate his or her powers. It also provides that the Judge of the Youth Court (unless the Chief Magistrate is appointed to the role) will be responsible to the Chief Judge of the District Court for the proper and efficient discharge of his or her duties under the Youth Court Act and the *District Court Act 1991*.

Clause 7 makes changes to section 14 of the Youth Court Act, which relates to the constitution of the Youth Court. The changes remove the limitation on magistrates hearing major indictable matters, and clarify that special justices cannot hear major indictable matters. The changes also provide for magistrates to impose sentences of detention of up to 3 years.

Clause 9 amends the appeal mechanisms to reflect the new composition of the Youth Court. In relation to a decision of a magistrate on a major indictable matter, the appeal lies to the Full Court of the Supreme Court. There is scope in the Youth Court Act for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to determine that the Full Court is to be constituted of only two judges for that purpose.

The Bill also contains amendments to the *Young Offenders Act 1993*, *Adoption Act 1988*, *Children's Protection Act 1993*, *Family Relationships Act 1975* and *Judicial Administration (Auxiliary Appointments and Powers) Act 1988*. These are all amendments that are either consequential on the changes to the composition of the Youth Court, or amendments that are required to ensure that the day to day work of the Youth Court is able to be exercised by the magistrates of the Youth Court.

I would like to thank all organisations who provided comments and feedback on the Bill.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Youth Court Act 1993*

4—Substitution of sections 9 and 10

It is proposed to repeal both sections 9 and 10 and replace them with new sections that make provision for the constitution of the Youth Court's judiciary and its principal judicial officer, the Judge of the Court.

9—Court's judiciary

The Court's judiciary is to consist of—

- the Judge of the Court; and
- magistrates who are designated by proclamation as magistrates of the Court; and
- special justices who are designated by proclamation as special justices of the Court.

A proclamation designating a magistrate or special justice as a member of the Court's judiciary must classify him or her as a member of the Court's principal judiciary or as a member of the Court's ancillary judiciary and, if the person is designated as a member of the Court's principal judiciary, must state a term for which he or she is to be a member of the Court's principal judiciary. A proclamation under this section may be varied or revoked by subsequent proclamation. At least 2 of the magistrates of the Court must be designated as members of the Court's principal judiciary.

The fact that a judicial officer is a member of the Court's judiciary does not prevent the judicial officer from performing judicial functions unrelated to the Court.

10—Court's principal judicial officer

The Judge of the Court is the principal judicial officer of the Court with responsibility for the administration of the Court. A District Court Judge, or the Chief Magistrate, will be designated by proclamation to be the Judge of the Court for the term stated in the proclamation (which may not be longer than 5 years). A proclamation under this proposed section may be varied or revoked by subsequent proclamation and a previous designation as Judge of the Court does not prevent the office holder from being designated by subsequent proclamation to a further term as Judge of the Court. The proposed section makes further provision relating to the office of the Judge of the Court, including giving the Judge of the Court the power to delegate a power or function conferred on the Judge of the Court under the *Youth Court Act 1993* or another Act to a magistrate who is a member of the Court's principal judiciary. The appointment of a person as the Judge of the Court does not prevent the person while holding such office—

- if he or she is a District Court Judge—from simultaneously holding the office, and performing the duties and exercising the powers, of a Judge of the District Court; or
- if he or she is the Chief Magistrate—from simultaneously holding office, and performing the duties and exercising the powers, of the Chief Magistrate.

5—Amendment of Section 12—Registrar

6—Amendment of Section 13—Responsibilities of staff

The amendments proposed to sections 12 and 13 are consequential.

7—Amendment of section 14—Constitution of Court

Apart from the proposed amendment to section 14(2), the proposed amendments are consequential. The other amendment proposes to increase a sentence of detention that may be imposed in criminal proceedings to 3 years (rather than 2 years as is the current upper limit that may be imposed).

8—Amendment of section 15—Time and place of sittings

The proposed amendment to section 15 is consequential.

9—Amendment of section 22—Appeals

The amendments proposed to section 22 are consequential and also make it clear that an appeal against any judgment given in proceedings in the Youth Court are to be made in accordance with the rules of the appellate court. An appeal against an interlocutory judgment given by the Judge of the Court or any judgment given by a magistrate will lie to the Supreme Court constituted of a single judge. In the case of any other judgment given by the Judge of the Court, or a conviction or sentence imposed by a magistrate in relation to a major indictable offence, an appeal will lie to the Full Court of the Supreme Court. Appeals against interlocutory judgments given by magistrates and special justices, and any other judgments given by special justices, will lie to the Judge of the Court.

10—Amendment of section 32—Rules of Court

The amendment proposed to section 32 is consequential.

11—Transitional provision

This provision clarifies issues of a transitional nature resulting from the proposed amendments to the Act.

Part 3—Amendment of *Young Offenders Act 1993*

12—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

The proposed amendment will delete the definition of Judge and instead rely on its use in context.

13—Amendment of section 9—Youth Justice Co-ordinators

The proposed amendments to section 9 are consequential on the changes proposed to the *Youth Court Act 1993* in relation to the constitution of the Youth Court's judiciary.

14—Amendment of section 28—Power to disqualify from holding driver's licence

This proposed amendment is consequential.

15—Amendment of section 38—Establishment of Training Centre Review Board

The proposed amendment to section 38(2)(a) is related to other amendments to the proposed amendment to the constitution of the Youth Court. It is proposed that section 32(2)(a) will provide that the Judge of the Court and the magistrates who are principal members of the judiciary of the Youth Court will be members of the Training Centre Review Board.

16—Amendment of section 39—Reviews etc and proceedings of Training Centre Review Board

The amendments proposed to this section are consequential on the amendments proposed to section 38.

17—Amendment of section 63—Transfer of youths in detention to other training centre or prison

The proposed amendments to section 63 will allow applications under this section to be made to the Judge of the Court or a magistrate of the Court.

Part 4—Amendment of *Adoption Act 1988*

18—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

The proposed amendments to section 4 are consequential on the changes proposed to the *Youth Court Act 1993*.

Part 5—Amendment of *Children's Protection Act 1993*

19—Amendment of section 6—Interpretation

20—Amendment of section 21—Orders Court may make

21—Amendment of section 29—Convening a family care meeting

The proposed amendments to the *Children's Protection Act 1993* are consequential on the changes proposed to the *Youth Court Act 1993*.

Part 6—Amendment of *Family Relationships Act 1975*

22—Amendment of section 10EA—Court order relating to paternity

23—Amendment of section 10HB—Orders as to parents of child born under recognised surrogacy arrangements

24—Amendment of section 10HG—Power of Court to cure irregularities

The proposed amendments to the *Family Relationships Act 1975* are consequential on the changes proposed to the *Youth Court Act 1993*.

Part 7—Amendment of *Judicial Administration (Auxiliary Appointments and Powers) Act 1988*

25—Amendment of section 2—Interpretation

The proposed amendment to section 2 will delete the reference to a 'Judge of the Youth Court' from the definition of judicial office. This means that an auxiliary appointment to that office will not be able to be made under this Act.

26—Amendment of section 3—Appointment of judicial auxiliaries

This proposed amendment is consequential on the amendment proposed in the previous clause.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Griffiths.

SUPPLY BILL 2015*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 March 2015.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (16:17): It is a pleasure to contribute on behalf of not just the community of Goyder but, indeed, the opposition about the Supply Bill, which I am reminded is \$3.29 billion. I must admit that it intrigues me why it is necessary for an advance to be made, but when you consider the fact that the budget, while presented in June, the questioning that takes place as part of estimates occurs in July and then the finalisation of the bill going through the parliament towards the end of July does create the need, so I do now understand how the process works. I had not thought about it in the last nine years, but I have just this afternoon.

First, I want to reflect upon some words from the member for Mount Gambier when he talked about police checks. I commend him on pointing out the concern he has before the parliament because it is one that I think is felt by many members in this place. I note also that minister Bettison, and I apologise for the use of the surname but I cannot remember her electorate, and I am sorry about that.

An honourable member: Ramsay.

Mr GRIFFITHS: The member for Ramsay; thank you. When contact is made by the Goyder electorate office to the minister's office the response is very swift; I do not question that. My frustration stems from why the need, firstly, for the community to contact a member of parliament and then the member of parliament to do that when the process should ensure that the swiftness attached to the review delivers the outcome that the people making the police check requests actually need.

I am also able to quote examples of employment opportunities that have been stifled because of delays. I had one particular instance where I spoke to the person himself (in this case an employee of a school, not a teacher but an employee) and he had been told to stay in one completely distinct room within the school area and to have no interaction with any young person for a two-week period because the clearance had not yet come through.

The minister in this chamber (within the last week, I think) referred to the fact that the expected numbers of police clearance checks for this financial year is in the range of \$150,000. The minister referred to a doubling of staff members available to help the resource and I think staff are working overtime to catch up, but the situation does not appear to be improving. It creates an enormous level of frustration in the wider community where there are people who either need it for a professional reason or require it for a volunteer opportunity, as the member for Fisher just mentioned, and their chances are being stifled by not being able to get this check in place.

I completely understand why the check needs to be there—I do not disagree with that—but we have to ensure there is improvement. The member for Mount Gambier referred to the blue card system available in Queensland and it immediately made me reflect upon the fact that, 13 months ago the Liberal Party, in fighting the 2014 election, had a policy on the implementation of a card. It might have been a slightly different name, but of the same principles. My recollection is that it was a \$7 million commitment to put a system in place that was designed to ensure that the one check was required for a three-year operational period to hopefully remove this backlog and to have a swiftness attached to it to allow people to have the clearances undertaken.

In the last week I have been contacted by a young lady who was applying for a job in local government in the Copper Coast area. She needed a clearance to be in place and had been told that, because she had what is termed to be 'a common name', it was going to take longer for the police clearance to come through. I shake my head in disbelief at that sort of an explanation being provided, but that is an example of the sort of feedback that is coming back to us. No doubt the minister is getting it magnified 10 times over at least with the contact that members are making with the minister's office. It is an example of where red tape reduction might be working in other areas but where it is putting a hurdle in place for other people and creating a lost opportunity. I hope that that becomes a focus, a review and an improvement opportunity.

I want to talk about pensioner concessions on council rates. That has been played out in the media at length for the last few months, and rightly so. I am pleased that the Local Government Association, in an announcement yesterday, has decided to circulate a petition amongst its 68 councils, encouraging councillors to be involved in getting as many people as possible to sign it.

From the opposition perspective, many of us have written to people who are 60 and over within our electorates and asked for support for a petition. Based on the efforts of myself and others, I have received back some 10,000 signatures, and that will be tabled in the parliament when we return. They are still being collated. I know that the member for Hartley has 2,000 signatures from his own efforts, so it shows the level of animosity, tension and frustration that exists amongst the older cohort of our community who feel quite rightly that they should continue to receive this concession which has been in existence for about 40 years. It was \$150 for probably 28 of those years, it has been \$190 for the last 14 years, and it was extended in 2001 to include self-funded retirees to a maximum of \$100. It has been an important component.

When the Local Government Association, having done its sums, advised in the information it forwarded to people through January and February that there is up to a 20 per cent bill shock factor that pensioners will feel if it is removed from 1 July, it is completely appropriate that people express their opinion to their local members no matter what political persuasion they are and that they do their absolute best to convince government to have a change of thought and to ensure that from 1 July it continues, as it must.

I have a level of personal frustration with the member for Frome. It is my vivid recollection that, when he was sitting in that curved area on this side of the chamber, he put a motion before the parliament for a review of pensioner concessions and was advocating in the range of a \$40 per year increase at that time. My sums—

Mr Gardner: Before he sold out.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Others reflect, 'Before he sold out.' In doing my sums at that time, it equated to about a \$7.5 million increase to budget in funding that. The minister and the Premier signed an agreement post election, eight days after election day, to give government to the Labor Party again, and that was one of the conditions—a review of pensioner concessions. I can only assume—

Mr Gardner: They have reviewed it and slashed it.

Mr GRIFFITHS: True. I can only assume that, by virtue of the minister's own previous actions and by inclusion of that clause to the contract that the now minister signed with the continuing Premier, it was for an upward movement. The minister himself has been rather silent on this—I am not aware of public words having been said about his position on it. It is a portfolio area that he has responsibility for but, when I have contacted him, he has referred to the Minister for Finance, and that disappoints me.

Mr Gardner: You asked a question on it.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I believe I have. The member for Morialta reminds me of a question that I asked—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! You don't need his help.

Mr Gardner: I am whispering in his ear.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You don't need his help.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I was getting to that, Deputy Speaker. I asked a question of the minister about this. I think he was a bit tempted to stand up, but the Treasurer stood and took the answer in his place. I think the minister must be rather frustrated because, on that day of questions, other members and I asked, I think, in the range of seven questions of the minister, and my recollection is he gave answers to two. One would hope that those two answers would have been fulsome and indeed provided a lot of information, but that sadly was not the case either. Anyway, we move on.

I also want to reflect upon the fact that, while there is a lot of public debate about national partnership agreements and federal transfers through to state and local government in particular about pensioner concessions, it is also important to put on the record that, in the figures provide to me, the federal component of funding support to the operations of the South Australian state government over the four-year forward estimates will increase by 23 per cent, or fractionally under \$2 billion per year, by the end of that four-year period.

That is real dollars; that is dollars that are actually budgeted for and will appear. So, while there are many words said about previous agreements that existed with a different federal government which, as I understand it, did not have dollars in budget figures—words were said, but there were not necessarily actions—this is a deliberate action that will be there.

I understand why people are doing it, but I am disappointed about the suggestion of some sort of taxation system and, in the review of that, for up to \$1,200 per the value of the average family home for South Australians. That will be another hit to the cost-of-living pressures that will impact on people enormously. It was only around a month ago some publicity was given to the fact that I believe that residents of 60,000 homes were struggling under the pressure of trying to pay electricity bills. The cost of electricity has increased, as the member for Stuart reminded me earlier, I think 156 per cent on average over the life of the government. This will be a significant one, and I truly hope that whatever comes out as part of this review, that is not a factor.

I also want to make some positive comments. Last week, I had an opportunity to meet with representatives of the City of Salisbury. We spoke about the challenges facing that community with the automotive industry transformation. The City of Salisbury (and rightly so) is focusing on ensuring, as much as humanly possible, that their community has a great future. They are working collaboratively, as I understand it, with government, and I acknowledge that.

They are also working with business leaders in their community and ensuring that, through whatever sources are available, the right processes, supports, policies and financial endeavours are available to ensure job opportunities and the growth of existing businesses, not a decline, and, in dealing with those challenges, that the outcome is a positive one.

The City of Salisbury has been very proactive, and I appreciated the fact that they contacted me to stimulate the meeting. In the spirit of bipartisanship, I have put through a request that the shadow cabinet meets at the City of Salisbury and has the opportunity to be briefed on what is occurring there, because I believe it is quite important. It is important that we know so that, from an opposition perspective, we can support the government in what it intends to actually do when it comes to supporting the community. That is how the parliament should work. So, that is a positive one, and I recognise that.

While the Minister for Transport is in the chamber, I will reflect upon a visit that he paid to the seat of Goyder probably five or six months ago. The minister was there to open a boating facility, for which I am grateful. There is some feedback about some concerns there that need to be improved. The minister made, I think, two hours of his time available to be in the car with me while I drove and showed him some of my roads. It was very generous of him to give that time up on a Sunday afternoon, and I note that since then there has been improvement in some sections. I am not sure if it is the result of—

Mr Bell: Of course it is!

Mr GRIFFITHS: It has worked. I am trying to be fair, as I drive around, and I think, 'Well, I took the minister on this road and it is better now.' The status in which you are held has risen even more in my eyes, minister.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: What you didn't notice in the rear-view mirror was that it was healing as you drove over it.

Mr GRIFFITHS: The member for Newland comments that the sealing machine was behind us fixing it up, but I am not sure about that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, healing.

An honourable member: It follows him everywhere he goes.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, I know. I am sure the minister understands that the road network we managed to drive on in that time is but a fraction of the network that exists within the electorate. That is part of the challenge he faces when determining priorities on where expenditure should go across the whole state across the forward years. The people of Goyder certainly continually remind me about their road network, and I shall certainly speak to the minister and put issues to him as often as is necessary.

I also want to put on the record a bit of a challenge. The people of Goyder are dealing with some serious transformational issues themselves when it comes to significant development proposals. The first is the Ceres wind farm, which has 196 turbines, from memory. At the time it was proposed, it was the largest wind farm in the Southern Hemisphere and will involve a connection system going under the gulf through to St Kilda. So, instead of the overhead line feed, it will actually go under the water. It is a \$1.3 billion project, but it is not supported by all, I think it is very fair to say, and a significant number of people are involved in trying to have the concerns attached to that proposal addressed, and I commend them for that. The uncertainty about what is occurring with the RET scheme is creating a lot of doubt about what is going to happen with that project.

The more significant issue the community is dealing with at the moment is the Rex Minerals proposal for a copper, gold and iron ore mine. I can appreciate that the minister has granted an approval, subject to 99 conditions, and that post that Rex Minerals decided to pursue a smaller scale start-up, but it is the lack of information available on what the details are of the smaller scale that causes concern. There are a variety of different groups, and they have researched this to the nth degree. There are some exceptionally dedicated and clever people involved in putting the case for issues that have to be addressed as part of it, and I commend them for that.

There are sections of the community who want the mine to occur; I do not deny that, and indeed I tell everyone that that is the case. Predominantly, though, those are people who probably live outside a 20-kilometre radius around the development site. Those who are within that 20-kilometre radius have expressed and continue to express concerns about it, and I think always will. It is this smaller scale start-up and the impact upon how the site is operated and managed, and the impact upon waivers or exemptions to exist for adjoining property owners, that have created concern.

I have written to the minister for mining seeking some clarification because it is such a key issue that people want to know about. In particular, I raised one point. Department of State Development staff were good enough to address a public information forum at Ardrossan probably six weeks ago now, and I commend them for the quality of answers they provided. At that time, there was a question asked by one of the adjoining property owners who was within scope of the blast zone that required a waiver to be in place. Rex Minerals, as part of its mining lease proposal, detailed that a waiver would be in place, I believe, by July 2015, if I remember correctly the reference in the hundreds and hundreds of pages that form the mining lease proposal.

However, now, because of the smaller scale start-up, DSD staff are referring to the fact that it might not be necessary in the initial instance for a waiver to exist over this adjoining land that is part of the blast zone for the larger more largely developed site. I am quoted in the *Stock Journal* and in local media as saying that that concerns me enormously. It was new to me when I heard that and I had never heard it expressed before. DSD has said it is a possibility that that might be the case when it comes to the final approval of the plan for environmental protection and rehabilitation (PEPR) that is necessary within 12 months of the approval being granted by the minister.

My words upon hearing that were, 'This is coercion and not negotiation.' I do not think that is how large industry, particularly in very much a traditional agricultural area, should be engaging in the conversations that it needs to have with adjoining property owners who will be impacted by a development that takes place there. In confirming that I have written to the minister, I urge him to ensure that he provides a response that is both fulsome and soon, because it has probably been two weeks since I wrote to the minister, and that the community is advised of this because it is an important issue.

I just want to finish with a few things. The emergency services levy has been very contentious with the people of Goyder. I know that in some statements attributed to the member for Frome in *The Recorder* newspaper in Port Pirie, he questioned the opposition comments about a 1,223 per cent increase to a property owner for the ESL (emergency services levy). I can assure the minister that I have spoken to a property owner who has shown me their ESL bill for the 2014-15 year and it is an 1,173 per cent increase.

When the quantum of dollars attached to it are on a statewide basis, \$90 million a year are coming out of South Australians' pockets. This is enormous, and it impacts upon people no matter

where they are, but it is particularly impacting upon our primary producers and the owners of the larger properties, those being farms, no matter what size they are.

I also want to recognise that, as part of my program to make the government aware of issues in Goyder, I have invited ministers to my electorate. Minister Mullighan has been good enough to come, and I have also had visits from minister Hamilton-Smith and minister Close, and I appreciate that. It was a chance to be with them for at least a 24-hour period, to show them issues in the electorate and to make them aware of what the opportunities are—and what the challenges are, in some other cases too—I am grateful that they took that chance to come with me and have a look.

Finally, I want to finish with regional development. It is an absolutely key issue, and it is an opportunity for a significant difference to be made to what I believe is the future of all of South Australia. I do recognise that minister Brock, by virtue of an initiative of his own as part of the agreement with the Premier, created the job creation scheme with a \$10 million fund which has a one-year lifespan only, so it runs out on 30 June this year.

My frustration is that, while it was announced as part of the conditions of the contract in March, it was not until I think late November/early December that the components of that and the conditions attached to grant applications were actually given to people who therefore had a chance to apply. From briefings I have had with departmental staff, it is obvious to me that no projects will be completed by 30 June.

There will be commitments in place, yes, but the point I still make is that it was in July when I asked minister Brock questions in estimates about the timing of the job creation scheme. He referred to a meeting that was occurring on 5 August 2014 with one of the Economic Development Board chairs and part of the team that was determining the guidelines for it, but it was still another 3½ months before it became available and gave people a chance. It is important to react now and not wait for such a lengthy time, so I urge the minister and all ministers to ensure that when things are announced they are done quickly and proactively so that the community gets the chance to benefit.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:37): We have made a swap, and I appreciate the tolerance of the member for Mount Gambier. I rise to speak to the Supply Bill 2015. Obviously, this bill is needed to supply money from the Consolidated Account until the budget bill can come through. We have to put into place funding to pay the public servants—

Mr Knoll: And ourselves.

Mr PEDERICK: —and ourselves, which is absolutely true, member for Schubert—so that is why the Supply Bill has to come in until the Appropriation Bill comes through and is ratified by the Governor. This year, I am sure we will be approving the full amount of \$3.291 billion in the Supply Bill. This is absolutely essential to keep the wheels of government turning and, obviously, all the public servants involved.

I guess what concerns me with all things in the budget is that we just seem to be facing cuts and more cuts, especially in regional areas, and yet we see more and more spending in the city. Yes, we have seen some shiny new things, and the Adelaide Oval is a great place to go but came at a huge cost, I believe, to this state.

The forests were sold at Mount Gambier for around \$650 million, when they were really an asset worth \$1 billion at least. Anyone in the field of forestry—my uncle, Uncle Oz, used to work down there for forestry many years ago—would tell you that it was sold far too cheaply, and that is the very reason that a Canadian superannuation firm got involved, because they picked up a bargain: OneFortyOne Plantations. From what I understand, not all is going well with the supply of logs to the local mills, because obviously OneFortyOne can find out when they have an opportunity and they can put logs off-shore and make more money for the company that way if they think fit.

We have had these things come to us, and a lot of people like these developments, but what they forget is the absolute cost. We have a hospital being built for well over \$2 billion when I think a refit of the Royal Adelaide Hospital where it is would have well and truly done the job. There are

some excellent units in the current Royal Adelaide Hospital. Yes, it has been classified as a rabbit warren at times, but there are some excellent units in there, and I speak of the burns unit for one, which has done great work for victims of burns.

Then we look at the desalination plant, another item that has cost about \$2.2 billion when we put all the pipelines in place. It is idling along at about 10 per cent capacity—about 30 million litres of water a day, I think it is—and I think it will have to at least idle along in perpetuity, because from what I understand about desalination plants, if they shut them down all the materials used to get the salt out of the water dry out and you may have to replace a lot of those items. That is another expensive option that could have been half the size; it could have been 50 gigalitres a year instead of 100, but I think that is what happens when people panic.

I want to talk as well about what else has happened in the region, and certainly throughout the Hammond electorate, which is the lack of agriculture funding. We are down to about the lowest spend per annum that we have had for many years in the agriculture sector this financial year. It is down to about \$59 million and, really, we should be putting so much more into agriculture and the research and development. Once, we used to be a powerhouse of research and development in agriculture in this state. We would send teams of people to the Middle East with John Shearer farming equipment and other equipment, showing people in Libya and other places in the Middle East the benefits of broadacre farming practices. South Australia really led the way, and I know we are still doing some work in those areas but it is nothing compared to what it was.

If we do not do the research, how else do we support the mainstay of the economy? Mining has fallen apart, we know the iron ore price has collapsed, gas and oil have crashed—they will all turn around, absolutely. It is what goes on in the background. We certainly saw this when the expansion of Olympic Dam did not go ahead, the government acknowledged—well, they made out—what agriculture does and that agriculture is huge for this state. There are 25,000 people at least employed right throughout the sector to do with food, from the start of the process right through to the delivery of food on the tables at restaurants or in the home. It is a huge workforce and its benefits for the economy are huge.

I certainly think, from my background as a primary producer, that a lot of primary products are undervalued and a lot of especially broadacre farmers from my background struggle to make ends meet, especially with the price of machinery, where a heavy tractor might be \$300,000 plus or a harvester might be \$700,000. Some people might think farmers are millionaires. Well, I can tell you there are farmers with multimillion dollar debts just to put a feed on the table. It is just the price you have to pay for keeping the operation going. There should be a lot more attention paid to our agricultural sector.

Today in question time I noted a Dorothy Dixier from the other side about what the government is doing for pensioners. I do not think they are doing much. They are withholding pensioner concessions. They have made no statement, at this stage, about whether they will pay pensioner concessions on council rates from 1 July. This state government does not admit the fact that they pay 90 per cent of pensioner concessions, and that it is a state issue; the state needs to pick that up. The emergency services levy has increased to take in \$90 million extra from right across the state, and it is really hurting people. The sad thing about the emergency services levy increase, after they take away the rebates, is that it does not add one extra dollar to emergency services.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: It is; it is a real shame. It would not be so bad if we could see some more upgrades, if we saw places like Rockleigh get their CFS shed, or if we saw more training and more equipment for our 13,000 volunteers. As I indicated in a speech yesterday, they have been taken for granted by this government, especially in regard to cancer compensation. The government had to be pulled kicking and screaming through a select committee to finally award potential compensation for the 12 types of cancer, and they deserved to get that compensation, just like the Metropolitan Fire Service firefighters.

I also want to speak about the Murray-Darling Basin diversification fund. At the moment, I am supposed to be at a meeting about this fund with the Treasurer and his staff—I think they are having a preliminary meeting instead. I got in touch with Jamie Briggs' office this morning, the

assistant minister, and he rang me back later and said—and I will put it out there for public knowledge—that, if the state does not allocate this money by 12 May, by federal budget day, he is going to pull it. That is what he is saying. And there is my phone call reminding me to go to the meeting, but I will be 10 minutes late, if that is alright.

It is just a disgrace that politics is being played with this \$25 million, when all communities from the Victorian border right down to the mouth are reliant on the money that was allocated several years ago under the former federal Labor government. When that money was initially allocated, it was stated that the horizontal fiscal equalisation was going to be taken into account in regard to GST payments to South Australia, and it was all going to happen. However, all of a sudden, politics has to be made out of this money, because we have a state Labor government that does not truly believe in the regions. I would like to see the regional development minister stand up and make sure this money is delivered. If it is pulled, it will mean that all those jobs, all that employment, will be pulled out of the Murray-Darling Basin in South Australia, when Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria have already got that money on the table and are putting it into programs. It is an absolute disgrace.

It is a bit like this government talking about land tax. You would not talk about it if you were not thinking about doing it—to think they can tax people every year for owning their home. Everyone pays stamp duty, pays heavily on stamp duty, when they transfer a property. Do they think people can be hoodwinked into thinking that with an annual land tax rate they will be better off? The average rate would be something like \$1,200 a year. It would be a lot more than that for houses that are worth over \$500,000, and rising, and many houses are worth a lot more than that. I think people are smarter than the government thinks they are, if they think they are going to agree to an annual land tax.

We heard the Premier talk today about marine parks and the so-called benefit to this state. All it has done is shift the effort. People from Kangaroo Island have just moved off into other fishing zones, further down Yorke Peninsula in some cases. I believe some have even gone interstate because it has just blocked them out of access to fishing. It has also caused a lot of distress to people in the industry, and I am aware of at least one suicide in regard to marine parks. The way the government supposedly consulted was really flawed. They got people to say where they were fishing, and then the easy answer was, 'Well, that's where we'll put the marine park.' It is just ridiculous.

The car park tax, or the transport development levy, has been talked about today. You can take a lot of those letters out and just call it the car park tax—it is a lot simpler. This has a real impact on regional people who do not have the access to public transport that people have in the city. I note the transport minister is here today, and I had a meeting with him yesterday about public transport in my electorate. I can only hope we will have some improvements into the future. The reality of life is that people from the outer regions drive their cars here. The former lord mayor of Adelaide wanted to have bikes running everywhere. I do not know what he thought we would do—park our vehicles on the edge of the city and then get on a bike and ride in. That is fairytale stuff.

There are a lot of issues around the River Murray and Lake Albert. I have already talked about the diversification fund. There are issues with Lake Albert and salinity, and the government will not even look at the possibility of a connector through to the Coorong. There should be an environmental impact statement taken on what the effect would be if we opened up a connector from Lake Albert to the Coorong so that people could make an informed decision, but the government always comes back and says, 'Any work that's been done has only been done on the Lake Albert side and not on the Coorong side.'

I acknowledge that there are three new ferries under construction. That is a good thing, but it has taken years because the government was trying to fob this cost off onto local government. Now we see that at least two new ferries have more weight restrictions—at Taillem Bend and upstream at Mannum—and it is just not good enough. We need to get on with the job of building two more ferries for \$3 million each. We need to get Bowhill Engineering to get those extra two on the books. They are a great engineering company in my electorate and they will do the job, as they are doing with the first three ferries.

On health, and the Repat closure, this is a real vote turner that even the health minister has not looked at appropriately. My wife came from the western suburbs from Labor voting stock—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Shame!

Mr PEDERICK: Shame, yes. She's learnt the error of her ways.

Mr Picton: That's what she tells you.

Mr PEDERICK: Let me say that she does a lot of work to get me re-elected. I must say that it has given me a whole new wave of friends in the western suburbs, as if I did not have any before because I am a Port supporter. I know a doctor who works at the Daw Park Repatriation Hospital and some of the health workers are thinking for the first time in their lives that they will be voting Liberal because they are so ashamed.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: A doctor?

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: First time ever!

Mr PEDERICK: No, she's a Labor-voting doctor to my knowledge. They are outraged. I talk to people out there and they ask, 'What is going on?' It is the health minister's dream of centralising the Repat. The Repat, where it is, could not be any more central for the rest of the people in the state who do not come from urban areas. It is a great spot, and I think it is more about real estate than health.

An honourable member: That's just not right.

Mr PEDERICK: It is right. He wants to get it closer to the military base at Edinburgh. Military people live all over the place, and it does not take into account that this was put up for veterans. This comes from a government that said in its pre-election material it would never ever sell the Repatriation Hospital at Daw Park.

An honourable member: Never ever.

Mr PEDERICK: Never ever. We did not hear that today when the Premier got up and talked about his so-called achievements since the election a year ago—and I do not think we will hear anything about it either. However, it impacts down the chain. All this centralisation of health impacts on the good people of Hammond especially, as we have seen already, those who live in Goolwa and just outside of Hammond in Yankalilla and Finniss for people to access the health services they had before they were centralised. The people of Goolwa cannot get triage at Goolwa Medical Centre anymore; they have to get to Victor Harbor, which could take up to a half-hour ride, and I think that could result in some very unfortunate outcomes. There are all these impacts right down the line, and it also affects issues around the downgrading of the Noarlunga Hospital.

On the subject of road funding, I want to talk today about safety fencing. We see so much safety fencing going up that next thing they will be putting safety fencing around the safety fences so we do not hit the safety fences. I am nearly over it. Truck drivers have said to me, 'Where are we going to pull off our trucks because we can't get off the road easily enough. If something is wrong and we have to change a tyre, we have fencing.' There is also concern for motorists bouncing off the fencing and back into the traffic. I see where they should be in some places, but now it just seems ludicrous. Every tree is getting fenced off. Do we have to be such a nanny state? Do we have to legislate for the stupidity of people?

There was a recent accident at Coomandook the other day where a lady from Geelong had been driving all over the road at Keith and they had been trying to get on to the services to pull her up. Finally, she went to sleep and flipped it, and thankfully she did not hit anyone else. When they found her she was standing upright in an upside-down car, but she was all right. So, I think there really needs to be a good look at this work.

In regard to the safety fencing that is going on, why is so much of this work being allocated to Victorian contractors? That is my question. We have perfectly good contractors here in South Australia, like Mike Mason, and I know he is getting some of the work. I have to wonder when this government talks about its so-called achievements, why it does not give more work to state-based contractors instead of funnelling the work interstate and overseas. I would love to say a lot more but I am running out of time, so I commend the Supply Bill to the house.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. S.C. Mullighan.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (16:57): The role of opposition is to hold the government to account, and today in the house we hear the Premier stand up and spruik the advancements and the achievements of what the government has achieved in the first 12 months. One sits here with all the eloquent words and the spin and thinks, 'Jeez, we must be heading in the right direction. You beauty! We've finally got this state back on track, and it's going to be great.' The kids will have a future; they will at least have a job here; they can go to university here; and I will one day be able to see my grandkids here.

I want to be a believer. I actually want to believe in the words that the Premier is espousing. In holding the government to account, instead of me getting up and rabbiting on about my thoughts and beliefs, I thought I would go and do a bit of research: just how is South Australia travelling compared to the rest of the country? Just as the Reserve Bank uses long-term averages to determine the level of normal interest rates, the Commonwealth Bank does pretty much the same thing with economic indicators. They do this for every state and territory, and the key indicators are compared with decade averages that are against the normal performance. Each quarter, CommSec attempts to find out by analysing eight key indicators: economic growth, retail spending, equipment investment, unemployment, construction work done, population growth, housing finance and dwelling commencements.

I will ask the house: where do people think we stand as a state compared to everyone else in Australia? We are seventh; we are ranked seventh on economic performance. In fact, there is only one state worse than us, and no chocolates for getting that answer right; it is Tasmania. The state is ranked third on population growth but seventh overall. That takes into account economic growth, dwelling starts, housing finance and construction work.

It is with great sadness that the Weatherill Labor government has effectively abandoned its pledge to create 100,000 jobs by 2016 in the state budget. The state budget forecasts the creation of just 15,000 jobs over the next two years, with employment growth of 1 per cent in 2014-15 and 1.25 per cent in 2015-16. On Treasurer Koutsantonis's own budget figures, South Australia will be 85,000 jobs short of his government's target in 2016.

To bring this to a local level, I inform the house that the South-East is in a jobs crisis. The latest Department of Employment job figures show the unemployment situation is particularly bad in the South-East, with unemployment running at 9.4 per cent and youth unemployment at 18.3 per cent. When I compared this with the north of Adelaide, which sometimes cops a bit of a bad rap, their unemployment was 8.6 per cent and 17.4 per cent respectively on that same data.

The real concern for me is the last 12 months. The number of unemployed in the South-East grew by 2,400 people in 12 months, so 2,400 more people are unemployed now than they were 12 months ago. So, that figure has gone from 6,000 people to 8,400 in total. We are in a jobs crisis down at the South-East. I was going to ask the Minister for Forests to rule out in this house whether any of those job losses were attributed to the forward sale of the forests, but I did not get a chance to get that question up this week. We need to be working in a bipartisan way to look at jobs and jobs growth in the South-East.

The other figure I find pretty amazing when you start looking at it is that the government spent \$160 million on targeted voluntary separation packages, yet the number of public servants is going up. You have to wonder what the hell were we doing spending \$162.6 million last year to reduce the number of public servants. Mr Koutsantonis continually tries to blame the federal government and everyone else for the financial mismanagement and incompetence but sooner or later he will have to admit his responsibility for the financial mess his government has created.

I want to spend a couple of minutes talking about something dear to my heart; that is, the South East Drainage Network. I am imploring the government to take this into consideration in the next budget. What happened is the government appointed an organisation called newDemocracy. They come from Sydney, or have representatives from Sydney, and they came down to Mount Gambier and the South-East and held a range of forums, talking to the local community about how the drains are going to be funded. The government is reported to have paid \$200,000 for this from the NRM levy.

I want to spend a bit of time going through each and every one of the seven recommendations this newDemocracy came out with because I think it is pertinent to the future of suitable drain maintenance in the South-East. At present, the state government commits \$2.2 million to maintain the drains. The actual figure needed is closer to \$8 million to do the job properly. The government engages this group, newDemocracy, to come down, work with locals and say, 'How are we going to find the \$6.8 million shortfall?' These are the recommendations from this committee back to the government, and I want them inserted in *Hansard* so they are there for all time.

Recommendation No. 1 is that the community panel recommends that the state government should pay for the ongoing maintenance of the South East Drainage Network from state appropriation. The panel specifically opposes the introduction of a regional-based levy. I will repeat that last sentence because it is very important: the panel specifically opposes the introduction of a regional-based levy. The fear was that the government wanted to levy residents of the South-East as an isolated group to pay for this work.

There are many examples of where the state government is spending funds subsidised by the people of South Australia. These include, obviously, the Adelaide Oval upgrade, the Torrens Footbridge, extension of tramways, O-Bahn extensions, redevelopment of Torrens art precincts, Casino upgrades, Torrens Riverfront upgrades and a shift of OZ Minerals office from Melbourne to Adelaide; and the panel saw no difference in the maintenance of the South-East drains.

Recommendation No. 2 is that the community panel recommends that \$2.2 million is not enough for acceptable maintenance of the South East Drainage Network. The panel recommends funding be set at the OECD industry standard, which is 3 per cent of capital value.

Recommendation No. 3 is that the community panel recommends that the state government credits the value of South-East water which will be delivered to the Coorong via the South East Flows Restoration project in line with the market value of the Murray River water market prices and allocates the savings/funds directly for the maintenance of the South East Drainage Network. Basically, we have flows going into the Coorong not being valued as of any benefit to the wetlands and the areas down there; yet, as we quite rightly agree, flows through the River Murray attract that recognition.

Recommendation No. 4 is that the community panel recommends that the South East Water board must maintain all its water management works in a good state of safety, cleanliness and repair and in an efficient working order as prescribed by the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act 1992. If anybody travels down to the South-East, you will see that that act of 1992 has not been adhered to.

Recommendation No. 5 is that the community panel recommends that the government source sufficient annual funding for the drains from better planned budgeting and fairer apportionment of annual budgets without adding levies or increasing existing taxes. Currently, the South East ratepayers contribute \$4.9 million through water and land-based levies annually to the South East Natural Resources Management Board which is spent on managing land and water resources in the South-East.

Recommendation No. 6 is that the panel recommends that the state government should only accept funding for future capital drainage works with a provision to adequately fund the maintenance. This government has in the past accepted money for drainage works which is adding more drains to the area with no thought for how it was going to be maintained into the future.

Recommendation No. 7 is that the community panel recommends that, in consultation with affected stakeholders, the existing drainage network be scrutinised/assessed in order that drain maintenance is appropriately prioritised. I hope that the minister looks at those recommendations and addresses them properly with the Treasurer to fund the South East Drainage Network efficiently.

The last thing I want to talk about is the scourge of pokies. I am getting this in because there are a number of people in our community suffering due to pokie addiction. In the last 20 years of South Australian pokies, \$12 billion has been lost. That was in a report commissioned in July last year. In actual fact, South Australians have lost over \$12.2 billion in pokies since they were introduced into hotels and clubs on 25 July 1994. Unfortunately, of the \$12.2 billion lost on pokies, \$5 billion has come from people with gambling problems. An average South Australian pokies loss

is \$72,000 per hour for every hour of the year. I will say that again: \$72,000 per hour for every hour of the year.

I will give credit to one suggestion which I promised I would get into parliament, and that is the suggestion of Mulga Button who is one of my local residents. He wants to see above every pokie establishment the average payout for the poker machines of that day. He argues that it is no different to driving past a petrol station, looking at the price of petrol and deciding that you will go to the next petrol station or wait until tomorrow to fill up. So, above every premises that has pokies, it would be mandated that they indicate the payout rate as an average for all the machines in that venue and then that would be known to the consumer who could then make an informed decision as to whether or not they will frequent that establishment or move onto another one. With that, I conclude my remarks and commend this to the house.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (17:11): I too rise to speak in support of the Supply Bill. Of course, without any finances the government will not be able to go forward, so we want to see South Australia at least ticking over whilst they are in charge.

I want to speak about a couple of things today and, in fact, the member for Mount Gambier obviously has similar issues in his electorate as in mine. I am not talking about his issue with the flood plains; I am talking more about the overarching issues that we are having problems with in South Australia. He mentioned the State of the States report that CommSec puts out, and where South Australia sits in the whole scheme of things. Again, I look over the same reports that he does and I have the same concerns he has as to where South Australia sits in the rankings.

I know I have talked about this and I like to use football terms to explain my position, and I do not apologise for that because I think people understand that very clearly. If there was a premiership table, we are sitting second to last on the premiership table when it comes to economic growth. We sit seventh out of all the states on economic growth; only Tasmania is below us, and they are making a bit of a charge, too, so we need to be very careful. That is of great concern, in my opinion, because South Australia is just going backwards. When you are sitting in that position on a premiership table, you want to do a fair bit of work to get yourself back up and you need to get your team moving.

I fear that this government has not been doing that and, after 13 years, we are really starting to see why South Australia is sitting so far down the ladder. I remember when we used to be up in the top two or three and be hunting around the leading packs, able to fight for top billing with the likes of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. As I said, sadly, we are sitting second to bottom on the table when it comes to economic growth.

It is similar with unemployment and all other key economic indicators. South Australia really is languishing way down the list. The Treasurer can sit there and make excuses for what is going on and blame everyone else as he does, but it is time for us as a state to roll up our sleeves and the Treasurer needs to start focusing on what we are doing here in South Australia and not pushing the blame on everyone else.

Last year, he ran a \$1.2 billion deficit budget; \$300 million of that was unbudgeted spending which is phenomenal. That is \$300 million of unbudgeted spending in a 12-month period, and that is how this Treasurer seems to operate South Australia. If you keep running budgets like that, you will keep slipping further down that premiership table, and it is very alarming.

The Treasurer was also caught out when the government formed again after the last election and they had to find a way to claw back some money—to make some more money, if you like—and they started with some new taxes. They increased the emergency services levy on all South Australians. They made everyone pay more. They took away the concessions and they made people pay a massive amount. In some cases, more than 1,000 times was the increase on some people's emergency services levy. Everyone in South Australia is paying more. The reason for that is the mismanagement of the budget by this current government and the Treasurer needs to take some responsibility for that and stop passing the blame.

The ESL has gone up considerably and, as I said, in some cases it was 1,000 per cent, yet not one cent more is going to the emergency services—that is the irony of this. Not one cent more is

going to emergency services. We see the great work throughout the summer that the CFS does, and the SES—we know they do marvellous work—yet this government is taking more money from South Australians under the guise of the emergency services levy but they are not giving any of it back.

They also ran a big campaign and spent \$1.1 million on advertising to push their propaganda that the federal government is taking away some concessions from pensioners. Whilst they concede that they are taking 10 per cent of the \$190 that pensioners get in concessions for their council rates—that is, \$19 is going back to the federal government—\$171, or 90 per cent of this figure, is what our state Treasurer, Treasurer Koutsantonis, is clawing back from South Australian pensioners. That is a shame.

As I said, they want to sit there and run an advertising campaign for another \$1.1 million, which is money that could be going to pensioners or other people in need. They run an advertising campaign on television, blaming the federal government, when the facts are that 90 per cent of the claw back, \$171 out of the \$190, is what Treasurer Koutsantonis is clawing back from pensioners—and we think that is wrong.

As mentioned earlier with the ESL, the Liberal team recognises that the tax increases are an unreasonable burden to people and we think that is not on, with the pensioner concessions as well. We are going to do everything we can to stop the Treasurer from getting that through. We do not think pensioners should be hit this way. It is very, very unfair and it is something we will not stand for, so we are fighting very hard to stop Treasurer Koutsantonis from doing that.

That is the sort of thing he does, that governments and treasurers do, when they want to claw back money because they have spent willy-nilly. I mentioned the deficit before, last year's budget, and we talked about the whole state debt pushing upwards of \$13 million towards \$14 million. It really is getting out of control, and these are the things that governments will do.

Then we look at the health minister, who is doing anything he can to save costs, cut costs, closing the Repat. This Labor government said that it would never close the Repat, that the Repat would not close under the Labor government. They went out to community consultation and got tens of thousands of people writing in and putting in submissions saying they did not want the Repat to close, that they could not afford for the Repat to close. These are veterans, these are people who have served our country, and as we head towards ANZAC Day you will hear more from these people. They are people who have served our country and they spoke out in their tens of thousands, as I said, with their submissions, but this government just did not listen to what they had to say. It is closing the Repat and giving them no consideration whatsoever.

We also talked about the other facilities around the place. A lot of noise was made about the Flinders Medical Centre neonatal intensive care unit. That is in my electorate, and I very much supported the push to try to keep that up and running. The good news there is that the health minister did listen to a point; he has brought some of the things back that he was going to slice and slash, but he has taken control away. We are keeping an eye on that, because he has taken control away and put it with a centralised body.

I have personally had some involvement with the unit up there. My daughter went through there when she was born, and I am forever grateful for the great work those people did to keep my daughter alive. She is now a lovely 12-year-old girl who is growing into beautiful woman. Those people are absolutely outstanding, and I would hate for people in the south, in particular, not to get that great support from that unit. I will be keeping a check on it, because whilst it looks positive, the government has taken away that control and it is centralising that control and allowing the Flinders Medical Centre neonatal intensive care unit people to run their own show. So there are a couple of concerns, and we will find out more about that in the coming weeks and months and make sure that it still operates as it should.

There is plenty of talk as well about closing emergency departments. This government said that it was going to close the Noarlunga emergency department, and then it said that it was going to keep it open. However, what it did not say—and this is something that people of the South need to be very careful of—is that this is an emergency department that will not take emergencies that need to be admitted to hospital. That is right: it is going to keep an emergency department at Noarlunga

that will not take patients that need to be admitted to hospital. So ambulances will get backed up and that will increase the flow into Flinders, which we know already has ramping issues.

People get themselves to hospital, not everyone takes an ambulance. In fact, the health minister has said himself that about 30 per cent of people get to hospital via ambulance, so if you are taking yourself or if someone is taking a friend or family member to hospital and they do not know if they will or will not need to be admitted to hospital, it will be very, very confusing. This whole emergency department shake-up is very, very confusing—and it is happening because this government is trying to claw back money and save money. So people of the South, with the Noarlunga emergency department, are none the wiser as to what is going on. This government really needs to come clean. I just do not know if it is an emergency department if they will not admit people into hospital if they go there. The people down there and the people I speak to in my electorate are very confused.

There are a couple of other issues I would like to talk about that have been brought up in relation to finances. I know this has been raised by members before me, but I refer to the DCSI checks. I have a number of people contacting me, and I am doing everything I can to help out everyone in my community. I understand that we need to have DCSI checks and that we need to make sure that people, including children and the most vulnerable in our community, are kept safe in this manner, but it is getting convoluted and drawn out. It is a great example of red tape at its absolute best.

I know a lot of taxi drivers have contacted me, saying, 'We get our notice to renew our licence and our details, and that is going to take a couple of months, and at the same time we get a notice that we must get our DCSI check updated, and that is going to take three months.' A lot of them are forced to sit out of work for a while, waiting for the DCSI check to come back. They have their licence renewed and they are all ready to go, but they are forced to sit out and be without work for a number of months while they wait for these clearances to come through.

Bus drivers are in a similar position. In fact, one gentleman in my local area drives underprivileged children around in a bus, and he is going to have to say that he cannot take them around because he does not have his DCSI check back yet. He has been waiting for months to get this returned so that he can go out into the community and drive underprivileged kids around. It really is causing a great concern for people in my electorate.

I have previously talked about where South Australia sits on the premiership table. I have talked about economic growth and about unemployment being another concern in relation to where South Australia sits on the national scale. South Australia is very much at the bottom of the table and one of the poorer performers as far as unemployment is concerned. The government goes very quiet when I talk about their 100,000 job pledge, which was supposed to be in place in the next 12 months or so. Again, if you look at the budget papers, according to Treasurer Koutsantonis' own figures he is going to fall 85,000 short of his 100,000 job pledge.

That is the sort of thing we keep seeing from this government: false hopes and false offers to South Australians. This government is not delivering, then saying, 'Oh, it's okay,' and invariably blaming someone else. That is a real concern. Quite frankly, I think South Australians are getting sick of it; they want a government that is going to roll up its sleeves and get on with the job, and that is what we need to be doing. Jobs and opportunities are very dear to the heart of people in my electorate.

I have mentioned the emergency services levy, and I have mentioned other pension concession and council concession cuts. The government is talking about the proposal of a new land tax on the family home. They want to impose a \$1,200 land tax on the family home that everyone will pay every year instead of stamp duty. It just another way to claw back money. It is a lot of money for your average home, with people who own a \$400,000 home paying \$1,200 year. This is another new tax this government wants to come up with. That is Treasurer Koutsantonis' plan, that is what he is talking about and that is what he has out there in the marketplace.

He will not let this \$1,200 land tax rest. Treasurer Koutsantonis is desperate to bring it in and start slugging people even more. Families just cannot afford it. Right across the state, from the member for Mount Gambier's electorate through to my electorate, running from the Oaklands Park

and Warradale area, right down through Sheidow Park and Trott Park, and into Reynella and Old Reynella, people cannot afford to pay another \$1,200 a year for a land tax that Treasurer Koutsantonis wants to put in place.

I hark back to what we started with, that is, the mismanagement of this budget over many years, and, more recently, last year, with the \$1.2 billion deficit and a \$300 million overspend of unbudgeted spending. That is why the Treasurer wants to bring in these new land taxes and tax the family home another \$1,200 a year. I must say that it is just not on.

We then look at waste, which is another thing that this government is famous for. It is very disheartening when you look at these issues and see some of the waste that has happened in a number of projects, including one I have looked at recently—the tramline project, which was really disappointing. I know the Minister for Transport was not the minister at the time, but I have seen the GHD report the government commissioned in 2010. There were over 1,000 faults in this \$20 million tramline project.

The report says that if you want to restore the tramline, the electrification and all the works that have been done to what was scoped, what was asked for, and what was ordered in the first place, the whole of the tramline, from Victoria Square to the Morphett Street Bridge, needs to be dug up and the cables need to be relaid. I have seen this report. It shows the conduit that has been laid in the ground and the poor job that was done. A rush job was done. No bedding was laid down. I have run pipes at my place for stormwater and things like that and, from the pictures I have seen—and I am not a very handy person—I think I have done a better job than what has been returned in this project. And this government let that happen.

The report says that it needs to be dug up. So, in effect, \$20 million needs to be spent to redo this project to get the standard that was requested. The government is just tinkering around the edges and we are waiting to see what needs to get done for this to be remedied. Again, this is a \$20 million project and this report was hidden away, under the covers, under the table. No-one was meant to know about it, but it did come out and it shows that another \$20 million has been wasted. It is just not good enough.

Likewise with the review into the electrification of the rail line; again, we have mentioned the electrification to Seaford before. It is a lovely project and it has been fantastic. Sadly, though, after half a billion dollars has been spent on the rail revitalisation program, the head of the department came out the other day and said, 'Still more works need to be done. This is not right; it's not safe and we still have to shut the line down again to get this going.' No-one really knows when it is going to be finished.

After the government's mismanagement of this project—after a long period of time, when it should have been electrifying all the lines that were outlined right from the start—it decided in May 2012 that it would not electrify Gawler. The government had blown the budget, it had run out of cash and could not go ahead with that project. It was very disappointing for the people of the north. Thankfully, for the people of the South and through my electorate, we got lucky and that project got done first.

The report showed that there was more value in the project running out to Gawler. It still is a valuable project, but the government has again just parked that to one side and forgotten about it. It has moved on with other projects and has forgotten the projects that it started. The government is happy to do the glossy things but it does not finish the job that it starts.

Then there is the \$50 million that has been written off on the Gawler line project by the Auditor-General. This is the sort of thing that typifies the waste by this government, the money that just gets thrown out the door. As a state that is sitting down at the bottom of the ladder, second to last in so many of those key economic indicators, to be throwing away \$50 million on projects like this and just shrugging our shoulders and saying, 'Oh well, too bad, too sad' is not good enough. But that is what this government does. That is what the Treasurer on the other side does. He does not care: \$50 million is a sneeze to him and he lets it go. I think South Australians are getting sick of that. That is the sort of waste that we want to stop in order to get our state going forward.

As I said—and I stress it again—we need to roll up our sleeves, get dirty and start getting these things done and not wasting money. The government has thrown \$50 million out the window

and who knows when this project is going to start up again. The minister has already indicated that he cannot really commit to this project picking up again in 2017-18, as has been promised in the forward estimates. We will keep a very close eye on that. It worries me that he says that because it starts you thinking that maybe there are more problems with the budget than the government lets on and there just isn't money there to play with.

They are great concerns. However, I will give credit where credit is due. We have lobbied hard with the government. I know it is working very closely with the federal government for a big slice of money for the Darlington project in my electorate. I think over \$600 million is coming from the feds. In fact, it might be more. I will need to check that figure and come back to the house with the exact number. But 80 per cent plus of the Darlington interchange project—and it could even be more—is coming from the federal government. We thank them for that money because it is going to be a great project. I know they have been out to consultation.

Regarding my electorate, again, we have talked a number of times in this chamber about the Southern Expressway that was built running south. Sadly, at the time—and it was before my time here in parliament—there was no on/off ramp put at Majors Road for the people of Sheidow Park and Trott Park, who would really have benefited from that infrastructure spend. They were just overlooked. It really benefited the people further south—and good luck to them—but it was disappointing for the people of my electorate.

I have watched this new project that is going on through Darlington very closely. We have had a number of community meetings. We have lobbied and spoken to the department and we have made submissions about what we think, how it should work and how it could work better. The initial plans were again going to exclude people coming from Sheidow Park and Trott Park, O'Halloran Hill and Darlington. People who got onto South Road from there were going to be overlooked and they were not going to get any expressway benefit from the new Darlington project. That was extremely disappointing.

Our community has worked really hard. We have rallied hard and we have spoken to the department. As I said, the minister—I will give him credit—has listened as well. The community has come out in force and we have engaged the community. They have bought into this and they have had their say about what they would like to see and how they would like to get some benefits out of this new project.

When this new Darlington project comes on board, we are hoping that the work that has been done by our community to raise this issue, after being left out with the Southern Expressway—we really hope with the new Darlington interchange that the people of Sheidow Park, Trott Park, Darlington and O'Halloran Hill will be considered favourably and will get some benefits out of all this investment that is coming from the federal government. They are investing in roads and we need everyone to benefit from that. It is a big investment from the federal government and we appreciate that.

There is a subsequent investment from the state government as well, and I acknowledge that, but the significant funds are coming from the federal government. To get that flow through for the people of my area and to be able to access the freeway-type effect and miss those sets of lights as they head towards town will be a great benefit for them. We hope that is what will happen. As I said, the people have worked hard. I have listened to the community and I have talked with the community. I have taken their thoughts on board. I have fought very hard for them and we hope when this project is announced—and we hope it is not too far away—that the government will say they have listened and they will give something back to the people of Sheidow Park and Trott Park. They deserve it. They have fought hard and worked very hard.

In summary, we do need to keep taking South Australia forward. We need to get off the bottom of the ladder and there is no doubt about that. If we roll our sleeves up and get working, I hope we can do it. I support this bill and hope South Australia can move forward.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY ON WATER PRICING BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

*Resolutions***HUMAN ORGANS TRAFFICKING**

The Legislative Council agreed to the resolution from the House of Assembly relating to the joint committee on the operation of the Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1983, with the following amendments:

Paragraph 1—Leave out 'That this house appoints a joint committee' and insert 'That in the opinion of this house a joint committee be appointed';

Paragraph 2—Leave out 'it report no later than 3 December 2015'

to which amendments it desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly:

In the event of a joint committee being appointed, this council will be represented on the committee by three members, of whom two shall form the quorum necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee and the members of the joint committee to represent the Legislative Council will be the Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins, the Hon. T.A. Franks and the Hon. K.L. Vincent.

*Bills***REAL PROPERTY (PRIORITY NOTICES AND OTHER MEASURES) AMENDMENT BILL***Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (TREASURER'S INSTRUCTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:34 the house adjourned until Tuesday 5 May 2015 at 11:00.