HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 6 May 2015

The SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson) took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

Ms CHAPMAN: Sir, I seek a point of clarification?

The SPEAKER: As I said to the deputy leader yesterday, I accept points of order, I do not really accept points of clarification because they are impromptu speeches, so I call the Attorney.

Ms CHAPMAN: I seek to make a personal explanation, sir.

The SPEAKER: I call the Attorney.

Personal Explanation

CHILD PROTECTION

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) (11:02): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yesterday, in question time, I responded to questions about whether unsupervised trainees are working on cases of at-risk children. I wish to correct my response. While there has been a general direction and a number of specific directions issued by the chief executive to Families SA staff in response to the Coroner's recommendations, I was mistaken in my recollection that the department had issued a specific direction in respect of recommendation 22.22. There has, however, been a cabinet decision that the department will implement all recommendations other than recommendation 22.9, which is to be further investigated, and 22.13, which is supported in principle. Yesterday, I was also asked to provide a copy of the direction issued to staff from the chief executive that the paramount consideration must always be the wellbeing and welfare of children. I would like to table that direction and the others I referred to in my ministerial statement yesterday.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:03): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yesterday, you, sir, tabled a letter of report and annexures from the Attorney-General and copies were provided, as I understand it, to those that sought. I was provided a copy and accordingly have no reason to believe my copy is not as per the original. It comprises the letter, as is indicated, two pages of transcript and, thirdly, a schedule, which is a page numbered 153 from the Coroner's report. That is a document which is my document, not the document that—if it is, I would like some explanation—but is in fact my document. Mr Speaker, you will see that I have written the words 'Attorney-General' in the margin and the words 'will consider', which are also handwritten on the document. It is the document that I delivered to your office at about 11.15 yesterday. I advised your assistant to bring it and the two recommendations to which I was referring to your attention. So, that document is not material provided by the Attorney-General; I am indicating that that last page is—

The SPEAKER: I am quite willing to accept that.

Ms CHAPMAN: Just for the record—

The SPEAKER: So what is the mischief?

Ms CHAPMAN: I am not suggesting there is any. I am simply making a personal explanation as you rejected my request to seek a point of clarification. I just want to place on the record that that is a document that I provided to your office at 11.15 yesterday.

The SPEAKER: It appears we have mistakenly circulated a document from you in addition to the Deputy Premier's document—

Ms CHAPMAN: Correct.

The SPEAKER: —which you were eager to have tabled in this place yesterday.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, sir. To be clear, I had not sought to tender anything yesterday. I had inquired about whether you had received the Attorney-General's report.

The SPEAKER: And I had, and I then shared it with the house, but it appears that I shared an extra page inadvertently with the house, which was of your authorship.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes. Thank you, sir.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: GLENELG WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT PRIMARY SEDIMENTATION TANKS REHABILITATION PROJECT

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:07): I move:

That the 514th report of the committee, on the Glenelg Wastewater Treatment Plant Primary Sedimentation Tanks Rehabilitation Project, be noted.

SA Water will be upgrading the seven primary sedimentation tanks at the Glenelg Wastewater Treatment Plant in a staged approach over a 12-month period commencing July 2015. The project includes: concrete repairs to the sedimentation tanks; the application of an acid resistant coating to expose concrete surfaces; and the rehabilitation of mechanical equipment, including the replacement of scrapers, guide rails and chains and associated mechanical components.

The cost of the project is $5.895 million, GST exclusive. The proposed works are critical to the operation of the plant, with the works to improve plant reliability and provide security to the ongoing sewer operations in the area. Given this and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:08): The opposition members on the committee support the report. It is a project that will be much in demand over the next few years. Unfortunately, there are a few things that the SA Water people were not able to tell us. Of concern is the $70 million-odd pipeline to the city that was going to send all this wastewater up to the city. Unfortunately, they still have not answered that one correctly or to our satisfaction.

Our view is that the water is just far too expensive and no-one is prepared to buy it. So, we have this pipeline worth tens of millions of dollars coming up to Adelaide city that is not being used, or is being used very little. The cost of the water is something else we asked about: what is the cost of water to local authorities and local users? That has been unsatisfactorily answered at this stage as well. However, in light of the fact that the project has to go ahead, the opposition supports it.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:10): I too rise to give support to this report and to make a small contribution to the Public Works Committee hearings regarding the wastewater treatment plant upgrade, the inlet works and the Anderson Avenue pump station project.

The Glenelg Wastewater Treatment Plant is designed for annual flows of around 60 megalitres per day to serve an equivalent population of just over 203,000 people. At times of high flow the volume of wastewater received from the wastewater treatment plant is delivered by the Anderson Avenue wastewater pumping station. It can be in excess of 1,800 litres per second. That is a significant amount of water to be treated.

What was made clear in the report and during the hearing with witnesses from SA Water, is that the Glenelg Wastewater Treatment Plant and pumping station is an ageing asset and there are a number of concerns around structural, mechanical and electrical elements of the current infrastructure, and there were also a number of inefficiencies experienced because of this. Any amount of ageing infrastructure highlights the inefficiencies and the unreliability that comes with that.

I note that the local MP has expressed concerns, along with the public, about odour. Witnesses were unable to give an exact percentage figure on just how the odour control will be changed with these works. I am sure that any member in this place or the public would share my concerns that when treatment plants have odour issues it is an extremely unpleasant experience. The hearing was told that it is not possible to put out a specific target or percentage of improvement, and that was something that was of concern.

Delivery of the project will cost $24.157 million, excluding GST, which is fully allowed for in the SA Water budget. Delivery of this project is required within the current regulated period for SA Water and, as such, practical completion is targeted prior to 30 June 2016. During the hearing the witnesses said that in order to achieve this challenging milestone, detailed design, long lead-time procurement and construction is intended to begin as soon as possible, so I commend the report to the house.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:12): I welcome the report and the upgrade of this treatment plant. Ever since we moved to the Bay 17 or 18 years ago (and long before that) the smells were more than evident to both my family and myself. My wife moved to Glenelg as a small child and she tells me that way back then the treatment plant was occasionally quite smelly. Recently, about a month ago, I was driving back from an event at Sports SA at Adelaide Shores and coming past there, even with the windows up—I thought I had the recirc on the car going but obviously I did not because it really did take your breath away: it stank, it absolutely stank.

Let's remember that the treatment plant is situated on some of the most valuable land in South Australia. The residential land along there sells for millions and millions of dollars, so why can't we put some effort into reducing the smell from this treatment plant? The cost alone cannot be just a consideration. We are looking at triple bottom line approaches to environmental impacts at the moment and so we should be looking at what else we can do there.

The need to upgrade the plant is a necessity; there is more and more water coming through. We are using thousands of litres of water per person per day which is just amazing. We should be able to cut back on that but it seems that our lifestyles now do not seem to be having much of an impact on reducing the inflows into the sewerage works.

Making the plant more efficient is something I certainly agree with. Reducing the smell would be something that I would be more than happy to support. Whether you cover the whole place and enclose the whole thing and filter the air, I do not know. The member for Finniss pointed out the cost of recycled water. I did some surveys on this a number years ago. We actually got the details of the amount of water that was being reused through the Glenelg wastewater treated water pipeline and what was still going out to sea. Far too much is still going out to sea, particularly during the winter months, when the irrigation is not taking place.

The cost of that water, I understand, is set at 75 per cent of potable water prices, which I think is far too high. Surely the environmental cost of pumping that water out into the gulf should be factored in, and we should be able to reuse that water. I know the West Beach Primary School's bore is broken. To pay to get the bore redone is to me a crazy thing when you have got all this water that is being pumped out to sea and is being wasted. Surely, for the cost of connecting West Beach Primary School into the treated water pipeline, we should at least be able to use more of that water, have less going out to sea, and also end up with some decent ovals for the kids at West Beach Primary School to play on.

If you wanted to have a dream, you would move this whole treatment plant out of that area, but I do not think that is ever going to happen. What we need to do is make sure that it is going to be as efficient as possible, and that the result of the impact on locals around there and also the broader environment is minimised. I look forward to seeing the outcome of these works.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:16): I thank the member for Finniss, the member for Chaffey and also the local member for the area (member for Morphett) for their contributions. I also thank the rest of the Public Works Committee for their hard work, as well as the executive and the witnesses. I certainly think it is good to see the asset being maintained and cared for.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: 2 SECOND AVENUE, MAWSON LAKES

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:17): I move:

That the 515th report of the committee, entitled 2 Second Avenue, Mawson Lakes, be noted.

Renewal SA owns the property located at 2 Second Avenue, Mawson Lakes. They have negotiated a long-term lease with Codan (namely, a 15-year lease, with the right to renew for a further 10 years). In order to facilitate a lease, Renewal SA was aware that they would need to upgrade the facility to an acceptable standard. They have agreed to the following works:

- base building works;
- fit-out works to a maximum of $6 million (the lessee will contribute the remaining funds to meet their own requirements);
- construction of a new building; and
- civil works to facilitate semitrailer entry and egress from the site in a single direction.

Details of the exact works are included in the committee's report and the agency's submission. These works will ensure the facility meets the Building Code of Australia requirements, complies with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act, and meets a minimum 4-star NABERS energy rating.

The cost of construction is estimated at $17.977 million (GST exclusive) and the total gross rental over the initial 15-year lease period is anticipated to be in the order of $46 million (GST exclusive).

Works are due to commence in July 2015, with the completion next year in February. Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:18): The opposition members again supported this project. It was interesting to listen to the information that was supplied to the committee on the day. We asked some questions about why Renewal SA were spending the money on upgrading this facility that was formerly used, and why indeed the company that has taken over the lease of the building is not doing it themselves. I found that the answers were satisfactory, but questioned to some extent why this happened anyway.

My view is that the government may well have been told that if they did not pay through Renewal SA, the company would have gone interstate and taken its employees with it and we would have had nothing. We never quite drilled down to the bottom of that one; however, the project will be a good project. It is a substantial upgrade, which of course, for that amount of money, it has to be, but for the benefit of South Australia we supported the project.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:20): I too rise to support this project. As the Chair and the member for Finniss have explained, the Renewal SA project at Second Avenue Mawson Lakes is certainly an interesting project. Essentially, the project has been described as looking to leverage and exploit the maximum potential out of those facilities that we have within Technology Park. Codan Limited is the tenant that entered into an agreement with Renewal SA, and the proposal will see Codan relocate to Technology Park from Newton with up to 250 employees.

I share the member for Finniss's sentiments as to whether there was an ultimatum or deal put to government to entice them to Technology Park. They are currently operating out of a number of different facilities. This facility and this development will enable them to amalgamate operations into that one location.

The building was constructed in three stages, firstly in 1995, then 1997, and then 2000. It has always been used for technology and advanced research type activities, but initially it was constructed for telecommunications company Motorola, as many of you would know. They subsequently left occupation of the premises in 2008 and since then BAE occupied the facility. BAE then left at the end of 2013 and, at that stage, we put the building in the hands of a commercial agent

who undertook a national marketing campaign and then three months later brought forward Codan as a potential tenant.

The concerns that I have are around the fact that this is a significant investment of about $17 million that is simply for a relocation, and it seems the government has a bigger defence and technology picture in the project. Renewal SA will be providing significant upgrades to the current offices previously used by BAE, but we as the opposition supported this project and we see it as a bigger picture within the defence industries here in South Australia.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:22): I thank my fellow Public Works Committee members, the member for Chaffey and the member for Finniss, for their contributions, and I appreciate the work of all other committee members and also the executive and administrative officers of the Public Works Committee and all those witnesses who presented. I appreciate the bipartisan support for this project.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: GLENELG WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADE OF INLET WORKS AND ANDERSON AVENUE PUMP STATION PROJECT

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:23): I move:

That the 516th report of the committee, entitled Glenelg Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade of Inlet Works and Anderson Avenue Pump Station Project, be noted.

This is the second major project to be undertaken at the Glenelg wastewater treatment plant, in addition to the one that was mentioned in the earlier debate, the other being the recently considered primary sedimentation tank rehabilitation project. Given the age of the facility, it is timely to undertake major upgrades to ensure the plant's ongoing reliability and safe operation.

The aim of this project is to minimise the risk of wastewater outflow and the risks of work health and safety incidents, as well as (and the member for Morphett will be pleased to hear this) manage the odour issues that are currently occurring. Specifically, the project will see the construction of a new standalone inlet works at the plant, replacement of the mechanical and electrical infrastructure at the Anderson Avenue wastewater pump station, with installation of four new pumps in sump B and decommissioning of sump A, and the decommissioning of redundant, unsafe aspects of the existing inlet works and wastewater pump station.

The proposed works will address the ongoing issue of odour management, which is currently a problem, as we have heard, affecting neighbours in the vicinity of the plant. The cost of the project is $24.157 million, GST exclusive. Works are due to commence this year in May, with practical completion in June 2016. Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:25): The opposition supports the project again, as indeed it did with the first one, and the same comments I made in the first report are applicable to the second one.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:25): I rise to support this report. The news that odours will be reduced is music to my ears and also to my nostrils. I look forward to breathing the beautiful fresh air that is a delight down at Glenelg most of the time.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:26): Thank you to the member for Finniss for supporting this project, as do all the other Public Works Committee members. Thanks also to the member for Morphett—I hope your nostrils will appreciate this project as much as we will. I thank the executive officer and administrative officer for their hard work and I appreciate the bipartisan support for this particular project.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: APY LANDS MAIN ACCESS ROAD UPGRADE PROJECT

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:26): I move:

That the 517th report of the committee, entitled APY Lands Main Access Road Upgrade Project, be noted.

The main access road is currently used by more than 60 per cent of the total APY population, providing access to health and education, as well as being the main route for food delivery, medical supplies and export of animals. The road is highly corrugated and frequently floods, rendering it impassable. This increases the cost of service delivery, damages vehicles and goods, and contributes to the high rate of vehicle accidents in the region.

This project will see the upgrade of the current main access road from the Stuart Highway to Ernabella (approximately 210 kilometres), as well as the upgrade of 21 kilometres of community access roads. Specifically, it will upgrade the unsealed main access road, provide sealed roads in key areas, such as access to sealed airstrips, to provide all-weather access for emergency service providers, such as the Royal Flying Doctor Service. It will also stabilise floodways at major watercourse crossings. It is a jointly funded project between the state and federal governments at a total cost of $106.25 million, GST exclusive, to be undertaken over four years and managed by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

This was an interesting project to review, and I am sure all Public Works Committee members would agree, given its location and challenges. The department is seeking to use this project to encourage development of skill and employment in the APY lands, with a minimum target of 30 per cent of local Indigenous people to be employed on the project. The committee wishes them every success in achieving this absolutely worthy target and with the successful completion of the project. Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:28): Again, the opposition clearly supports this project. It was an interesting submission, and the hearing was interesting in itself, on some of the problems that are anticipated to be faced during the course of this $106 million project. I would like to particularly congratulate the federal government—they are the principal funders of this project—the Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, and his cabinet colleagues, who have seen fit to improve markedly, by this project, the life of those people who live on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands.

The federal government and the Prime Minister are belted around the ears pretty regularly on a lot of things, but let me tell you that the task at hand they have committed to here is an excellent one, and I do not think anybody could dispute that. It is living proof that the Abbott federal government looks after all Australians as best they can. This $100-odd million to be spent, with some state money in it, will make it dramatically easier for the Aboriginal people who live on the APY lands.

Let me also say that the employment that is going to be created will be a good thing, and we asked questions about that. I have no doubt that they anticipate issues regarding employment, the use of contractors, where they get everything from and the very logistics of working in that isolated part of Australia. It will not be an easy project, but at the end of the day the people who live out there will have a vastly upgraded road, much of it a gravel road but with bitumen crossings over the places that are flooded out each year or whenever it rains, which is probably not each year up there. Once again, let me congratulate Prime Minister Tony Abbott and the federal government on providing that funding.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:30): I too rise to support this project and air the same sentiments the member for Finniss has expressed, particularly in regard to the partnership between the state government and the federal government, and I too express congratulations on the long-term view of the benefits this upgrade of the road will give to the people there. This is the road from Pukatja to Iga Warta, from the Sturt Highway right the way through.

The committee was told that this is obviously a great opportunity to provide employment and opportunities for the people up in the lands. Of course, living in a regional part of South Australia, I too experience the wear and tear on vehicles, the dangers and the lack of safety on any unsealed road, particularly with floodways and with large corrugation and washouts, so I think this is a great project. It is an asset to that region, and it gives confidence that government support for a faraway, regional centre of South Australia is being addressed.

The fill materials will be brought up for this project to reshape the road and make it smoother, as a more advanced road base is better than the natural road terrain. Obviously, the floodways will be sealed, and that is a common issue with faraway, desert locations, particularly when they have

little rain, but when they do have rain it always causes significant damage, so that will improve the safety on those roads. Accessibility, of course, is always an issue in isolated areas, so the plan to improve that is being addressed. This road will provide safer road conditions and employment opportunities, and I support the project.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:33): Having travelled extensively in the APY lands by air but more particularly by road, I and, I imagine, Anangu Tjuta—all the Anangu—greatly appreciate this money being spent, because when you are going to land on an airstrip on the APY lands you just hope that, firstly, there are no camels on the airstrip and that, secondly, the airstrip is in a good enough condition for the plane to land. We have had to get out and push the aeroplane backwards to get it out of a bog at one end on one trip. You need to have good airstrips, but you also need good access to those airstrips, and you need to have good roads from the communities.

Let's just remind ourselves in this place that Pipalyatjara is right up in the north-west corner, and if you drive from Adelaide to Pipalyatjara it is further than driving from Adelaide to Sydney. Adelaide to Sydney is about 1,380 kilometres, according to the map on the iPhone this morning, and it is about 1,700 kilometres to Pipalyatjara—another 300-odd kilometres further than driving to Sydney. Even driving to Amata, which is where I understand the road is going to finish up, is further than driving to Sydney.

The tyranny of distance is so real out in the APY lands. I encourage every member in this place, if they have not been to the APY lands, to go up there—go up there with the local member or go up there with the Aboriginal lands committee. We are going up there again at the end of June, I think. We welcome other members of this place—there are spare seats on the plane—to come with us and see the APY lands, to come and see what a beautiful place it is and what fantastic people are living on those lands and to see where this money is going.

I am very concerned that the jobs that will be created in this particular project will not be the 30 per cent we are targeting. I hope that RASAC (Regional Anangu Services Aboriginal Corporation) gets some of the work here. I was speaking to Mark Jackman, the new general manager of RASAC, just last week, and he was concerned that there would not be the jobs there. We should be making it an imperative that, whoever is managing these contracts, whether it is DPTI or private contractors, those jobs will be given, wherever possible, to Anangu either for training or for on-the-job development.

The need for good roads up there is vital because you need to provide good food. Last week, I was with minister Maher out at the Toll depot at Regency Park for the launch of the Mai Wiru/Toll partnership. Mai Wiru is Aboriginal or Pitjantjatjara for 'good food'. Mai Wiru is the Aboriginal organisation that runs most of the stores on the APY lands. They now have, with the ability to travel, there weekly, an A-double refrigerated transport going up there—

Mr Pederick: A road train.

Dr McFETRIDGE: It is a road train, I am informed by the member for Hammond—taking fresh food. At the moment, those roads shake those vehicles to pieces. I travelled once in one of the new school buses out there, and I asked the teacher how long the new bus would last and he said, 'Only a matter of months, really, going over these roads,' as the roads up there are so rough.

We need this sort of project in place, not just to reduce the number of accidents and improve road safety and make it easier to access everything from the stores, to the communities and to the airstrips, but also to make the people who live on those lands feel that they are part of South Australia and not living in a different country. Many times, I think they are living in a different country up there. They might predominantly speak a different language, but they are part of South Australia and they deserve this money. I congratulate the federal government on stumping up the money, and I certainly look forward to the project being completed.

I will finish by saying one thing: we have seen a lot of issues in the media, and we have spoken about them in this place, about management of the finances of APY. Here is another case: the legal advice that was sought for the management of this contract between APY and the state government was put out for expressions of interest. I understood that there was one offer of solid

legal advice from Alice Springs for $7,000, but for some reason the APY Executive decided to give the legal contract to Johnston Withers at $23,000. Why is that so?

This is why I was pleased to read minister Maher's ministerial statement yesterday that there will be this extra emphasis on managing, observing and opening up for more transparency the financial management on the APY. This is a great project, it needs to be managed well, it needs to be completed on time and on budget, and we need to make sure that we continue to advance the issues for Aboriginal people, not just in the APY but all over South Australia.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:38): I recognise the contributions of both the member for Finniss and the member for Chaffey, members of the Public Works Committee, and also from the member for Morphett. I am pleased that we have bipartisan support for this project because it is a necessary project and socially just. I know from speaking to some of the elders from the land just recently that they are welcoming this project for many reasons, not just for accessibility but also for the employment opportunities. I thank everyone involved in this project: the witnesses, the executive officer and the administrative officer of the Public Works Committee and fellow committee members.

Motion carried.

Motions

E-CIGARETTES

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:46): I move:

That this house establish a select committee to investigate and report on e-cigarettes and any legislative and regulatory controls that should be applied to the advertising, sale and use of personal vaporisers; and in particular—

(a) the potential for personal vaporisers to reduce tobacco smoking prevalence and harms;

(b) the potential risks of these products to individual and population health from vapour emissions, poisoning and the reduced impact of tobacco control measures;

(c) make recommendations on approaches to the regulation of personal vaporisers under the Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997, including addressing the following areas—

(i) availability and supply;

(ii) sales to minors;

(iii) advertising and promotion;

(iv) use in smoke-free areas;

(v) product safety and quality control; and

(d) any other relevant matters.

Electronic nicotine delivery systems, also known as electronic cigarettes, e-cigarettes or personal vaporisers, are battery operated devices that can vaporise liquid nicotine into a fine aerosol, which is inhaled into the lungs. Alternatives that do not contain nicotine are also available, and they are available in many flavours. The devices are designed to simulate the look and feel of smoking. Electronic nicotine delivery systems are not specifically regulated, although some are captured by legislation in place if they contain nicotine or look like cigarettes.

Electronic nicotine delivery systems are often marketed as healthier alternatives to conventional tobacco cigarettes; however, conclusive evidence on the health risks or benefits of these systems is not likely to be available for years or even decades. A recent World Health Organisation report recommended that electronic nicotine delivery systems should be regulated to protect public health and ensure that the public has reliable information about risks and benefits.

It is important that we understand the health risks associated with these e-cigarettes to individuals and the community as well as the potential for their use in reducing smoking prevalence. Currently, people can vape on the bus or in a workplace, whereas laws have been in place for decades preventing people from smoking in these same spaces. South Australia does not have legislation designed specifically to regulate these e-cigarettes, but some are captured by legislation in place. Electronic nicotine delivery systems that resemble tobacco products are captured by section 36 of the South Australian Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997, which provides that:

A person must not sell by retail any product (other than a tobacco product) that is designed to resemble a tobacco product.

This carries a maximum penalty of $5,000. The liquid nicotine designed to use in the electronic nicotine delivery systems is a schedule 7 poison regulated under the Controlled Substances Act 1984. It must not be used for domestic purposes and it is an offence to sell it without a permit, which is not provided for electronic nicotine delivery systems retail sales.

Other legislation that applies to tobacco and smoking does not apply to electronic nicotine delivery systems. This includes bans on sales to minors, use in closed areas, promotion and display. The Therapeutic Goods Administration has not approved electronic nicotine delivery systems for use as aids in withdrawal from smoking and, therefore, these e-cigarettes cannot be sold as quitting aids at this particular time.

In January 2015, Queensland became the first Australian jurisdiction to regulate e-cigarettes in the same way as tobacco products are regulated. New South Wales has announced that it will ban the sale of electronic nicotine delivery systems to minors, while the Australian Capital Territory has undertaken public consultation on proposed regulation. The Western Australian government has successfully prosecuted an electronic nicotine delivery systems retailer for selling a product designed to resemble a tobacco product. The Western Australian Supreme Court found that 'resemble' includes how a product is used as well as its appearance. An appeal to this decision has recently been lodged with the Full Bench of the Supreme Court of Western Australia.

Data from Australia's Poison Information Centre show that calls regarding accidental poisonings from nicotine intended for use in electronic nicotine delivery systems increased from two in 2009 to 54 in 2015. There is sufficient evidence to recommend a precautionary approach to the sale and use of electronic cigarettes. A 2014 World Health Organisation report has found that electronic cigarette aerosol is not merely water vapour, and its use poses serious threats to adolescents and foetuses. In addition, it increases exposure of non-smokers and bystanders to nicotine and a number of other toxins. The report recommends that electronic cigarettes should be regulated to achieve the following regulatory objectives:

- to impede the promotion to and uptake of electronic nicotine delivery systems by non-smokers, pregnant women and youth;
- to minimise potential health risks to electronic nicotine delivery systems users and non-users;
- to prohibit unproven health claims from being made about electronic nicotine delivery systems; and
- to protect existing tobacco control efforts from commercial and other vested interests of the tobacco industry.

I believe the unregulated environment in which we find these e-cigarettes or electronic nicotine delivery systems being promoted and sold within South Australia is something this select committee will address and make recommendations on.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Speirs.

Resolutions

HUMAN ORGANS TRAFFICKING

Consideration of message No. 7 from the Legislative Council.

Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:47): I move:

That the amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Ms VLAHOS: I move:

That the members of this assembly on the joint committee be Mr Duluk, Ms Digance and myself.

Motion carried.

Motions

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr van Holst Pellekaan:

That this house request the Legislative Review Committee to inquire into an amendment to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Regulations 2011 to enable de facto relationships to be recognised on the register recording the death of a person (death certificate).

(Continued from 25 March 2015.)

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:48): I rise to speak and thank the member for moving this motion. It is an important and emotional issue with far-reaching effects for those who are involved in the issue. The government supports the motion.

The member, in moving the motion, has asserted that South Australia is the only Australian jurisdiction that does not record de facto relationships on death certificates. The government acknowledges that all other Australian jurisdictions recognise de facto relationships on death certificates to some degree; however, the level of recognition differs. The member also spoke about the experience of his constituents. He spoke about a case where a surviving de facto partner was excluded from recognition on the death certificate despite being in a relationship for 33 years—a heartfelt recount.

The government acknowledges that people in such circumstances would most probably consider they should be recognised on their de facto partner's death certificate. However, in the interest of pragmatism we need to recognise that there are issues associated with including de facto relationships in the register recording the death of a person. These issues may include: how the de facto relationship would be verified; in the case of a dispute how to manage the risk that may arise from inclusion on the death certificate of such a relationship; defining what a de facto relationship may be; and whether the name of the de facto partner at the time of the death should be recorded, or should all known de facto partners be recorded.

How decisions will be made on requests to add or remove a de facto partner after the death is registered also needs to be addressed. For these reasons and for the few complexities that I have highlighted here, the government considers that referral to the Legislative Review Committee may be the most appropriate avenue to consider the issues associated with the inclusion of de facto relationships on the register recording the death of a person.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:50): I appreciate the government's support for this motion. The best way to go was carefully thought through by my colleagues and me in our party room and we resolved that, for some of the reasons mentioned by the member for Elder on behalf of government, the Legislative Review Committee would be the best way to go, so I do appreciate that.

Let me say again in the brief time that is available to me, I am not looking to confer any additional rights on people that do not already exist but I think it is important that those rights that do exist are fairly recognised on a death certificate. We all know people who are in really good, wholesome, loving family relationships who are not married, and if one of those people were to die then the partner would not be recognised if that was a de facto relationship. Obviously that has an impact on the surviving partner, the children and grandchildren—whatever that family make up is.

I think it is a very fair and reasonable thing to essentially try to contemporise the act and to bring the act into the modern day world and allow what is already recognised in many other forms of administration across our state and nation into that act. I trust that the Legislative Review Committee will consider some of those very basic straightforward principles all the way through to some of the complexities which the member for Elder mentioned as well which need some very genuine consideration.

I also point out that, if the Legislative Review Committee were to agree and propose to parliament, and parliament were to agree with what I think is sensible and what I outlined in my first opportunity to speak on this motion, it would not in any way undervalue any previous marriage in any way. Using, for example, the constituent of mine or one of the examples that I used previously whereby a person died after being in a de facto relationship for over 30 years, and the partner was left feeling, understandably, dreadfully sad that they were not recognised on the death certificate,

and that the person who died had previously been married. That previous marriage should also continue to be recorded on the death certificate.

It is no judgement in one way or another about how that marriage ended, whether it was because one of the married people died or whether it was a divorce, whether it was amicable or bitter, it is just a record of that person's life—and a really critical, important, poignant component of their life. I think most of us would agree that today de facto relationships would be included in that record.

I also touch on one of those complexities which the member for Elder raised, that is, how do you determine which de facto relationships would be on a death certificate, because we all know that in the real world people can have a series of relationships. Again, that is not a negative comment about them; they might well have all been very positive. However, if a person went through their life having a range of different relationships, how would they be recorded on the death certificate?

I think that, for me at least, is probably the most complicated issue for the Legislative Review Committee to address, and I would be more than happy to participate in that discussion at whatever level the committee would like me to. Again, I thank the government for its support, I thank my colleagues for their support, and I look forward to the good work of the Legislative Review Committee.

Motion carried.

SPEED DETECTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Wingard:

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

(a) the operation of speed cameras and speed detection devices in South Australia;

(b) the relationship between the location of speed cameras and the incidence of road accidents;

(c) the impact of constantly changing speed limits and the effectiveness of speed limit signage;

(d) the effectiveness and appropriateness of current penalties for speeding offences, including a review of fines imposed;

(e) the operation of the Community Road Safety Fund; and

(f) any related matters.

(Continued from 25 March 2015.)

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (11:55): I return to my remarks on this item regarding speed cameras which we last spoke about at the end of March. As I was saying in my previous comments, I actually question whether or not there is any real policy framework which attempts to establish the reasoning behind the installation of a speed camera or a red-light camera. There is only one fixed camera in my electorate and that is at the intersection of Brighton Road and Sturt Road, actually just a few metres from my electorate office, and it is probably in a fair position—I have no issue with it. The area has no green arrow turn from Brighton Road into Sturt Road, so it is imperative for road safety that people are not tempted to run the red light when a vehicle is taking the opportunity of the change of lights to turn into Sturt Road. In my view, that fixed camera is a useful safety precaution.

However, we see time and time again examples of safety cameras and traffic patrolling which may not necessarily be connected with road safety but instead might be more to do with revenue-raising. As members of parliament, when we identify an area which might benefit from a red-light camera being installed to improve local community safety, I have found first-hand that it is quite difficult to get anything to happen. Recently I was approached by the year 1/2 students of Seacliff Primary School, and I want to read the letter that they sent me:

Dear Mr Speirs

Yesterday we had a big problem at our school traffic lights and it was very scary. The lights did not work when we headed to go home and fast trucks kept coming down the hill and so we were stuck. We rang the police but they did not come. Our teachers had to help us across the road but it was not safe for them. We need cameras to stop speeding trucks at our school crossing. They are always speeding. Come and have a look. Why do some schools have cameras and we don't? Brighton Road is very busy. Can you please help us to get some cameras so that we can always be safer.

Love from Room 5 Year 1/2 children, Seacliff Primary School

So, the students at Seacliff Primary School have written to their local member, and I took Jacinta Day, the chair of the governing council, along to catch up with the Minister for Road Safety to discuss whether this was actually an area where we could get a red-light fixed camera installed.

Unfortunately I had a very bizarre meeting with the minister. I was grateful that he agreed to meet but he was not able to tell us the decision-making process around the installation of one of these cameras, and we left quite confused. The minister agreed to go to Seacliff Primary School, although I do not think he has done that yet, to observe the situation.

The school is at the bottom of a very steep hill where the road speed changes. I am not sure necessarily if a red-light camera there would make the intersection or the crossing safer, but what I do think it would do is create more caution for drivers moving through that area at the bottom of the hill and raise awareness that there is a school crossing on a very busy road—a road that has 45,000 vehicle movements a day. I will continue to lobby on behalf of the students of Seacliff Primary School and hope that the government will start to listen.

We have seen speed cameras appear outside schools on a regular basis in marginal government-held seats. I know there is one outside Richmond Primary School, there is one outside Seaview High School, and there is also one outside Black Forest Primary School on South Road—all within marginal government-held seats. There is no real difference between having red-light cameras outside those schools and Seacliff Primary School and Brighton Primary Schools—two schools which, I think, are in greater need.

What we need is a policy framework in the public domain outlining very clearly the decision-making process when it comes to installing one of these cameras. I do not think we have that in the public domain at the moment; we have confusion between revenue raising and legitimate road safety measures, and the community would benefit significantly from being able to know the reasons behind the installation of speed cameras. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2015

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 May 2015.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:01): I rise to indicate my support for the Supply Bill presently before the parliament to approve the appropriation of $3.29 billion for the continued operations of government, in particular the salaries of public servants and continued funding of programs pending the consideration and approval of the budget yet to be presented by the government.

The fiscal performance of the current government is clearly woeful. Nevertheless, we understand the responsibility of maintaining the operation of government pending budget approval. What I will say is this: in simple terms, it is of great concern to me that the government continue to be blind to the annual deficit and accumulating state debt.

In the time I have been here in parliament, they have had a continuous clearing sale of just about everything that moves—and there is not much left. Although there is some stock left in the Housing Trust, according to a recent government announcement it is to sell everything within a 10-kilometre region. That will affect my electorate because they will be selling those first—unquestionably a quick, available sale.

They still have the desal plant and some wastewater treatment plants, but I do not doubt for one moment, at the rate the government is going, that they will be up for grabs in due course as well. They have announced they are selling the MAC—a sacred cow some would say, but I would say a well-performing asset—and it is with no justification other than to raid its resources and reserves to prop up the government's inefficiency.

Also for sale is the State Administration Centre. In the CBD, the heart of government, these properties are up for sale. They have sold just about every government building, but now the Education Building and the headquarters for government in State Administration are for sale. And because they have not been able to get a sale, they throw in another sweetener, the Torrens Building, which they promised, back in the original announcement, would not be sold.

Again, the government is desperate: they sold the forests under value and they sold the lotteries commission and they are now getting to the bottom of the barrel. They need to understand that there is not much left. South Australians cannot continue to prop up the irresponsible financial management of this administration.

The state's indicia of economic performance and the great social cost that follows and social dislocation from our unemployment and the fact that we are now top of the ladder for our performance in relation to making it attractive for our young people to stay in South Australia when they are still leaving in droves just confirms how economically stagnant we are.

In economic terms, I think that the only other underperforming jurisdiction, other than South Australia, of course, is the Northern Territory and, given their financial position and minimal population, that is understandable. So, we are top of the pack in leading indicia such as unemployment and bottom of the pack in economic performance. Is it little wonder that we have still anyone in South Australia who is not looking for greener pastures.

The government's announcement in relation to health reform, on the back of complaint about some alleged reduction of financial contribution by the people in Canberra, and taking no accountability themselves, is to attempt to abolish the Health Performance Council. They have finally backtracked on that, but they are still pursing their Transforming Health agenda on the basis that they say that they can justifiably increase our health services in South Australia, yet they want to cram seven emergency departments in our major metropolitan hospitals into three. I think that is scandalous and completely undermines their public commitment to the health and welfare of South Australians.

Their more recent announcement that they would close the Repatriation General Hospital as an acute health services hospital is something the public has been outspoken about and will continue to be. It is a scandalous decision by the government and it is a complete abrogation of responsibility to those who have served our country and to the families who have needed their services in the past and will continue to need their services.

As to infrastructure, notwithstanding the whinging and whining of the government in respect of its alleged poor circumstances with respect to the federal government, the government is doing things with infrastructure which continue to scandalise and undermine its claims of being financially responsible.

The Torrens Junction grade separation of freight and passenger rail, for example, a project which has stagnated and which is inconsistent with the state government's own published plan, will leave us in a circumstance where $232 million of federal money is sitting parked in an account and not being applied. It is just scandalous! On one hand, the Treasurer and the Premier come into this place and repeatedly go on about the federal government. There is money sitting in accounts which, if they got their act together and did their job, would ensure that we had that money applied and, in this case, would address the very dangerous situation we have in South Australia, where our construction sector is desperate for work.

It is critical for South Australia to start putting forward quality projects for that government funding. Every state is in there getting the money. We have an infrastructure Prime Minister and we have Warren Truss out there on a regular basis saying that he is ready to build Australia, yet South Australia is sitting on its hands, sitting back here whinging and not getting those projects ready. Again, it is a scandalous mismanagement and not dealing with the importance of ensuring that we have work for South Australians and opportunity for our young.

I also want to say today, on a particular infrastructure project, how deeply disappointed I was in the government's announcement that they would have an ANZAC walk along Kintore Avenue as our Gallipoli centenary year foundation item. The states had an opportunity to put in to get

commonwealth money, put in a bit themselves and to seek, in this case, Adelaide City Council support for that project.

In terms of the 100 Years of ANZAC celebrations, in particular the Gallipoli recognition of the service and sacrifice of men and women in that conflict, we have known about the projects that were to be done to support the celebration of that centenary, yet the government has not even turned the first sod! This is a brick walkway. It is not some great huge construction. It is a $10 million project. You would think that they would at least have had that ready for when we had the significant recognition day on 25 April this year. However, it is still on the drawing board and we are waiting for that to take place.

This is a year of recognition of the contribution that South Australians have made to the Great War, World War I. I would hope some recognition is given by someone in the government (whether it is here in Parliament House or in the walkway) to those who have been members of this parliament who have given service and served in public life, whether they be governors, premiers, members of parliament or those who have held judicial positions. There is all manner of people in leadership roles in South Australia who have made their contributions as well.

Dr Weste, of our library, has provided me with a list of those in our parliament who have served, and I will briefly refer to them. Mr Edward Bagot, MLC from 1938 to 1941, in 1916 embarked Adelaide as a lieutenant in the 1st Australian Wireless Signals Squadron. John Bice, MLC from 1941 to 1959 for the Liberal Country League, enlisted in July 1916. Arthur Seaforth Blackburn, a member in the House of Assembly, is well known to members, I am sure, because of his decoration as a contributor both at Gallipoli and then in France in 1916. He was later a state president of the RSL from 1946 to 1949. He was highly decorated and awarded the VC.

George Fedor Baron Hundt Bockelberg was the member for Eyre for the Liberal Country League from 1956 to 1968 and enlisted in the 9th Light Horse Regiment in February 1915 and served at Gallipoli and the Western Front. Horace Bowden was an ALP member for Gouger from July 1943 to April 1944 and enlisted in 1916. Norman Brookman, MLC from 1941 to 1949, served in France as a gunner with the 11th Brigade Field Artillery. Archie Cameron was the member for Wooroora from 1927 to 1934 for the Country Party and enlisted in the AIF in 1916 and fought on the Western Front.

William Joseph Denny was a member of the House of Assembly for the United Labor Party, the member for West Adelaide from 1900 to 1902 and Adelaide from 1902 to 1933. His descendant Bill Denny, of course, has served in veterans organisations in South Australia. He enlisted in 1915 and was commissioned in 1916 as Second Lieutenant in the 9th Light Horse and was awarded other decoration. Lieutenant Colonel James O'Loghlin, a member of the Labor Party, was involved in SA's volunteer forces from 1883 and enlisted at age 62 in August 1915. I also mention George Yates, MHR for Adelaide from 1914 to 1919 and then again from 1922 to 1931 for the ALP.

I conclude by particularly acknowledging Sir Thomas Playford, whose portrait adorns this chamber. He was a member of this parliament as the member for the seat of Murray from 1933 to 1938 and, when its name changed to Gumeracha, from 1938 to 1968 for the Liberal Party. He enlisted in May 1915 for the 27th Battalion. He landed at ANZAC Cove in September 1915 and served three months there. Then he fought on the Western Front in France and Belgium. He was severely wounded and promoted to Lieutenant. I particularly acknowledge him, but in no way do I suggest that does not recognise those who have otherwise served. However, he was severely injured and, notwithstanding that, returned and made a very substantial contribution.

I will refer to Stewart Cockburn's reference in the chapter titled 'Death's Feast' in *Playford: the Benevolent Despot*, which he published some years ago. A whole chapter is dedicated to his service. I think it tells us of the character of those who served and, I am proud to say, of those amongst them who have served us here in the parliament on all sides of politics, when he wrote that German messages were 'fired by means of de-fused rifle grenades into the Australian positions', and this is at the time they had arrived in enemy territory:

'Welcome, you brave Australian heroes, [they] said. 'Soon your blood will stain the fields of France. You will find the German dog can bite. Witness Verdun.' It was a taunt full of prophetic, deathly truth.

Playford was to fight with his battalion in slaughter houses like those at Messines, The Somme The Ancre, the Ypres Salient, Passchendaele and Pozieres Ridge. He was to be terribly wounded at Flers, near the end of the

last battles of the long campaign on The Somme with their appalling suffering and casualties. Few Australian soldiers saw more action than he did. Few endured the hell of war more stoically. Yet hardly a word in his own handwriting survives to disclose what his own inner feelings and emotions may have been, or to betray what misery or fear he experienced. A few postcards written to his mother survive. According to Sir Walter Crocker, some prayers, perhaps chosen by his mother, were found after his death in his wartime wallet, one of the few mementoes of the war he had bothered to keep. His family say they can now find no trace of these prayers, of which even Lady Playford, on the eve of her own death in 1986, seemed unaware. Of his sensitivity to the ghastliness of all the events he witnessed there can be no doubt. His family and those close friends sometimes watched tears trickle down his cheeks as anniversary occasions recalled to him things he was so characteristically reluctant to speak about.

The contribution that South Australians made who then came back and served in public life and, in particular, in this parliament, does, I think, deserve some acknowledgement.

I would hope the government would consider, in addition to the walk they are doing, that we do something here in the parliament to recognise those who have served and indeed to provide at least the facility to ultimately embrace others who have served in other subsequent conflicts who have also served in the parliament.

I think it would be a fitting tribute to this parliament to ensure that, just as we have recognised women in the parliament, on special occasions we do recognise the sacrifice of those who, like Sir Thomas Playford, who went on to serve over 26 years as a premier of the state, made that contribution and returned really in humility and in silence. Really, only now and in recent decades are we uncovering the extraordinary contribution they made. With that, I endorse the passage of the Supply Bill.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (12:17): I stand to make my contribution on today's Supply Bill which is before the house and note that we are asking for $3.291 billion of funding to be released for the state government to be able to spend. I appreciate those periods in the parliamentary calendar when we are able to get out and about in our electorates. We have just had a few weeks of not sitting here, and I have certainly been able to connect with my electorate in a more consistent way than when it is broken by parliamentary sittings.

I have been out and about doing a concerted doorknocking campaign and meeting with as many people and organisations as possible to get a good understanding of what makes them tick and what they want me, as their local representative, to be following up on and to get a better understanding of their ideas and opinions not just of me but also of the state government that is governing South Australia at the moment.

I just want to run through a few issues which I think are on the radar of members of the South Australian community at the moment and which have a clear connection to the appropriation of funds because they are all economic or spending related. These are issues that come up time and time again in my electorate in one form or another, whether that is on the doorstep or through people directly contacting the Bright electorate office.

I want to focus on one issue that quite a few members have spoken on in the last few days, and that is the issue of pensioner concessions. It is a state government responsibility to fund this concession and, as we know, the federal government over the years has provided a contribution towards the provision of concessions in general, and obviously that connects through to the pensioner concession on council rates.

Yesterday, the shadow minister for local government, the member for Goyder, tabled a petition with over 13,000 names calling for the reinstatement of pensioner concessions because there is a huge amount of uncertainty, at both local government administration level and amongst elected members in local government but also, in particular and much more importantly, amongst older and more vulnerable people in our community, people living on fixed incomes who really have to watch the dollar and keep a very strict household budget, and the loss of a concession, which amounts to around $190 per annum on the council rates, is substantial.

I speak to a lot of people in my electorate—and my electorate is a particularly elderly electorate, with a lot more older people living within the boundaries of Bright than the average South Australian electorate—and I speak to a lot of older people whose council rates are actually the biggest single bill they receive in a year. They may own their home freehold so they do not have mortgage payments, and they keep an eye on electricity and water—issues that are rising and keep

on rising—but the single biggest bill they receive through the letterbox on an annual basis is their council rates. I think that is something that councils need to be particularly aware of.

There is a role for councils to do better in terms of cutting their cloth to suit the economic times and also looking directly at their rate-setting policies and trying to do a better job with that. I do acknowledge, as someone who used to serve on the City of Marion council, that councils can do a lot better in this area to provide rate relief just by doing business better and avoiding duplication with other tiers of government—something that I think happens all too often in local government. I am quite happy to criticise local government and to actually say that they have a role here in cost of living and affordability as well.

I am quite encouraged to see some South Australian councils start to wake up to that, and I see my own area, the City of Marion, producing a historic rate projection on which to develop this year's budget. A budgeted rate rise of 2.9 per cent is what they are going to develop the budget on this year, and that is the lowest it has been for many years. As someone who continually tried to fight for lower rates when I was on council and never had the numbers to make that happen, I am quite happy to see it happening now because I think the City of Marion's 5 per cent average rate rise was not sustainable in the local community and certainly impacted on household budgets.

I am also pleased to see the number 3 in front of the City of Holdfast Bay's annual rate rise: it looks like it will come in at about 3.8 per cent. Councils do seem to be rising to the challenge to cut their cloth according to economic situations and recognising that there are challenges facing the South Australian community. I also note that Adelaide City Council is going to have what essentially seems to be a rate freeze, and also I saw in the media that the Norwood, Payneham and St Peter's council's rate rise will be around about 1.8 per cent. I think that is good to see and we need more of that.

In reflecting on the situation with local government revenue and rates, I have to make comment on this situation of pensioner concessions which has become, in my view, a really cynical political game being exploited by the state Labor government at the moment, creating uncertainty and playing to the politics of fear, which is the worst type of governance that any government can follow.

It is very disappointing that the federal government has administered a cut to the concession funding. I am the first one to say that I am disappointed in that, but, at the same time, that cut only amounts to 10 per cent of the entire pensioner concession, so how can the flow-through effect of this be the entire removal of the pensioner concession, which amounts to around $190? The federal government's cut has been used as a trigger by this state government to remove that entire concession, stripping pensioners of $190 of rate relief. This comes off the household costs of some of our most vulnerable citizens, those who have to rely on fixed incomes, and often low fixed incomes.

If the federal government's reduction on funding was the real reason for the state government's decision, a $19 cut would be flagged, not the loss of the full concession. It is clear that after years of financial mismanagement, this state Labor government is grasping at straws, and I cannot believe that they can do so with straight faces while attacking the most vulnerable people in our community.

Another issue that I want to touch on briefly, an area where perhaps we are not directing enough funding from the money that is being appropriated through the Supply Bill, is child protection. During our time away from parliament, there has been the handing down of the Coroner's report into the death of Chloe Valentine. I took some time to read that and to look at the various contributions in our state's media about that. I can really say from the bottom of my heart that I was deeply affected by what I read in the Coroner's report and what I read in the media about what happened to Chloe Valentine.

In my view, it is an entire failure of government if you cannot keep the most vulnerable people in society safe from the sort of abuse that that young girl suffered. It is an absolute tragedy that that occurred under the watch of Families SA and there is no doubt—and this is not my opinion; this is the opinion of our state's Coroner—that there are huge failings within the child protection bureaucracy.

I find it quite startling that Tony Harrison has remained in his position as chief executive of that agency, and I am deeply troubled about his ability to drive culture change when the Coroner's report has said quite clearly that he was sucked into the bad culture present in Families SA rather than being a change for good in that culture. I find that devastating; I think the Coroner's views were devastating, and there is no doubt that this government must see it as a state crisis and look to take immediate action.

I am pleased that legislation will be brought before the house in the coming days to ramp up some of the legislative responses around this, but while that will help, the heart of this problem is a deeply broken culture within Families SA, and our child protection system in this state is woeful, to say the least. It is heartbreaking, and anyone in an elected position within South Australia needs to think deeply about what our role is in terms of keeping the most vulnerable people in the society safe.

There are many people working within Families SA who are trying their very best. It is an incredibly challenging environment. I have had a child protection issue presented to my electorate office in the last couple of weeks and the situation that has unfolded in this young person's life is such a tragedy. You are left asking yourself how there could be such brokenness in our world that results not only in young people becoming the victims of sexual abuse but actually their lives being pulled into the most awful uncontrolled circumstances. These people are just children—12, 13, 14 year olds—involved in the most depraved sexual actions. I was reading through this scenario that was brought to my electorate office, and again it was just heartbreaking.

I have recently been speaking to a couple of friends who work within the child protection system and they told me firsthand stories that not only is what occurred with Chloe Valentine a daily part of their lives and a daily challenge that they face, but it is also getting worse, not better. Their view was that one of the reasons it is getting worse is because of the epidemic of drug addiction, particularly ice, gripping the most vulnerable elements of our community and the desperation that is associated with the need for that drug leading young people (these are children) into doing pretty horrific things.

During the break, the member for Hartley had an article published in support of the federal government's taskforce looking at the ice epidemic in Australia. He suggested that South Australia needs to look very seriously at what the situation is in our suburbs and towns with regard to ice and the damage it is doing. I would support the member for Hartley's position and implore the government to not only look at the child protection system in terms of what needs to be reformed, but what are the causes that are resulting in more people entering the system, and does ice and other drugs actually have an impact there? From what I am hearing from Families SA staff, it certainly does. It is a massive problem facing our state, a massive social problem and one that we really need to get some policy solutions to.

I want to move on to another matter in my electorate at the moment, and that is the closure of the Hallett Cove Police Station, one of several shopfront police stations which are being proposed to be closed by this government, something that was not revealed during the election campaign in 2014. The government continues to put forward the position that it is tough on crime, it wants to be tough on crime, but we now have this announcement, that was not brought up during the election, that eight suburban police stations are to close.

Hallett Cove is an area which has had real difficulties with crime in the past, particularly crime associated with hoon driving, petty vandalism and graffiti. In recent years, the suburb has, however, matured in many ways, but local residents have taken considerable comfort from the fact that a police station was opened in Hallett Cove in 2008. Just 1.5 cycles in the electoral calendar later it is to be closed.

The government made a huge deal in the 2006 election campaign when it won the seat of Bright from the Liberal Party that it would commit to delivering a police station in Hallett Cove if elected in 2006. It was elected in 2006, my predecessor became the member of parliament for Hallett Cove and subsequently that new police station was opened. I remember there was a lot of glossy material that went out into electorate. I remember the police minister at the time, Michael Wright, appeared with Chloe Fox on many of those pieces of material, smiling at the official opening of the

new police station and taking much pride in being able to deliver that election promise. The police station was opened in 2008 and seven years later the shutters are going to be pulled down on it.

We have been told that the presence of these shopfront community police stations have questionable crime prevention outcomes. While that might be the case in some regards, I think in Hallett Cove we have a large suburb, which when you combine in with Trott Park and Sheidow Park (represented ably by the member for Mitchell) we have a community of 24,000 people. That is the size of the City of Mount Gambier. It sits up there on the plateau above the City of Marion by itself.

It is essentially a regional town within the metropolitan area and served with a service centre around the Hallett Cove Shopping Centre, where there is a growing community precinct. We have the Cove Civic Centre opening in a few weeks time, we have several churches and quite a few NGOs and government services based there as well. So, we have this stand-alone community of 23,000 to 24,000 people at Hallett Cove and it is quite a distance from the alternative police stations. Sturt is about eight kilometres or so to the north and Christies Beach is about the same distance to the south.

Those two police stations—Sturt and Christies Beach—are not easily accessible by Hallett Cove residents, and the peace of mind that was provided by having the police station at Hallett Cove was substantial. I have been undertaking a survey of the community, trying to build up evidence in terms of what people think of this police station. Overwhelmingly, people want it to stay but, in particular, it is the peace of mind, the perception that it gives them. If we are to lose the police station, will we be provided with ongoing patrols in the area?

The police commissioner says that the police stations trap police officers in one location and do not enable them to get out into the community to make patrols. If the police station does close, are we going to get a commitment to ongoing patrols around what is essentially in the metropolitan area quite a large and isolated community?

I have written to the police commissioner, Gary Burns, seeking an understanding of crime prevention strategies that will be rolled out around the closure of these police stations, what measures will be taken to give the community confidence that their safety and crime prevention will be a top priority on an ongoing basis with South Australia Police and the state government, and particularly how will we build confidence in the community on an ongoing basis so they can be confident that they are safe despite the police station being closed. I do not want to revert to the days when hoon driving, graffiti vandalism and petty crime was commonplace in Hallett Cove, and I will be fighting hard to ensure that some form of police presence is maintained in that area. I think prevention is much better than cure.

When the police station was opened in 2006, there was much rhetoric from the state Labor government and the previous member that this was a preventative strategy, that it was going to create a police station presence in that community. I am going to be fighting very hard in my communications with the Minister for Police and the police commissioner to ensure that Hallett Cove—and no doubt I will be working alongside the member for Mitchell—and the related communities of Trott Park and Sheidow Park have confidence in security and that crime reduction and crime prevention is maintained, because prevention is better than cure and a police presence in our community is vitally important.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:37): I rise to support the Supply Bill. I would like to focus a lot of my discussion today on our health system in South Australia and go through, I guess, the complete picture of health in this state, from prevention right through to hospital care. The reason I want to talk about health in particular is that it has obviously been a very controversial issue in recent times and probably over most of the last century. It is also the largest part of state expenditure that this Supply Bill is dealing with. We spend something like $5.2 billion on our health budget every year, and this Supply Bill, which many members have said is quite a large amount of money, is only $3.3 billion. So, it does not even cover the whole health budget by itself. It is a really substantial area of government expenditure and it is becoming larger and larger every year as a percentage of every tax dollar that we collect in South Australia.

The projections are quite scary. If the growth rate of 8 or 9 per cent in health expenditure every year continues, versus a 4 or 5 per cent increase in tax revenue, within the next 20 years the whole state budget is going to be taken up by health expenditure. We will not have an education

system, we will not have an environment department and we will not have social services, because every dollar we receive will have to be spent on health. That is obviously a huge pressure for all other government departments and agencies. I note through the budget process every year that all agencies need to put up budget savings, and a lot of that money inevitably always needs to be spent on the health system.

We talk about the health system, and it is arguable as to whether Australia really has a system as such compared to some of the international systems where things work together much more seamlessly. We can look at countries like the United Kingdom, with its National Health Service that covers the whole breadth of health within the one system, or even in America where there are some private systems such as Kaiser Permanente which covers everything from preventative health through to chemists and doctors, through to hospital care, all within a closed system.

We, of course, do not have that in Australia or South Australia. We have a huge split across hospitals, primary health care, preventative care, aged care, respite care, ambulance care, private hospitals, private health insurance—they are all providing different services with different governance systems, with different funding sources, with different workforce issues and with different model of care changes. As a patient you need to use those services seamlessly. You need them to be available when and where you need them. You need them to provide you with the right service in the right place at the right time.

However, from an administration or government perspective it is very hard to coordinate all those different services together to provide the care that we want for patients. Then combine that with all the challenges that we see externally heading onto the health system, particularly first and foremost the ageing of our population. That is something that I talked about in my maiden speech and it is always going to be a focus for me as a member in this place.

I think one of the greatest challenges that we face as a state is how we are going to continue to provide services at the level that we expect for people in the baby boomer population—which is going to be a huge proportion of people in coming years. The number of people over 65 is going to balloon but also the number of people over 80 and the number of people over 100 is going to balloon over the next 20 years. That is going to increase the demand that all of our health system faces, which is going to increase the amount of money that we need to spend on it but also the supply will be constrained in terms of the amount of workforce that we will be able to find to provide those services.

There is also an increasing burden of chronic disease that we have seen in Australia which impacts as well; there is increasing demand for treatments; and there is an increasing demand for medical and nursing staff. Technology in health care is becoming more and more expensive. Therefore, as well as health inflation rising we are also seeing the demand and utilisation of the health system rising.

Sometimes you hear people ask, 'Why is the health budget going up by such a large amount; shouldn't it just be going up at the inflation rate?' It is not quite like the inflation rates that you see impacting on grocery prices; it is more like if you are going to your supermarket, the inflation rate is going up but you are also purchasing more at the same time so you are getting a double effect on the increase of your bill every week. That is what the health system is facing.

In South Australia we have already seen something like a 90 per cent increase in our health budget over the past 13 years, since 2002, which is a massive increase and certainly no other area of government expenditure has seen that sort of increase. It is very questionable as to how sustainable that is.

Ultimately, from our health system, we want to make sure that people stay healthy for the longest period of time and that, when you get sick or injured, we want people to be able to be treated quickly, safely and close to where they are and in an environment that is safe and is going to make them better. However, to do that requires work across the whole spectrum of services. Right from having a preventative health system which, where it works—and there are a number of areas where it has been demonstrated to work very well, such as tobacco control—we have seen it as the most effective and the most efficient way of improving the lives and healthcare outcomes for people.

Then there is primary health care where it can be very effective in improving the coordination of care and keeping people healthy and out of hospital for longer. However, that can lengthen people's lives, though, which can ultimately be more expensive; but surely that is an outcome that we want to see.

Aged care has transformed from merely being a housing focus. In aged care homes there used to be people who would be able to park outside their home in the aged care centre because they were still well enough to drive a car while they were in aged care. That obviously is not the case now; the focus now in aged care is on nursing care and providing, in particular, care for people with dementia—that has become a much-increased focus.

Then, of course, there is hospital care—particularly public hospitals, which are always our focus. It will always be the case that the most complex care is provided there, and it is the backstop for our system. But, in Australia we cannot ignore the private health system as well; they have a very important role to play in our mixed system—particularly private health insurance and private hospitals.

Private health insurance is a bit limited in terms of what services it can actually provide, and therefore there is a very heavy reliance on the publicly funded aspects of the health system (particularly Medicare and hospitals) as well as out-of-pocket expenses. Most people who use the private health system, even if they are heavily insured, still end up paying quite a lot out of pocket. Also, the private hospital sector is very important, but that has arguably been much smaller in South Australia than in other states.

Here in this parliament we have limited control over that continuity of care in South Australia. We have limited control over the funding that is provided, the standards that are imposed and the governance for each part of those systems. Therefore, being in charge of that system, it is very difficult to control all those moving parts, particularly with so many external factors impacting.

The greatest progress towards sorting this out in recent years has been the long process of national health reform that occurred over the previous decade. While that has not been perfect, it did make some significant differences in, first and foremost, creating a proper incentive for the commonwealth to take action. Up until that point in time, we saw a system where the commonwealth would only have to increase their payments to hospitals by a few per cent a year, which accounted for the inflation that we saw, but not the growth in demand that we saw.

That meant that the commonwealth could wipe its hands of a lot of the issues in terms of the demand of hospitals, and so they did not have the incentive to put back into primary health care or to put back into preventative health care. What we saw in national health reform was a proper incentive for the commonwealth to take action and they, for the first time, committed to funding 50 per cent of new hospital costs on the system. So, they were going to be an equal partner in that growth funding that was needed. Plus, there was going to be activity-based funding directly to local hospital networks, which would create the incentive for those systems—those local hospital networks—to operate as efficiently as possible on a national basis, and to compete against each other to make sure that they were the most efficient and that they could reap the rewards of the efficiency that they had.

There were also reward payments to states for good governance and for good outcomes for patients, such as faster treatment in emergency departments and shorter waiting lists for elective surgery. It also supported big investments in prevention and primary health care. Now, very unfortunately, all of that has been completely torn up. I would like to think that everybody is very disappointed in this outcome in South Australia and in the South Australian parliament. Really, for our state, this has meant that the commonwealth is no longer a partner in trying to fix these issues that the health system has.

It is something like a $50 billion over 10 years to public hospitals. But, even more than that cut in terms of dollar amounts, what it also means is that the commonwealth can wipe their hands of the public hospital system and wipe their hands of having any impact in trying to fix it. This means that they do not have the incentive to invest in primary health care, they do not have the incentive to invest in preventative health care, or in aged care—all those things that are going to help reduce the costs in public hospitals. For all states and territories we will be left carrying the burden of the impact

that that will have on public hospitals. They want to return to that system where there were increases of slightly more than CPI for public hospital funding, with no increase for growth funding that is desperately needed.

There have been words from the Treasurer in recent days saying, 'Well, public hospitals are state responsibilities, and they have to manage them.' It has never been the case that the commonwealth has completely wiped their hands of public hospitals until those comments. What we have seen is that any idea of a partnership on public hospitals has been completely thrown out of the water, and there is no federal plan on how to address the demands that our public hospitals are facing.

That is what we have seen nationally. Obviously, in South Australia, we have to bear the brunt of whatever those national funding issues are. But, on a more micro level, we have been doing a lot of work since 2002 on reforming our health system in South Australia as best we can, putting aside those important federal issues.

When we came to government, we established the Generational Health Review, which set out a very clear set of principles looking at what health care in South Australia should have. It established very early on that we needed to pivot away from acute hospital care to primary and preventative care to try to reduce that demand on hospitals as the population ages, which I think has been consistent, that we have been trying to address that over that period of time. That, of course, now impacts upon the federal reforms, where trying to segment—states look after hospitals and commonwealth looks after primary—makes that very hard for the state government to do.

In 2007, we brought in the state Health Care Plan 2007-2016, and that was perhaps, up until that point at least, the most significant health reform plan that we have had in this state, of course creating the new Royal Adelaide Hospital to make a much more efficient public hospital system in South Australia, but also opening up a network of GP Plus centres around the state to ensure that we have more primary care and more preventative care to help people stay healthier and keep out of hospital.

Now, we are onto the next step, which is looking at the Transforming Health process. Of course, this review came about from looking at those federal budget cuts and how we are going to be able to help as a health system in managing that, but as time has progressed it has more and more been looking at the data of how our hospitals are not performing very well on a national basis at the moment when you look at things like length of stay in hospitals. When you look at some of the safety and quality measures of whether patients are getting good outcomes in particularly our metropolitan hospitals, the data clearly shows that we have a lot of work to do to improve, and that is what the whole plan has been about: trying to improve those patient outcomes.

There have obviously been some very controversial aspects of that plan. First and foremost, in my electorate the very controversial aspect we had in the draft plan was about Noarlunga Hospital. For a long time Noarlunga Hospital has worked in partnership with Flinders Medical Centre, and I think people very clearly understood the relationship: that Flinders is the large tertiary-level hospital in the south and Noarlunga works in partnership in that. But distance is very important in the south, and for people in my electorate, particularly down in Aldinga, it is a very long way to get up to Flinders if you need treatment. Because of that, some of the proposals in the draft plan caused a lot of concern. Particularly, the issues which caused concern were closing the emergency department and establishing an emergency walk-in clinic and stopping any ambulances coming to the hospital.

When the plan was released, I held a forum in my electorate which was very well attended, and the minister was kind enough to come down and address people and answer their questions about the plan. I also spent a lot of time doorknocking and visiting shopping centres to talk to people about the plan, but also met with a lot of the doctors and nurses. I did this together with the member for Reynell and the member for Fisher. We worked very well as a team of MPs down in the south to look at some of the issues in that draft, and the conclusion we came to was that there were some changes that we believed needed to be made to improve the plan, particularly based on the feedback that we had from the emergency department doctors and nurses at Noarlunga.

The recommendations that we put in to the Transforming Health consultation were that we should:

- keep the emergency department on its current site;
- keep the name as an emergency department (either a community or a local department) and not call it a clinic;
- allow ambulances to still go to Noarlunga when it is safe to do so;
- keep the emergency department open 24 hours a day, seven days a week, with medical and nursing cover available;
- keep the same facilities, in particular things like resuscitation rooms, available, as is the case now; and
- improve facilities for children in the emergency department.

Similar suggestions were not just put by us but were put by those doctors and nurses and by many members of the community into the formal consultation process. I think it is an absolute credit to the Minister for Health that he has listened and acted on those concerns and, in the next iteration of Transforming Health, announced changes to what the plan for Noarlunga Hospital was going to be, which picked up all of the concerns that myself and the members for Fisher and Reynell addressed in our plan. Transforming Health is going to result in some important benefits for Noarlunga, such as more day surgery happening at the hospital, which will mean less travel that people will have to do elsewhere.

Of course, there is a lot of debate about the Repatriation General Hospital. I probably do not have enough time to go through that in its entirety, but I think it is important to note that the care of veterans has changed a lot over time. My grandfather, when he returned from New Guinea in the Second World War, worked at the Repat caring for other veterans. That was a time when veterans went to the Repat and it was the only hospital they went to, and we had a significant number of veterans who would go there.

Nowadays, the number of patients at the Repat who are veterans has gone down from 100 per cent back then to something like 7 per cent today, which is a significant difference, but it makes complete sense. When you look at the fact that particularly veterans who are over 70 mostly have access to a DVA gold card, which means that if they need elective surgery they can get it in any private hospital for free across Australia, why would you not do that?

However, there are important aspects of the Repat that do provide important services for veterans. They include rehabilitation services and post-traumatic stress disorder services in Ward 17. Importantly, in the government's plan we are going to build new facilities for those services, with a focus on veterans, to make sure that those services still continue with the same teams in brand-new facilities.

These health reforms have seen unbelievable levels of scaremongering in the community. Just the other day, we had a forum with Channel 7 at Morphett Vale and heard some more scaremongering there, including claims that people from Aldinga and Sellicks would have to go to Modbury to get their eye surgery. Claims like that are completely false. Procedures like eye surgery will still be available at Flinders Medical Centre, as they are now. However, it highlights that it is very easy for those sorts of scare claims to get around the community, and it is a lot harder to correct them than it is to start them.

We will be doing all we can to make sure that people know the absolute facts about these plans, but we would also like to hear from those people, including the opposition, who criticise the plans. I would like to hear from them what their plans are. Do they have any policies? We did not hear a policy from them at the election. We did not hear a consultation paper being delivered in the Transforming Health paper, so I want to hear what their plans are now that we are in this stage.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:58): I also rise to speak today in support of the Supply Bill and particularly to speak today about Collective Impact and the launch of Together in the South's work last Wednesday 29 April. The launch of this work followed months and months of collective planning by a collective group of leaders from the southern community, community organisations, the City of Onkaparinga, Flinders University and government representatives in our southern community.

Together SA is a South Australian organisation pioneering Collective Impact in South Australia. Collective Impact is an extremely successful results-driven model of social change that brings together large sections of the community, business and government to work together in a new and focused way to achieve lasting and effective results with and for people on difficult and urgent social issues. A key part of the work is that it is place-based and absolutely puts people at the centre of the work in a way which engages and empowers them and develops their leadership.

Successful Collective Impact approaches utilise certain elements, two of which I will talk about today; the first is the collaborative development of a common agenda or shared vision for social change. Typically, the community will have a shared understanding of the specific problem or problems they wish to solve and will work together with all sectors to devise shared strategies for change. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright): Presented a petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to retain and index state government concessions on council rates.

TOD HIGHWAY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders): Presented a petition signed by 640 residents of Eyre Peninsula requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to widen and upgrade the Tod Highway between Kyancutta and Karkoo, in order to provide safe passage for all vehicles.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students from the Golden Grove Lutheran Primary School, who are guests of the member for Wright.

Ministerial Statement

COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: On Friday 17 April, I attended the Council of Australian Governments meeting in Canberra, along with other state and territory leaders, the President of the Australian Local Government Association and the Prime Minister. I am pleased to report that it was a fruitful meeting held in a constructive spirit. Among the list of positive outcomes were discussions on defence, renewable energy and addressing violence against women.

Importantly, COAG acknowledged the contribution that a continuous naval build strategy could make to strengthening Australia's industrial capability, employment, specialist industry skills and workforce capability. States and territories noted the uncertainty regarding the renewable energy target and that a speedy resolution was desirable.

Leaders agreed to take urgent collective action in 2015 to address the unacceptable level of violence against women in Australia. Actions included a national domestic violence order scheme where DVOs could be automatically recognised and enforceable in any state or territory of Australia.

South Australians, indeed all Australians, want a safe and secure job, they want access to health and education, and they want to be supported as they age. They want politicians to work together. They want a vision for this country beyond just more cuts. That is why I am pleased to report to this house that COAG agreed to hold a special retreat in July where such a vision could be

discussed. The leaders' retreat will be dedicated to considering how the federation works and how services like health, education and aged care are funded and delivered. I look forward to this opportunity and to a continuation of the constructive work of the recent COAG meeting.

I am extremely pleased that the $80 billion of cuts to health and education set out in the 2014-15 commonwealth budget will be back on the table for discussion. I can inform the house that the Victorian Premier, Queensland Premier and I yesterday wrote to the Prime Minister welcoming the commitment to the retreat and the discussion of federation issues. We are committed to pursuing a constructive dialogue at the retreat.

However, we believe that the Prime Minister could instil great confidence in the retreat process by immediately reversing the cuts that were made to pensioner concessions. Some jurisdictions have implemented short-term measures that have staved off the direct impact of concession cuts on vulnerable people. In the context of the commonwealth budget, restoring this funding is a moderate sum totalling $1.3 billion nationally over four years, but it would demonstrate good faith with states and territories and the broader Australian public.

LABOUR HIRE PRACTICES

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:04): I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Every worker in South Australia deserves a fair day's pay for a fair and safe day's work. I am sure we are all extremely concerned by the issues raised by ABC TV's *Four Corners* program this week regarding workers in the food industry. No worker should ever have to endure mistreatment, exploitation or harassment at work, and no company should be able to shirk its statutory obligations to provide a safe workplace, return to work and state taxation.

When evidence is presented that indicates a section of an industry is operating outside the law and outside what is acceptable in our society, it is incumbent on governments to act. That is why the Minister for Industrial Relations has directed the relevant South Australian agencies to investigate possible breaches of the law. That is why the government will refer the matter of labour hire industry practice to the parliament's Economic and Finance Committee for inquiry. The Minister for Industrial Relations will shortly write to all members of parliament to consult on the terms of reference for that inquiry, and we will undertake broader consultation as well.

The terms of reference on which we will consult include consideration of non-payment or underpayment of return-to-work premiums; avoidance of taxation liabilities; exploitation, harassment and other forms of mistreatment of workers; non-payment or underpayment of wages and superannuation entitlements; recommendations to ensure a fairer, safer and secure industry; support for a coordinated national approach to this issue; and any other relevant matter. I invite members to contribute to the consultation. I thank the member for Little Para for his eagerness to chair the inquiry and for his initial advice, and I also thank the member for Taylor for her interest and action on this matter. Mr Speaker, the government will work to provide a better regulation of the labour hire industry.

COPPER MINING

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This morning I hosted the South Australian Copper Summit, an event attended by major copper producers, including BHP Billiton, OZ Minerals and Hillgrove Resources, as well as key explorers, service providers and representatives from our Indigenous community. The aim of today's summit was to enlist the support of the resources industry and other stakeholders in developing a South Australian copper strategy. Unlocking the potential of our mineral, energy and renewable assets is the number one economic priority. Making the most of our world-class copper resource needs to be a central element of that objective.

Speakers at today's summit at the redeveloped Adelaide Convention Centre included BHP Billiton's Darryl Cuzzubbo, OZ Minerals' Andrew Cole, EDB and mining veteran Terry Burgess, Greg Hall of Hillgrove Resources, and the highly respected deputy chief executive, Dr Paul Heithersay, and executive director Mr Mark Elford, of the departments of state development and DPTI. This was a formidable array of experts who believe in South Australia and believe that we have a strong future for jobs, investment, exports and economic growth if we can unlock the potential of our copper assets.

I told the summit that South Australia's past success was built on our copper endowment, and I believe that again this valuable resource can support this state's future prosperity. South Australia hosts the country's largest underground mine at Olympic Dam, and we have major copper projects operating at Prominent Hill and Kanmantoo in the Adelaide Hills. The government's message to today's summit—and I will reaffirm it here—is that South Australia needs to look beyond the current commodities cycle to set an ambitious target that reflects our capacity as home to 38 per cent of the nation's copper resource.

This needs to be a nation building goal. So, my challenge to the producers, explorers, the local community, and infrastructure and service providers is to embrace a target to increase our state's output to a scale that will raise Australia in the world rankings of copper producers. Currently, the United States Geological Survey ranks Australian copper production just outside the top five. With a long-term strategy matched by sustained global demand, I believe South Australia's copper reserves can leapfrog Australia into the top three in world production.

We have already taken some steps along this pathway. Our experts tell us that the metallurgy and the geology are challenging. That is why we have invested in a partnership with OZ Minerals to investigate a way to improve the quality of our copper ore for export. It is why we are working with the Deep Exploration Technologies Cooperative Research Centre to overcome the challenges of our ore bodies being locked away under deep cover.

Through PACE Frontiers, the Department of State Development is working in partnership with the Deep Exploration Technologies CRC on a deep mineral systems drilling program in the eastern Gawler Craton. The aim of the program is to map various components of mineral systems below cover, with the potential to identify preferred sites to target specific metal concentrations.

As we develop this strategy, the government will be contacting stakeholders to help identify our strengths and our weaknesses, obstacles that need to be cleared and advantages that need to be built upon so we can realise our full potential as a copper-producing province. We will also be consulting with the South Australian public in the regions, towns and cities, as well as workers and management, scientists and service providers to determine a shared strategy. I ask all members to make a positive contribution to the development of this strategy so that through collaboration we can realise the benefits of our copper assets for all South Australians.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:10): I bring up the sixth report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister detail to the house what disciplinary action has been taken against the Families SA staff highlighted as being negligent by the Coroner in his report into the death of Chloe Valentine?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:11): As members in the house would be well aware, the management of staff is essentially the responsibility of the chief executive. I had a meeting with the

chief executive this morning and at that meeting he informed me that he is undertaking a review of what may have happened in the past in terms of disciplinary procedures and the appropriateness of any activity that might occur in the future. I have no doubt that that will be publicly known in one form or another once that has been completed.

I would like to say though that, while it is appropriate to take seriously criticisms of individual workers—and I'm sure that the chief executive does and that was the nature of the discussion that we had—it is also important to recognise, and as one of the responsible ministers to be responsible for, the need for the practices and procedures and protocols of the department to be the major focus of what requires reform following the Coroner's review.

The vast majority, in fact in all of the recommendations made, there were no particular recommendations made by the Coroner pertaining to individual workers, and those are all useful guides for us in reforming the way in which we operate within Families SA and will be taken very seriously.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): A supplementary, sir: is the minister suggesting that there will be a review into what has taken place in terms of disciplinary action or what shall take place in terms of disciplinary action?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:13): I'm sorry if I was unclear. As I understand it from my meeting this morning with the chief executive, his intention was, and I believe he has already put it into place, given that these circumstances occurred before his tenure as chief executive and obviously before my tenure as minister, he is undertaking a process whereby he is able to determine if any disciplinary action had already occurred, and then in that context what might be appropriate at this point bringing into consideration the report by the Coroner and the findings made.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): A further supplementary: so you are making it clear to the house that there has been no disciplinary action taken since the Coroner brought down his report?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:14): It is my understanding that none has taken place since the Coroner brought down his report and that what the chief executive has done is instigate this review to ensure that all appropriate processes have occurred. That was the nature of our discussion this morning.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): A further supplementary: can the minister confirm if any of the staff involved in the Chloe Valentine case have been promoted and, if so, to what extent?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:14): I don't have any precise details about that. I understand that a proportion of them have already gone to other work previously. I understand that some are still with us and that some are in positions that are higher than they were previously. Whether they are substantively in those positions or acting, I am unclear, and I am unclear about the numbers at this stage.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): Supplementary: will the minister come back to the house and provide us with that detail?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:15): As I said at the beginning—and my answer essentially will be yes, before people get excited about whether or not I am answering the question—it is important that we not become fixated about these individuals. The chief executive, as is appropriate, is going through a process, as he informed me this morning. That process will result in decisions that he will make as chief executive and therefore as the ultimate manager of the staff in question, and I am sure that that will all become public and that that will include, I have no doubt, where people are sitting at the moment.

What I am concerned about is that, while people can make errors or cannot adopt practices that, either with foresight or in hindsight, were not the best, we not become fixated with a witch-hunt or a desire to solve this—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: That this not become an effort to say that the beginning, middle and end of resolving what happened is by identifying individual staff members. It is far more important that we understand that the practices and the procedures within the department have required reform. There has been a process of reform and there will continue to be, and the Coroner has been extremely helpful in guiding how that reform might transpire.

An honourable member: What about the culture?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I know I am not supposed to respond, but it might save another supplementary. Culture is essentially, in an organisation, the build-up of the kinds of qualifications that you expect from your staff members, the training that you provide to your staff members, and the procedures and practices, and indeed leadership within the department, that guide how that operates. Those are all areas in which we have received very useful recommendations from the Coroner, and not only has there been some quite reasonable and useful reform in the last year or so, there will now be far more as a result of that Coroner's report.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How many parents known to Families SA have drug use safety plans in place?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:17): This was a question or a variation of a version of a question which was asked previously by the member for Adelaide and which I took on notice and is still, I believe, on its way back. The challenge in giving a clear and easy answer, which I am sure is what everyone would love, is the number of safety plans that exist within the system and the difficulty of in fact extracting them all to have a look at them.

I think what is of more interest, and probably gets to the kernel of the concern that the leader is raising, is the question of the existence of drugs and the way in which illegal drugs and legal drugs (and by that I mean of course alcohol) interact with the way in which we attempt to keep children safe. What I am clear on and the Coroner is very clear on is that what must sit at the heart of any decisions and any practices, which includes the way in which safety plans are constructed, is that the way that the child's environment is managed is what matters.

By no means are social workers in a place to act as police officers, to see illegal drugs, to act on illegal drugs, to seize them and so on. Their role is to make judgements about the safety of the children. While alcohol is a legal drug, it can cause enormous harm and damage to a child; it can also be completely benign. So, what the social workers are attempting to do is make judgements about the way in which that child's environment is managed.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): A supplementary to that: is the minister suggesting to the house that she will come back to us within a time frame to give us an indication of how many of these safety plans are currently in existence?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:19): As I have indicated, I had previously taken that on notice, when I had been minister for two or three weeks, I think, so there is an answer on its way back because I took that on notice. What I am further indicating to you, as I am coming to understand the way in which the child protection system works and also the system that sits behind that in terms of the way in which information is stored and able to be accessed, is that it may be very difficult to see all of the safety plans in order to give a rigorous answer. What we can do is come back with an answer that is clearer about the practices and protocols that sit around that.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister update the house on the government's commitment to establishing a commissioner for children and young people in South Australia following the Layton report recommendation?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:20): Yes, I can, although I suspect that the leader is fully aware of what I am about to say, which may, in fact, breach the question of what is publicly available and therefore shouldn't be asked about. The opposition spokesperson whom I have been dealing with is Stephen Wade in the other place and, once I took on this role three or so months ago, he and I discussed, leading up to the first week of parliament, the importance of coming to a resolution about what will be in that piece of legislation.

There is a difference of view, which is essentially, I think, a difference in emphasis on the extent to which this would be another ombudsman, another investigative authority—and bear in mind that other states do not have investigative powers and that a lot of the feedback we have had from various stakeholders was not to include that because we would be creating yet another investigative body that would duplicate the work done by others; nonetheless, also recognising the very sincerely held view by the honourable member in the other place and some of the crossbenchers that they desired to see something along those lines, we were engaging in discussion about what kind of accommodation we could reach.

I raised with him that it occurred to me that we have a royal commission that will be advising us on the child protection system and that we might be unwise to bring in another institution which has a role to play in that child protection system without determining whether the royal commissioner might be forming views that would influence that piece of legislation. The honourable member indicated to me that it was reasonable to ascertain that, so I asked Justice Nyland, who furnished me with a letter saying that, indeed, she did think she would be bringing back advice as part of her recommendations that would not only touch on the role of the commissioner but other allied roles. We have a number of institutions that seem to fit around child protection, and she thought that she would probably want to come back with some advice on that.

I discussed that with the honourable member in the other place and indicated to him that I would therefore hold the legislation until that was the case. Such was, I felt, the agreement that we had between us that this was a reasonable approach that I shared the press release I was sending with him and I adjusted a sentence to reflect more accurately something that he wanted to see. I was surprised, then, to see that there was some criticism from the other side about what I thought was a reasonable approach. I accept that people are impatient and would like to see progress occur. What I don't want to see is that we—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Well, it has been three months for me, and what I would like to do is make sure that when we bring in—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the leader.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: What I would like to do is make sure that, when we bring in a brand-new institution, we do it as wisely as we can, without feeling that within a year we would need to alter that act. As I say, I understand that was something that was perceived to be a reasonable position, and I certainly have enormous faith in Justice Nyland to give us useful advice on how to do that.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister outline how many cases out of the 225 applications last year pursuant to section 20(1) of the Children's Protection Act included a drug assessment as a condition of the order?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:24): I don't know, so I will bring that back for you.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Supplementary: given that, since the coronial response, Mr Harrison has indicated publicly on radio that that is an amount he has not yet been able to identify, have you made any inquiry of your department as to how they are progressing to identify that number?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:24): Identify the subset of the 225 that covers drugs? No, I haven't asked specifically about the number. I am interested in the policy that we enact and how we manage it once that is in the Youth Court's jurisdiction, but I will.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Further supplementary: has the minister or anyone in your department made any inquiry of the Drug and Alcohol Unit in the health department, which is charged with the responsibility to undertake the drug assessments to assist the testing of parents suspected of affected use, as to how many have been referred to them in the last year from the minister's department?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:25): Clearly, I can't answer on behalf of anyone in my department. I will have to inquire about that. My understanding of the way that the system works is that, when the Youth Court has an order which pertains to drug assessment, that drug assessment is routinely undertaken by that department, but whether or not that in fact comprises all of them, I am unclear. I will endeavour to get an explanation back to you.

Ms CHAPMAN: Final supplementary on this matter, sir, if I may, to the minister again.

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Does the minister agree that a quick check with the Drug and Alcohol Unit to identify the number of tests that they have actually undertaken on behalf of your department would assist the parliament in response to this issue?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:26): I am not really sure what a 'quick check' is in this context. As I have indicated, you have asked how many of the orders last year included orders specific to drugs, and you have asked whether DASSA is the department that engages with all of those, and I will come back with an answer.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is again to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Has the minister received a request from

Mr Harrison for any extra resources to support compliance with the direction given by the Attorney, and tabled here yesterday, that officers of the department are to comply with the provisions of the Children's Protection Act, including section 20(2)?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:27): No, the chief executive has not asked for more resources as a result of the implementation of the coronial inquest.

Ms CHAPMAN: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Yes; that is twice as many questions in the first 15 minutes as the Rann opposition received in an entire question time under the Brown and Olsen governments. Supplementary, deputy leader.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Thank you, sir. Your indulgence is noted. The supplementary to the minister is: at your meeting this morning, or indeed at any other meeting you have had with him since the coronial report was tabled on 9 April, has there been any request from the CEO or concern expressed by him that he wouldn't be able to actually implement applications under section 20(2)—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Do we need help from you, Jennifer? Do I let the member for whatever she is ask the rest of the question or do I—

The SPEAKER: The leave of the deputy leader to ask the question has been withdrawn. The member for Florey.

GENERATIONS IN JAZZ

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house how the Generations in Jazz festival is supporting the students and community in Mount Gambier and wider South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for her question. The member for Florey has been one of the stalwart supporters of Generations in Jazz over the whole period of time as the member, going for 18 consecutive years to Generations in Jazz.

Ms Bedford: I missed one.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Missed one year, but been to 18 years. It has been going for about 28 years. It is an extraordinary event, and she has been one of its greatest supporters. She has been urging me to attend and I have never been able to until this year, and I must say that I could not have been more impressed. This is the most extraordinary event, and I would urge anybody in this chamber to take the opportunity to get down there.

I had the great privilege of being there with the Minister for Regional Development and a very proud local member, and I want to thank the member for Mount Gambier for not only his support but also his kind hospitality when we were in the region.

Generations in Jazz has to really be seen to be believed. Something like 3,700 students and another 1,300 people bought tickets, so there were 5,000 people at the concert on Saturday night. They got to see world-class acts. People come from around the world to not only judge these bands—200-odd schools from around Australia—but they also provide instruction and support for these young people.

You are getting, on the strength of James Morrison who is an incredibly generous man who has a particular commitment to education and his particular philosophy of educating people in how to play jazz, a commitment so great that he whistles up all of his mates from around the world from the international jazz community and they fly into Adelaide and go nowhere else—everybody in Sydney and Melbourne are all scratching their heads about why the world has come to Mount Gambier—and you get some incredible acts.

Indeed, James Morrison now lives in Mount Gambier, which is a wonderful thing. To see a group of young people walking down the main street of Mount Gambier, playing their trumpets, their trombones and their saxophones, was quite a sight for the locals and it really lifted the spirit there.

Of course, it has led to something extraordinary. It has led to an academy of jazz, which is hosted by the University of South Australia, which is going to be a 200-person strong academy in due course, although I think they are already talking about expanding it because of the extraordinary national and international support for this effort. It has really put Mount Gambier, which already was famous for its beautiful Blue Lake and now—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is not so struggling, it is booming, and the member for Mount Gambier and this government share the same view that we want to talk up the South-East and the Mount Gambier region, and we resist anybody who wants to talk down this particular wonderful region of South Australia. South Australia has always been at its strongest when the community works together with government and the private sector and we are seeing this with Generations in Jazz. The inspiration of some incredibly far-sighted entrepreneurs down there in Mount Gambier teaming up with the incredible generosity of James Morrison has created what is a spectacular and world-class event. Mark my words, Mount Gambier will be known as the centre of jazz in this country and, indeed, in many respects, the world.

The SPEAKER: Would the deputy leader like to ask the same question?

Ms CHAPMAN: No, I am happy to move on, sir, thank you.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question, however, is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. My question to the minister is: when was the chief executive officer of the then department of families and communities informed of the then minister's, now Premier's, commitment to the parliament on 1 December 2005 to provide certain information on child protection applications made in the Youth Court to be included in their annual reports?

Ms Redmond: It's not quite 10 years; there's a few months to go.

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:33): Clearly, I will have to take that on notice. That vastly predates me.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel behaved very badly yesterday and I can hear him from up here. Deputy leader.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Supplementary, if I may, to the minister: when inquiring as to when that notice was given to the chief executive officer, could you also report back to the house the mode in which it was delivered and provide a copy of whatever that memorandum was at the time?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:34): Assuming that that is possible, then I will come back with a fulsome response for you.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): A further supplementary: when providing that information to the house, would the minister also advise the house what is the usual practice, process or procedure in advising departmental officers of new laws or obligations or undertakings that are given to be complied with?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:34): I have no idea if there is a usual practice for that. I would point out that what we are talking about is not the new law, but the agreement that seems to have been reached here some 10 years ago to report in an annual report. It was not in the legislation.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): Supplementary: is the minister aware that a commitment was made by the Premier in this parliament on 1 December 2005?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:35): I am aware that there have been discussions about this. I personally have not gone back and read that *Hansard*. What I have been focusing on—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: What I have been focusing on is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: What I have been focusing on are the contents of the Coroner's report and the recommendations that they have made for how we can improve the way in which Families SA operates to keep vulnerable children safe.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will not interject, 'The Newspoll was good; it really was,' and accordingly, I warn him.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier, after his statement was given to the parliament in December 2005, take any action at all to inform his then department of the expectation of provision of information in the annual reports?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:36): Let's just explore this red herring. If you remember—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, let's just go through it. Let's go through it all.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What was that again?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I was the person that fronted up and actually told everybody about my policy. I don't sneak around and run away; I actually tell people what I do.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker, as has been already noted in the public discourse about this section, the question of drug testing of parents and the reference to them to treatment was the subject of quite a heated debate at time during the course of the 2005 amendments. At that time, it was urged upon the government by crossbenchers, with the support of the opposition, that every parent should be referred to mandatory drug treatment. We resisted that at the time, and indeed the compromise that emerged between the houses was that there would be an assessment that would be made, rather than mandatory treatment.

It was also mentioned at the time that the relevant section that was incorporated into the act—I think it was noted by the relevant minister in the upper house that was representing the government at the time that it would be unlikely that that section would have much work to do, if at all. There was another section of the act which was broad enough in its scope to permit the assessments of parents about a whole range of their parental capabilities, including drug assessment. So, it was made very clear at the outset—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Unley.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is the sense in which I say this is a red herring: it was made very clear at the outset that assessments in a broader sense were always going to be undertaken under this subplacitum of the relevant section of the act. I understand that, in the Coroner's report, contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition said, it was noted that Mr Xenophon had sought an undertaking, but he could not find any reference in the *Hansard* to whether the undertaking had been given.

Ms Chapman: We found it.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I assume it was given, but nevertheless that is not what was contained in the Coroner's report. It is worth remembering, Mr Speaker, as a matter of—

Mr Marshall: But did you make it?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, I don't know. Through your deputy leader, you have just said that you found it in the *Hansard*; I presume it's there. But, the important thing to remember here is when undertakings of that nature are given in the parliament, as is the case with legislation of this sort, we were working directly with departmental officials. So, departmental officials were not only with us and provided us advice about providing that undertaking, they were in the house when the undertaking was actually given, and heard the undertaking.

So, the notion that we didn't communicate this to departmental representatives is fanciful. They were involved in advising us to provide the undertaking, or otherwise, and presumably, because it's asserted we did provide the undertaking, it would have been done in their knowledge and on their advice and then they would have heard it said in the house. It is said, I understand, and I understand it has been reported to the house that there have been no particular references in various annual reports to the use of section 20(2) of the Children's Protection Act in this respect. I am sure we will make some inquiries about this, but without having made those inquiries it is pretty obvious why, and that is because it has very little work to do and is subsumed entirely by another section of the act.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): Supplementary to the Premier: if it has so little work to do, or it is anticipated would have so little work to do, why wasn't that little bit of work reported in the annual reports ever since?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:40): That's a matter about which we will take on notice, but if it was never used, if the section was never used there will be very little to report, but I do accept that if there was indeed an undertaking to report how many times it's used it would have been appropriate to have in the annual report a section to that effect with the words 'nil' or 'zero' next to it. So, to the extent that that hasn't happened then that's something which was a failing.

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: I just have one other question, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before the deputy leader does so, I warn the leader, I warn for the first time the member for Heysen and I call to order the member for Hartley.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. Has the government received a response from the State Coroner, Mark Johns, regarding the explanation provided by Mr Harrison on the department's interpretation and application of section 20(2) of the child support act, and if so, will he table 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) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for her question. So far as I am aware, we have not received as yet a response. Whether

one is in the correspondence in my office or in the post, I cannot say, but I don't recall having seen anything from Mr Johns and I expect I would have recalled seeing it because it is, obviously, a topical matter.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Supplementary: with reference to section 20(2) in yesterday's tabled report, is there any reason why there hasn't been a direction issued to all Families SA staff, as you have tabled others this morning, to direct them to comply with the recording in the annual reports?

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) (14:42): The situation is that I tabled the document which indicated the communication that Mr Harrison has had with the staff. I think there were three documents tabled this morning. I think it's fairly clear to me and to the minister that, certainly from my point of view, since the Coroner's report, the reporting of that was something that was spoken about and I believe that's being chased up by Mr Harrison.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise if the government has implemented all of Coroner Mark Johns' recommendations from the Jarrad Delroy Roberts coronial inquest in May 2009, and if not, which ones haven't been implemented and why?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:44): Thank you, sir. I won't make any comments that are obvious to everyone. However, I don't have the answer for you with me today. I will have to look at that and come back to you. If you would prefer a briefing on that that's fine, but otherwise I'll come back to the house with an answer.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:44): Supplementary: are schools now reporting long-term absences and truancies to Families SA, and is this by way of the Child Abuse Report Line? It was one of the recommendations.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:44): I don't know if that is one of the bases on which child notification is required to occur; I will have to check that for you. Truancy and long-term absence is certainly a concern, and the education department has been working very hard on lifting attendance. There has been an enormous amount of work done and attendance has increased dramatically. However, there does remain a small group of students who, regrettably, are not attending and are in what we say is 'chronic absence', so, say, more than 10 days in a term.

We are working diligently not only through the 22 attendance officers where there is the cooperation in working with the family and encouraging the child to engage. I am also interested in the way in which we might use prosecution in a very small number of cases, although I recognise that that can have a perverse outcome and, therefore, there would be a very small number where that might be appropriate.

My concern would be that we don't want children simply to show up to school. We want children to engage with school and that requires schools to be offering what children can benefit from, particularly as they enter into the high school years, where they can feel supported and able to reach their potential. So that engagement is far more complex than could be managed simply through a prosecution; nonetheless, as I say, I have put that on the table with the department as something I would like to explore more deeply.

What we do know is that attendance at school is the most important thing for children. It is a safe place to be, it's a nurturing place to be and it's a place where, if they are able to develop an education and an interest in things, they are most likely to have a long-term future in work and a fulfilling life.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:46): A second supplementary, please?

The SPEAKER: Yes, I hope it arises out of the minister's answer—

Ms SANDERSON: Well, yes, I am wondering if—

The SPEAKER: —and, therefore, there wouldn't be any need to read it.

Ms SANDERSON: No, I am not reading it. Is the minister aware that, in the Jarrad Delroy Roberts case, the Coroner linked strongly the truancy and being absent from school as one of the reasons for his death and, had that been reported and had that been followed up, he would probably be alive today?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:47): The question is: am I aware? Yes, although I think it's always important not to assume that because something didn't happen, if it had happened, the outcome would have been totally different. It's a dangerous logical trap to fall into; nonetheless, yes, I am aware.

ONLINE SCREENING APPLICATIONS

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. Can the minister confirm that the state government will introduce online screen applications for volunteers, jobseekers and employees?

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) (14:47): Yes.

ONLINE SCREENING APPLICATIONS

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:47): When will this be implemented, and how will people be able to provide 100 points of identification and sign?

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) (14:48): It's always been part of our plan, and we feel that this will cut down the amount of applications we have to send back that are filled in incorrectly. July is the date at which we are looking for the online applications. I will need to understand some more details about the 100 points, but I understand that when people present at a post office—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Obviously, I am aware of how people provide 100 points of ID. I understand the question from the member for Adelaide would be about how that physical interaction would take place.

Mr Marshall: You have just told us that it's about to be implemented; you've got no idea.

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

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: What I do know now is that, when people put forward their applications at post offices, then there are authorised officers able to view the 100 points of ID and authorise that.

ONLINE SCREENING APPLICATIONS

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:49): A further supplementary: could the minister bring back to the house how the 100 points identification and the signature will work online, and what safeguards will be implemented to stop identity theft?

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) (14:49): I will bring that back to the house.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the government's invitation to private and non-government organisations to 'identify future uses of the Repatriation General Hospital site' through a registration of interest or expression of interest process allow for the possibility of SA Health-funded services other than Ward 17 continuing to be provided at the Daw Park site?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:50): No; the only services we would envisage remaining at Daw Park would be the possibility of Ward 17 and the orthotic service, which is currently there. Having said that, though, if an organisation wanted to partner with us and deliver one of our current programs that we have—we spend about $800 million or $900 million every year on contracts with NGOs to deliver services on the part of SA Health. If, for example, an NGO came to us and said they wanted to deliver one of those currently funded programs on the Daw Park site, of course that would be something we would consider; but, generally speaking, in terms of SA Health employees working on the site, they will be the only two things that we would expect to be on the site.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Can the minister inform the house of recent steps taken to increase inner and middle urban density?

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss has been playing up all question time. The minister.

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) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question. We all know that our communities and economy can gain many benefits from well-designed increased density in our inner and middle urban areas. Through a considered and consultative approach we can provide more living options in suitable locations that are close to various services and to transport whilst also stimulating growth in our economy.

Recent steps taken to achieve this include the announcement yesterday of the second stage of the inner middle metropolitan corridor development plan amendment. This builds on the success of stage 1 of this process which has seen around $250 million worth of projects approved or under active consideration since March of this year. Most recent projects approved under stage 1, for example, have included 244 to 248 Unley Road, Hyde Park—I think that's in the member for Unley's patch—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —140 residential apartments—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —10 separate two-storey townhouses, and a retail and cafe space at ground level, and a total of 226 car parking spaces and 62 bicycle parking spaces will also be provided. At 254-256 The Parade (which I think is the Leader of the Opposition's electorate), this development involves the construction of a mixed-use five-storey building, including to ground level retail shops and residential apartments. A total of 36 apartments will be distributed amongst the two buildings connected by aerial walkways. Twenty one parking spaces and 44 bicycle parking spaces will be provided.

Councils and communities within the targeted areas will now have considerable opportunity to consider and input into this stage 2 development plan amendment. On 30 April, I was also pleased to announce that Devine, a leading developer, will be transforming the former Magill Youth Training Centre to a modern urban community of more than 300 homes—

Mr Tarzia: What about the traffic, though?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This 19 hectare site—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thought it would excite the member for Hartley.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: He sounds like a budgerigar.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thought it would excite the member for Hartley.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned for the first time and the Minister for Health will rise and withdraw and apologise for referring to the member for Hartley as a budgerigar.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I withdraw and apologise for referring to the member for Hartley as a budgerigar.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Although I do not compare the member to—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Initially, the sound did remind me of the parrot in *SpongeBob*, but, anyway.

This 19 hectare site will provide diversity in housing types and density whilst maintaining approximately 30 per cent of the site as open space. The member for Hartley has already made a contribution, so I don't need to say anything further about him. Fifteen per cent of these homes will be affordable housing, creating more homes for real people who have real lives and who have jobs and kids to take to school, which I think was the quote the member for Hartley used the other day.

Further, the context of the closure of the former Magill training centre at Woodforde should also be noted. It was not a straightforward sale of property off the public books as some might suggest. The closure followed the opening of the Adelaide Youth Training Centre at Cavan in August 2012.

Work is also presently underway to reform our planning system with the aim to introduce to this house a bill in July that takes into consideration the final report and recommendations of the Expert Planning Panel. Opportunity will be afforded to all to provide input into this bill over the winter break, and indeed we are working with key interest groups in drafting these reforms such as the Local Government Association. Part of these reforms will take into account ways to ensure that our planning system facilitates and encourages well-designed urban infill through such mechanisms as having value-added assessment processes and through establishing an appropriately defined urban growth boundary.

The SPEAKER: Alas, there is time for no more.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It is always out of order to refer to members as animals, whether they are canaries or mosquitoes on heroin.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, similes and metaphors are treated alike by standing orders. Member for Fisher.

NEPAL EARTHQUAKE

Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Could the minister update the house on South Australia's trade links into South-East Asia and assistance with relief efforts into Nepal?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:56): I thank the member for Fisher for her question. I informed the house yesterday that significant progress had been made in developing the South-East Asia Engagement Strategy. Events today have demonstrated how the government's international engagement strategies have been of assistance in humanitarian efforts in the region. As members would be aware, a 7.8 magnitude earthquake in Nepal has killed more than 7,000 people and devastated rural communities, with hundreds of thousands losing their homes and possessions.

In Adelaide, the school community of Pulteney Grammar responded to provide special assistance to a school, an orphanage, with which it has a long relationship. Pulteney Grammar has part funded the orphanage and associated school for many years, and a former Nepalese student of Pulteney Grammar in 2013-14, Ishwor Ghimire, who was supported during his time here by the Brownhill Creek Rotary Club, is back in Nepal and assisted with the post-earthquake evacuation of students from the damaged school.

In response to his call for help, two parents from the Friends of Pulteney Grammar left today with tents and equipment for a one-month stay to assist the Nepalese students who are living in the open, and the pictures are quite dramatic. Although some allowance had been made for excess baggage—around 20 kilograms—the Malaysia Airlines local office was unable to waive excess baggage fees amounting to more than $5,000. After discussions with Malaysia Airlines in Adelaide and the local manager, the government was able to contact the head office of Malaysia Airlines in Kuala Lumpur, from where I have just returned, and the Australian High Commission in KL was called to assist.

Melissa Hutchings from the High Commission was able to confirm with the Malaysia Airlines Director Commercial that there would be a waiver of the excess baggage charges. This morning Lynn Rawson and Joanne Bourchier were able to board the flight to KL and then to Kathmandu.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: In the event that they have any further difficulty along the way, the government has given them a letter of introduction to the Australian High Commission in Kuala Lumpur, where staff will be available to assist.

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

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: The success so far of this relief effort is testament to the ability of our trade officials to work in a humanitarian way in concert with the state government. It was only last week that the Australian High Commission in Thailand assisted in the evacuation of earthquake survivors to Bangkok on a C-17, and I was present at that time. The South Australian government congratulates the Pulteney school community, Malaysia Airlines and the excellent staff serving with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade and Austrade and all in the state government who assisted, particularly the generous citizens of Adelaide who have assisted Pulteney to help those devastated by the earthquake in Nepal.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the government need to install extra communications equipment to enable mobile telephones to operate at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:00): I got this question during a press conference. Not that I am aware, but I am happy to get the matter investigated and come back to the house with a report.

RED TAPE REDUCTION STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Can the minister advise why the government has disbanded the Red Tape Reduction Steering Committee?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:00): We are going for a simpler regulation. We think we have done a fair bit of work reducing red tape. We have done a substantial amount of work, and now we are simplifying and streamlining our regulatory processes. For example, I know members—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The wall of noise from members who don't ask questions isn't impressive: being impressive is getting up and asking a question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: I am sure, sir, if you wanted to ask a question, you would. You don't need to be instructed by the minister.

The SPEAKER: I call the deputy leader to order for a bogus point of order. It could have been a good point of order that I would have upheld, and I warn the Treasurer for the second and final time for taunting Her Majesty's Opposition.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Long may they reign, sir—especially the head.

Mr Gardner: He's defying your ruling, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, he is. He is defying my ruling.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir, I am honouring your ruling. I honour your rulings. The government has done a large amount of work since we came to office to try to reduce and remove red tape. We are streamlining our regulatory processes, so we are moving to another stage of that process.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Stuart.

RED TAPE REDUCTION STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:02): Does the minister's answer to that question, saying that the government has done a large amount of work on removing red tape and so the steering committee to reduce red tape has been disbanded, mean that the minister and the government are satisfied that the amount of red tape that remains is appropriate?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:02): I know that those opposite don't follow closely our work, but I refer the honourable member to the 10 economic priorities for South Australia; one of them is making South Australia the best place to do business. One of the initiatives there is the Simpler Regulation Unit. Just to give you one example of the work we have been doing in this space is the 90-day project in relation to the tuna industry, which will be a guide to future work. It was an analysis, together with the tuna industry, of a range of regulations that were essentially applied to them and what was—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: I believe the Premier is debating. I didn't ask about the work that has been done. I was asking whether the government believes there is no more work to be done.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Just to join it up, sir, so the members understand, it was actually that work which informs what will be the future work program, which is about—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, you can laugh. If you ask the tuna industry, they are very grateful for the streamlining of the way in which we administer the regulations. The insight that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is the hard work of policy development, not the glib one-liners that come from those opposite. It's actually all about hard work, but those opposite

wouldn't know hard work if it hit them in the face. What is it—10 o'clock, get a café latte, read the paper and then work out what you're going to ask us? 'Oh, it's hard bloody work.'

Mr PISONI: Point of order: I believe that the Premier is drifting away from the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: I am shocked that I find myself having to uphold that point of order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The insight that we had about that wasn't the regulation itself. It was actually the time of year that the work was done to ask them to answer the questions and the fact that it was done in sequence—not at the same time, so not in parallel. When you are able to do that and collapse it, it wasn't actually the fact of the regulation, which is the exercise you get when you do a desktop analysis of looking at how you streamline the works. It was actually how it was administered that was a powerful as—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No: in fact, there is much work to be done. That is why we established the Simpler Regulation Unit.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I know those opposite think this is mirthful but we have the Coordinator-General, Jim Hallion, who is learning a lot about what is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right, the work rate of the average opposition frontbencher, two days a week, on a good week. Can I say there is much work to be done here for us to achieve our objectives. The Simpler Regulation Unit will lead our work in this area. The guide will be the sort of work we have done in the tuna industry. We are serious about this being the best place to do business anywhere in this country.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey promised that he would be good. Member for Davenport.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house why it took correspondence from me to her office before a critical incident report lodged by a school in my electorate was finally followed up 20 days after the original incident was reported by that school?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:06): I won't, of course, be going into any detail about an individual case and an individual student. I am grateful that the member chose to contact a political office—I believe it was the Attorney-General's office, initially, and then it was passed to mine. I think that is entirely appropriate. I can assure the house that the incident has been addressed and that the circumstances are being managed appropriately. I will now be undertaking an analysis of whether things ought to have been done differently.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:07): Supplementary, sir: does the minister accept that a 20-day time frame is an acceptable time frame for answering an incident report?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:07): Not necessarily. It depends on the circumstances. I won't prejudge any investigation.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:07): Supplementary: is there a guideline for how many days a response is reported on?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:07): I will have a look and see whether there are any guidelines on that.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. If the minister moves nonoperational MFS and CFS staff into SAFECOM, how can he guarantee, as he told the UFU, that 'where employees are performing the same work, they will be paid the same rate'?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:08): Mr Speaker, can I have the honourable member repeat the first bit?

Dr McFETRIDGE: If the minister moves nonoperational MFS and CFS staff into SAFECOM, how can he guarantee, as he told the UFU, that 'where employees are performing the same work, they will be paid the same rate'?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, I am actually doing the reform process for the question that has been asked on a number of occasions and across the state, that is, if we did bring together the three organisations, how do we deal with the different wage issues? I made it clear, first, that the whole reform process was about improving the service to the community and the resources on the ground and it was not an exercise in removing people's pay and conditions; and that one of the earliest things we would have to do before we transitioned to any new organisation is to have an appropriate industrial agreement between the parties to make sure those issues of wage differences are addressed. That undertaking was given to all people, not just the UFU, and it was made quite public at all the public meetings I held which members of the opposition have attended. I gave that undertaking then and I retain that undertaking.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:09): Supplementary: minister, if, as under the Fire and Emergency Services Act (section 17, I think it is), SAFECOM staff are paid under the Public Service award, how is it that you offered guarantees that there will be no changes in rates of pay from a UFU EB currently if those nonoperational staff are transferred to SAFECOM?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. The answer is quite obvious. All agreements are subject to review and all the parties, I have indicated quite clearly, would need to renew the agreements through an agreement—indeed, a new agreement that covers the new organisation. That is just normal industrial relations practice, so those sorts of things have to be worked through at a point in time when we progress the reforms to that stage. We are not at that point in time yet.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:10): Another supplementary, then, Mr Speaker: if the UFU EB is locked in until 2017, does that mean you are going to renegotiate that enterprise bargaining agreement with the UFU?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for his question. It may be a surprise to the member, but all agreements are subject to renegotiation by agreement with the parties. That is part of the enterprise agreement. There is an expectation that an agreement goes until a certain period of time. If other events occur and the parties agree to renegotiate, that goes forward. There is nothing extraordinary about that. I am surprised you are actually asking that question.

MONTACUTE CFS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. When will the Montacute CFS' new fire station be built?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:11): I do not have that information available to me, and I will get back to the member.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:11): My question is again to the Minister for Emergency Services. Are MFS Communications Centre staff being transferred to SAFECOM or not? The UFU have told them they are not being transferred.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for his question. I am a little bit concerned that the member for Morphett has this obsession with the UFU, which—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Well, actually, I don't. The only person who mentions the UFU and all these conspiracy theories is the member for Morphett. Also, I understand that the member for Morphett has not had that many meetings with the UFU, so I am not sure what they think.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That's not correct. I understand that is not correct at all, member for Morphett. What was the question again?

Dr McFETRIDGE: I will repeat the question. Are MFS Communications Centre staff being transferred to SAFECOM or not? The UFU have told them they are not.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: As has been made quite clear to all the parties to the reform process, no persons will be transferred until such time as the appropriate industrial agreements are in place.

Grievance Debate

MONTACUTE CFS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:12): I just asked the Minister for Emergency Services when the Montacute CFS' new fire station would be built and I wish to advise the house why that question is so important. I will do so through a time line. The first I became aware of the desperate need for a new Montacute CFS station to be built was in fact sometime in early 2009. When I was a Liberal candidate, the then member for Morialta, Lindsay Simmons, was in this place representing the people of Morialta, and the people of the Montacute CFS brought to my attention their sincere concerns in terms of both occ health and safety, fire safety and general management and the attractiveness of their existing station, which is completely inappropriate and unfit for purpose. They, in fact, were arguing for a new station to be built.

The then Labor government led by Mike Rann and emergency services minister, Michael Wright, promised in campaign literature distributed ahead of the 2010 election to build a new site. A flyer distributed throughout the electorate in 2010 by the Labor Party had a photograph of Lindsay Simmons appearing with one of the firefighters in uniform with a quote saying that the government 'has a new site leased and building begins this year', claiming that, in 2009, that had been fixed.

In August 2010, I was approached by the Montacute CFS, which had recently been advised that the Adelaide Hills Council were considering the appropriateness of the land and, as part of the usual process, had approached the SACFS Building Fire Safety Unit which had identified a number of issues. In August, the Hills council passed their concerns about the site to the DAC for their consideration.

On 5 October, I wrote to the Minister for Emergency Services seeking information on the project. On 12 October, I asked questions in estimates of then minister Wright and was informed by the chief officer of the time, Euan Ferguson, that issues were being addressed and a budget of $500,000 had been set aside. On 9 December, we held a meeting on site with SAFECOM staff, CFS staff, Adelaide Hills council staff, CFS volunteers, and a couple of other locals to discuss the

suitability of the location and to try to nut out some of these issues. It is safe to say that no resolution was reached.

On 18 January 2011, a meeting was held at the Montacute CFS where it was found that land had been rented by the government for two years before permission had been granted. Issues with the report prepared by the Building Fire Safety Unit were addressed and referred back to the unit for comment. On 2 February 2011, I received a letter from Michael Wright, the then minister, advising that he had:

> …been informed by the CFS Regional Commander 1 that the Building Fire Safety Unit (BFSU) conducted a bushfire risk assessment on the CFS site at the request of Adelaide Hills Council…and the outcome was unfavourable. The…Council has now provided comment to the Development Assessment Commission on the report. A meeting was held on 9 December…to discuss the issue and a committee has been formed to evaluate the BFSU report. The committee will consist of local and Headquarters representatives and will have its first meeting in mid January 2011 to address the issues raised by the council. I trust that the above information is of assistance.

It was of assistance, sort of, but not really. In March it was clear that the project was stalled with no new report being promised. SAFECOM advised they did not have an issue with the site and that the intersection outside the site was their primary concern.

In June, we learned a new site near the current site of the station began being investigated by the CFS, never mind the fact that the government had already spent two years' worth of money on leasing this new land; that was out of the picture. We had a new site they were looking at. I asked then minister Foley, the then minister for emergency services, when it was going to be built and he said that he had no idea and he did not care. The second part might have been my intrusion on the *Hansard*. He certainly said he had no idea; that he did not care was the impression given.

In September, the planning towards the new site being used next to the current site began and I remember taking the then shadow minister for emergency services as he was prior to his current incarnation, the member for Morphett, to have a look. In 2012, negotiations were being held between landowners, council and the CFS. In January 2013, council was granted permission, landowners signed off on the contract and were only awaiting sign-off from the DAC.

In August 2013, full permission had been granted, detailed work was being finalised, and rumours were circulating in Montacute that, at the end of the year, construction would begin, but a lease still had not been signed and there was a concern that the lease was not going to be signed due to a repeat of what happened last time where permission was withdrawn.

In January 2014, the ALP's election policy document—I think we are on to a new minister for emergency services by this time, but perhaps not the current one—stated that, 'Eleven stations will be upgraded including Salisbury, Gawler River, Montacute and Stirling.' As of the last couple of weeks when we have spoken to the Montacute Country Fire Service, I can advise the parliament that nothing is happening. They still do not have a station. They do not have a sign of when they are going to get a station. They have been waiting six years and the government has said at two elections that they have been delivering this. It is time to deliver for this community.

GENERATIONS IN JAZZ

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:17): There is mounting and continuing evidence to confirm the notion that learning music has a positive impact on student performance, especially on literacy and numeracy. We also know how important music can be in managing difficult behaviours, leading in turn to better learning outcomes. There is now an almost fully implemented national music curriculum and schools in Florey are actively pursuing this musical edge to learning, supported by the annual Florey Music Award which I present to each school every year.

Some schools are lucky enough to already have specialist music teachers or visits from music branch specialist teachers, while classroom teachers are often responsible for the first exposure to music, which can be group choral work, or percussion ensembles, or even music appreciation (that is listening to and discussing a piece of music) which is how my lifelong love of music began. These days, of course, we are all familiar with music in programs such as *Play School* and entertainers from The Wiggles to pioneers in this genre such as Peter Combe and Patsy Biscoe, both South Australian icons.

It is from this background that I report the results from last weekend's Generations in Jazz in Mount Gambier. I was able to attend the competition performance of Modbury High School's stage band under the direction of Ms Rosie Carr, assisted by Ms Joan Baker, and Doug Clark, a gentleman who supports the school, was also present.

Modbury High has a fine musical traditional and, although it is not a specialist music school, they have always maintained a strong interest in music and many others areas, providing a great educational opportunity to local students now currently under the leadership of principal Mr Martin Rumsby, who also travelled to Mount Gambier to encourage and congratulate students after their very credible performance. Last year, they were promoted from division 3 to division 2. There are actually five divisions over several sections now, and division 2 is a much more difficult challenge. I can report that they finished 18th in this section, providing a good yardstick for their current level and an impetus for improvement.

Generations in Jazz is about fun and personal bests. It is a collaborative weekend for teachers and students alike. Many friendships and professional relationships have been forged in the South-East by those with a shared passion for jazz and big bands. Vocal performances have and continue to take a greater part in the weekend, and this will open up for a whole new group of students the opportunity to take part in what is now arguably the premier music event in Australia.

This is of course because of the growing—if it could get any bigger, that is—involvement of James Morrison and his generous commitment to the event, which now sees him and his family living in Mount Gambier and overseeing the academy, run in conjunction with the University of South Australia, which bears his name. As mentioned in question time by the Premier earlier today, Generations in Jazz is now well known to musicians all over the world because of James Morrison and his involvement.

There is always a great opening concert on the Friday evening featuring previous winners and headline solo performances. This year we had Take 6 and the Hot Horn Happening, as well as soloists like Rickey Woodard and Jeff Clayton from the US, and Mark Nightingale and Brian Kellock from the United Kingdom. We also hear headline acts such as The Idea of North—an a cappella group not to be missed. Saturday is the competition day, and a monster school presentation and concert follows in the evening. Sunday is for workshops and superbands getting together, and it is also where results are announced during another showcase concert.

Thanks must go to all the sponsors involved, all the organisers and adjudicators, the Generations in Jazz board and committee, and of course, the mass of volunteers who are involved in everything from traffic direction to food preparation. Every single person does their very best to make the weekend memorable for all the right reasons. Each 20-member band has spent a year preparing the set piece and two others, so thanks go to all the teaching staff, all the school governing councils, parents and school communities who support these students to get to Mount Gambier ready for competition.

The outright winner this year in division 1 was Marryatville High School. They are, of course, a specialist music branch of the public schools here in South Australia, and it continues a legendary rivalry with Victoria's Wesley College. The winner of the Wenger Band Director's Award was Rob Chenoweth, who is also from Marryatville High School. They had bands in division 2 as well, and Marryatville actually won division 2.

We also see, in division 3, Prince Alfred College and St John's Grammar School from South Australia being placed. In division 4, we see Immanuel College, Pedare College and Wilderness School placed. In the vocal ensemble section, Wilderness School actually won over Marryatville High School, with St Mary's College (also from South Australia) in third place. Division 2 vocal saw Marryatville High School again successful, with Immanuel and Concordia (who are also from South Australia) place second and third. Vocal division 3 saw Pembroke from South Australia win, with Temple Christian College third. The James Morrison Jazz Scholarship recipient this year was Nicholas Pennington.

Congratulations to everybody involved. I do hope members will come down to the mount next year and witness what will be an even bigger and better event.

OPERATION SLIPPER

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:23): In this job, you get to meet some amazing people, go to some amazing places and do some amazing things. In my role as the shadow minister for veterans' affairs, I was very fortunate to be part of the audience that was there to help welcome back South Australia's contingent of troops returning home from serving in Operation Slipper.

Operation Slipper commenced in Afghanistan shortly after the attacks in New York in 2001. It involved some 35,000 defence personnel, officials, police, diplomats and other civilian contractors. On Saturday, 21 March, there were parades right across this nation to welcome back the troops, to mark the end of Operation Slipper and to recognise the enormous effort and, in many cases, the sacrifice that had been made as part of this operation.

Obviously, with any conflict like this where people are being put in harm's way through their roles in the military, there are casualties. There were 41 young Australian soldiers killed in Afghanistan during this time. I spoke to one particular set of parents on Saturday the 21st, the parents of South Australian Sapper Jamie Larcombe. To speak to parents, to realise the depth of their grief, the depth of their loss, was one thing but to then see other parents who had shared a similar fate with their sons was even more humbling.

We see a number of people, when they go to lay a wreath, put their hand over what people think is their heart. What is actually happening there is that people are putting their hand over their medals because the sacrifice they have made to have been awarded those medals is nothing like the sacrifice that people like Sapper Larcombe have made. I thank all those families for offering up their sons to help serve this country who have, unfortunately, paid that ultimate sacrifice.

Operation Slipper commenced in 2001 and ended on 31 December 2014. Prime Minister Abbott went to Afghanistan with opposition leader Bill Shorten. Veterans' affairs is one of those areas where we do try to have true bipartisanship, and we should try for that at all times. It is good to see it at the federal level and I try to do it at the state level with minister Martin Hamilton-Smith. The end of Operation Slipper, as I said, was in December 2014. Prime Minister Tony Abbott travelled to Afghanistan with opposition leader Bill Shorten for a special ceremony at the Australian base in Tarin Kowt in Urozgan province. He told the gathering of troops and Afghan leaders that:

> Australia's longest war is ending, not with victory, not with defeat, but with, we hope, an Afghanistan that is better for our presence here.

The last combat troops were withdrawn from Afghanistan on 31 December 2014, however, there are still 400 personnel remaining in Afghanistan as trainers and advisers and they are stationed at Kandahar and Kabul.

Fortunately, our young men and women who are going overseas for these conflicts do not suffer the same fate as our Vietnam veterans when they came back. The Vietnam veterans have taken many years to adjust to the fact that we do value their sacrifice, we do value their service and with a ceremony like Operation Slipper, that was specifically designed to head off any negative reaction about troops being sent overseas, it was there to recognise and celebrate the work that our young men and women have been doing from all of the armed forces: Army, Navy and Air Force.

The need to maintain that support, to value their efforts and to remember their sacrifices is something that I will continue to do every ANZAC Day and every other possible moment I get. Veterans' affairs minister Martin Hamilton-Smith and I, as the shadow, go to many events and we are both happy to stand side by side and to recognise that this is something that is above politics, it is something that we all—and I know all members in this place go to many functions with our veterans—need to make sure we never ever allow to slip from our absolute front of mind consciousness.

LABOUR HIRE PRACTICES

Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:28): I wish to speak today about something that aired on the ABC, the *Four Corners* program 'Slaving away', on Monday night of this week. The program discussed the practice of certain employment contractors in the horticulture industry around Australia and how they are taking advantage of workers on working holiday visas, subclass 417. Large parts of the electorate of Taylor in the northern Adelaide Plains are intrinsically linked to the horticulture industry and the

region is home to a highly dense cluster of horticulturalists in farms, poly and glasshouses. The region currently produces fresh produce, with an approximate farmgate value of $250 million a year in production.

I have been actively working with industry stakeholder groups, such as Primary Producers SA, the Horticultural Coalition of South Australia, Potatoes SA, the HortEx Alliance and the National Union of Workers over several years to ensure that we develop and enhance the productivity, employment and investment opportunities of the horticulture industries in the Northern Adelaide Plains without compromising worker conditions. Every worker in South Australia deserves a fair day's pay for a fair and safe day's work and I am very pleased today that the Premier has announced an inquiry into labour hire practices. No worker should ever have to endure mistreatment, exploitation or harassment at work.

I am very pleased that the Weatherill Labor government will refer the matter of labour hire industry practices to the parliament's Economic and Finance Committee for an inquiry, and I look forward to working with the committee to air any malpractices that are going on. The predatory actions of these rogue labour hire companies deserve to be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. I repeat that we should not do this without talking to the workers themselves. They bravely spoke out on Monday night about the practices going on around Australia.

Many horticultural businesses in my electorate are family-owned companies that are operated by themselves and have close connections with their staff, treating them as extended family. They, I know, would be disgusted by the content of some of the stories in *Slaving Away*. The larger companies in the Northern Adelaide Plains have taken action promptly and swiftly. For example, D'VineRipe—one of the largest tomato production sites in Australia and the Southern Hemisphere—have cut ties with the labour hire company that has been underpaying employees at its site and instituted new auditing steps to ensure that the appropriate rates of pay and awards are fully met and that workers have ethical entitlements to a fair day's pay for a safe day's work.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:31): Today, in the latest instalment of looking at the waste and mismanagement of this government, we turn to a topic that is something I think most people can grapple with, and that is the cost of a cup of coffee. Before I get there, when we look at the financial performance of a government it is often quite difficult for individuals to understand what value for money represents.

I think it would be pretty difficult for the person on the street to be able to understand whether $422 million is a good use of money in procuring the Enterprise Patient Administration System (EPAS). I think it is pretty difficult for the average punter on the street to understand whether $2.1 billion to buy a new hospital, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, which will cost us over $3 billion over the life of the project, is good value for money.

Something that people grapple with on a daily basis and can understand is the cost of a cup of coffee, and my staff and I did a bit of research over the past couple of days. I must admit that I actually do not and cannot drink coffee. When I come here in the morning, a glass of skim milk with Milo is what does me, but coffee does seem to be the order of the day. I see hordes of people walking to their offices with their cups of coffee, their ripple-wrap cups and so on, that they buy in the morning, and they certainly know the cost of a cup of coffee.

A little bit of a search on the internet reveals that Adelaide's average price for a cup of coffee is $3.47. That is probably weighted, with cheaper prices in the regions, so we will say that $3.60 to $3.80 is what a cup of coffee is worth on average in South Australia. Indeed, we did a bit of market research this morning, and we went and had a look around.

If you go to Cibo on Hindley Street, an espresso will set you back $3.10 and a latte $3.80; at Hudsons on Currie Street, $3.40 for an espresso and $3.80 for a latte; and at Rigoni's, the beautiful Rigoni's, it is $3.90 for an espresso and $4.20 for a latte. Surely, a restaurant of the calibre of Rigoni's is where, yes, you will pay a few more cents for a cup of coffee, but it will be amongst the best that you can get. Just down the road here at Madame Hanoi's, it is $3.50 for an espresso and $4 for a latte.

The reason I go through this is that people would say to that, 'Okay, it seems like a lot for a cup of coffee, but it is reasonable; I am prepared to pay it.' It just seems that this common sense is not applied when it comes to government procurement. I have received some information in regard to what the South Australian government pays for a cup of coffee in certain circumstances.

History SA had a three-day conference. At that conference, at which there were quite a number of guests, they paid $6.50 for a cup of coffee, but they did not pay for an individual cup of coffee: they bought 80 cups of coffee at $6.50, and that was on day 1. On day 2, they bought 190 cups of coffee at $6.50 and, on day 3, they bought 130 cups of coffee at $6.50. I am not sure that any punter on the street would say that that is value for money, but it gets worse. It was not an isolated instance.

There was a DFEEST three-day conference at which they had 20 people over the course of the three days who paid $6.50 for a cup of coffee. Going on, there was a DMITRE meeting on 15 May 2013 where 45 people in a group paid $6.50 for a cup of coffee. Again, on 29 October 2012, the Department for Manufacturing had a workshop, where they again thought that it was okay to pay $6.50 for a cup of coffee.

I know that we are here arguing about a couple of dollars for a cup, and even if I extrapolate that over the few hundred cups the government bought in this instance, for me it is not about the money: it is about the idea that somebody thought that $6.50 for a cup of coffee represented value for taxpayers' dollars, and it does not, it absolutely does not. It is another example of a culture that exists within this government that it is okay to waste taxpayers' money.

I genuinely believe that it is because somebody else's money. Certainly, the punter on the street would not be paying $6.50 for a cup of coffee. They would be going to any of these establishments I mentioned earlier and paying their $3.50 or $4. Instead, someone has decided that it is okay—in fact, many people in this instance have decided—to pay $6.50. It is because we do not look after these cents, the government does not look after the cents and the small dollars, that we get to a $331 million overspend on last year's budget. It is exactly these kinds of dollars which mean that departments such a Health blow their budget by $161 million and Education and Child Development blow their budget by $137 million. It is just not good enough, and the taxpayers of South Australia deserve a whole lot better.

ADOPTION

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:36): I rise today to bring to the attention of the house an important petition regarding adoption laws in South Australia. This petition was created by Shaun and Blue Douglas-Galley, and I am pleased that they and their adorable sons have been able to spend some time with us in parliament today.

Sean and Blue moved to South Australia with their two sons, who were adopted in the United Kingdom. They have since been campaigning strenuously to change the laws here to recognise their family and afford other couples rights equal to those of heterosexual families when it comes to adoption. This petition has obviously struck a chord with many people in our community, as evidenced by the many thousands who have put their name to it.

The law can often take time to reflect the changing attitudes of society, but slowly we have abolished the legal discriminations against same-sex people. From being the first state in the nation to decriminalise homosexuality in 1972 to the broader protections against discrimination on the basis of sexuality under the Equal Opportunity Act 1984, we have moved towards equality. The process of reform takes time, but it is not something that this government has shied away from. In 2003, shortly after this government was formed, we made amendments to more than 50 pieces of legislation in relation to equal rights for same-sex couples.

The Governor's speech at the opening of parliament earlier this year contained a commitment from this government to remove from our statute book every remnant of discrimination against people on the basis of their sexuality or gender. The Adoption Act is one of the last standing pieces of legislation that enshrines discrimination against same-sex people in this state. Last year,

the former minister for education and child development announced a review into the laws that govern adoption here in South Australia.

This review is currently underway and open for submissions until the 30th of this month. I am pleased to advise the house that the Douglas-Galley family have also submitted this petition to the review committee, and it will be rightly considered as part of this process. The review process is, of course, the place for the implications of any changes of law to be considered; however, it will not surprise anyone in this house that as the member for Port Adelaide I have a deep commitment to equality and believe that all South Australians should be treated equally no matter their race, gender, political persuasion, or, as in this case, sexuality.

In 2015 I firmly believe that it is unacceptable that there are still barriers to equality. Laws such as this one are being changed around the country and around the world. New South Wales, Tasmania, the ACT and WA all have equal adoption laws, and Victoria is also currently reviewing its legislation and, last month, Ireland passed laws allowing adoption equality. I believe that it is time for equality here in South Australia.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (VULNERABLE WITNESSES) 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) (15:41): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the various acts to make provision for special arrangements relating to vulnerable persons and the justice system. 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) (15:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Statutes Amendment (Vulnerable Witnesses) Bill 2015 is an important measure to improve the position of vulnerable witnesses, namely children and persons with a disability, within the criminal justice system, both in and out of court. The bill extends to victims, witnesses, suspects and defendants.

The bill preserves an accused person's right to a fair trial, whilst recognising that the South Australian criminal justice system needs to be more accessible and responsive to the needs and interests of victims and witnesses who are children and persons with a disability. The bill builds on previous legislative reforms and the wider Disability Justice Plan.

The implementation of the Disability Justice Plan and the present bill was a key policy commitment of the government. It was subsequently announced that the government would provide $3.246 million over four years to make the Disability Justice Plan a reality. To support the implementation of the bill, the government will be inviting tenders later this year under the Disability Justice Plan for both the specialist training for investigative interviewing of young children and people with a disability and the new communication partner model for people with complex communication needs.

The Disability Justice Plan and the present bill have been formulated in close consultation with the disability sector. I am grateful for the keen interest and active involvement of the Hon. Kelly Vincent MLC in the formulation and progression of these important reforms, and for the bipartisan support that we have received to date. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

Bill in Detail

The Bill includes:

(a) To provide for the admission of audio visual records of interviews as the evidence of victims or witnesses who are children aged of or under 14 years or have a disability that adversely affects their capacity to give evidence in cases involving a sexual or violence offence, and to regulate how those interviews are conducted;

The Bill inserts Part 17 Division 3 into the Summary Offences Act 1953 that provides that a statement of a witness who is a young child aged of or under 14 years of age, or has a disability that adversely affects the person's capacity to give a coherent account of the person's experiences or to respond rationally to questions, is to be taken by way of investigative interview and for an audio visual record of that interview to be made. This applies to witnesses of that class in sexual or violence offences. The interview must be conducted by a prescribed interviewer and made and conducted in accordance with the Regulations to be made under the Bill. The detailed operation of the regime for the audio visual recording of an interview with a vulnerable witness will be dealt with in these Regulations.

The Bill provides in s 13BA of the Evidence Act 1929 that the audio visual record of an investigative interview, along with audio visual records of pre-trial special hearings made pursuant to s 12AB that is inserted into the Evidence Act 1929 by the Bill, can be admitted as the evidence of the witness in a trial. The Bill provides that the audio visual record of the investigative interview can be admitted into evidence on application of either party to the proceeding. A pre-condition to the admissibility of this evidence is the availability of the witness during trial, if required, for further examination, cross-examination or re-examination—however any further questioning of a witness can only occur with the leave of the court. This will prevent a vulnerable witness being exposed to irrelevant, unnecessary or inappropriate questioning. A court has a discretion to rule as inadmissible either part or whole of a recording—or before admitting a recording, may order that it be edited so as to exclude evidence that is inadmissible for any reason

The taking of a statement by way of investigative interview, or the convening by a court of a pre-trial special hearing, are provisions available only for witnesses who are young children or have a disability that affects their capacity to give evidence. However, the power to admit the evidence pursuant to s 13AB of the Evidence Act 1929 is available to a court regardless of the age of the person or their capacity at the time a court is considering the admission of the evidence—there is no provision in s 13AB limiting the admission of the evidence to where the witness is a young child or has the requisite disability at the time a court is considering its admission.

The Bill does not seek to preclude the use of examination-in-chief by counsel at trial as there will invariably be scenarios where issues or points will need to clarified, explained or developed beyond the account provided on the video interview. However, it is not contemplated that such questioning should simply allow the witness to repeat the account as provided in the audio visual interview. It is anticipated that the investigative interview will provide a complete and accurate account at the outset of the investigation into the matter. Skilled examination-in-chief may be the only effective way to present the entire prosecution case if an account in an audio visual interview is flawed or plainly inadequate. It may also be that a confident witness, despite their young age or cognitive impairment, does not wish to use special arrangements to testify and may wish to give evidence 'live' as opposed through any pre-recorded interview.

Specific legislative provision is overdue in South Australia to regulate and provide for the use at trial of the pre-recorded interviews with a vulnerable witness. Any preference for 'live' evidence and blanket opposition to any use of pre-recorded evidence as a substitute for live testimony is outdated and does not have regard to research that has been undertaken in the field. Research does not support any view claimed of higher acquittals.

This part of the Bill will be supported by enhanced specialist training for investigative interviewers in most appropriately and effectively dealing with and questioning children and persons with disability. Such enhanced training should also ideally extend to other parties within the criminal justice system such as prosecutors, defence lawyers and judicial officers (though not necessarily to the same extent as the specialist training for investigative interviewers).

(b) To provide for special hearings for the pre-trial taking of evidence (both evidence-in-chief and cross-examination, and re-examination), in informal surroundings, from children of or under 14 years of age or persons with a disability who are victims or witnesses in trials involving sexual or violence offences

The Bill introduces, by insertion of s 12AB into the Evidence Act 1929, the availability of a pre-trial special hearing in cases involving a sexual or violence offence of witnesses who are young children aged of or under 14 years of age, or persons with a disability that adversely affects the person's capacity to give a coherent account of the person's experiences or to respond rationally to questions. Either party in proceedings will be able to use such a hearing. Such a hearing can conduct any supplementary examination-in-chief of the witness beyond that contained in any investigative audio visual interview as well as the cross-examination or re-examination of such a witness.

This part of the Bill aims to improve the quality of the testimony of this class of witness by taking their evidence as near in time as possible to the laying of charges so as to assist memory and alleviate the painful reliving of experiences many months or even years after the event. The Bill anticipates the use of special arrangements for a witness during a pre-trial special hearing and intends that the hearing will take place in informal surroundings that do not, as would a formal trial courtroom, stress or intimidate the vulnerable witness and inhibit communication.

(c) To extend the priority of sexual assault trials where the complainant is a child to those where the complainant has a disability

The Bill makes amendments to s 126A of the Supreme Court Act 1935, s 50B of the District Court Act 1991 and s 48B of the Magistrates Court Act 1991 to extend the priority for hearing of sexual assault trials where the alleged victim is a child to those where the alleged victim has a disability that adversely affects their capacity to give a coherent account of their experiences or to respond rationally to questions.

(d) Clarifying the definition of 'vulnerable witness' under the Evidence Act 1929

The Bill clarifies the definition of 'vulnerable witness' under the Evidence Act 1929 to include 'cognitive impairment'.

The Bill also extends the age of a 'young child' from a child 'of or under the age of 12 years', to a child 'of or under the age of 14 years' in the Evidence Act 1929 (with consequential amendments in the Summary Offences Act 1953 and Summary Procedures Act 1921). This amendment is in response to concerns raised that the present age of 12 years in the Evidence Act 1929 is too young and does not recognise the trauma and stress faced by children in their early teenage years who are confronted by the rigours of a police investigation or the procedures of a criminal trial.

(e) Amending the Evidence Act 1929 to give people with complex communication needs a general entitlement to have a communication assistant present for contact within the criminal justice system to facilitate the obtaining of an accurate and coherent account

The Bill recognises the role performed by communication assistants to facilitate effective communication with persons with complex communication needs and enable them to provide an accurate and coherent account of their experiences. The Bill includes explicit powers allowing the use of communication assistants to support persons with complex communication needs, whether witnesses, victims, suspects, or defendants both in and out of court. The Bill provides that a person with a complex communication need may use a communication device or a communication assistant for both in and out of court statements. The Bill includes provision for Regulations to be made to prescribe who can provide communication assistance, both in court and during an interview with a vulnerable victim, witness, suspect or defendant outside of court. The Bill includes the caveat that it be provided where available. There may be logistical reasons that preclude such assistance.

The communication assistant model in the Bill draws on the familiar and long recognised role of a language interpreter and will be similar to that role. However for people with complex communication needs, communication is broader than spoken language. It is only right that persons, be it witnesses, victims, suspects, or defendants, with complex communication needs have the same entitlement of support to communicate effectively and/or understand the relevant proceedings as someone who is unable to speak or understand English. There are augmented and alternative means of communication that can be legitimately used (such as speak-and-spell communication devices or picture book aids), especially with the contribution of a communication assistant, to facilitate and enable effective communication. There are a broad range of disabilities and complex communication needs and the term 'complex communication needs' is not confined to intellectual disability. The precise nature and extent of the role of the communication assistant will depend upon the particular complex communication needs in any case.

The Bill provides for two classes of persons who are eligible to provide communication assistance in court. First, the Bill introduces a role called a 'communication partner'. This is a person, or a person of a class, approved by the Minister for the purposes of providing assistance in proceedings to a witness with complex communication needs. It is contemplated that a communication partner will be a volunteer as part of a specialist scheme who will be trained to facilitate effective communication between members of the criminal justice system and the person with complex communication needs. Secondly, the Bill allows any other suitable person to be appointed by a court to act as a communication assistant in court. The Bill makes it explicit that a person can still play the role of providing communication assistance and be a witness in their own right at a trial of the alleged offending. This scenario may well arise given a communication assistant may be a person who is closely associated with a victim and as a result may be required to give evidence at trial of facts in issue. As with existing language interpreters, any communication assistant will have to swear or affirm in court the impartiality and accuracy of their role.

(f) Amending the Evidence Act 1929 to clarify and increase access to appropriate support persons to provide emotional support for vulnerable witnesses, both in and out of court

The Bill amends the Evidence Act 1929 to clarify and increase access to appropriate support persons to provide emotional support for vulnerable witnesses, both in and out of court. The Bill includes provision for Regulations to be made to prescribe the class of person who can provide emotional support or any other assistance during an interview with a vulnerable victim, witness, suspect or defendant. The role of a support person is quite distinct from the communication assistant.

(g) Amending the Evidence Act 1929 to broaden the special arrangements available to vulnerable witnesses (including defendants) when giving evidence, both at a special hearing or at trial

Section 13A of the Evidence Act 1929 already contains a number of specific powers available to assist vulnerable witnesses in providing evidence. These are often used in practice. The Bill contains further specific powers to support vulnerable witnesses in giving evidence, whether at a pre-trial special hearing or at trial. The specific powers

listed in the Bill or already in the Evidence Act 1929 are not exhaustive of the special arrangements that can be made to support or assist a vulnerable witness to testify in the most suitable manner. The courts should not be reluctant to make special arrangements beyond those specifically listed in the Bill or already in s 13A of the Evidence Act 1929 to assist a vulnerable witness who is giving evidence at either a pre-trial special hearing or at trial. A court could, for example, regulate the manner, topics and timing of the questioning of a vulnerable witness.

(h) Clarifying the definition of an inappropriate question under s 25 of the Evidence Act 1929 to include questions that are too complicated for a witness to understand

The Bill clarifies a court's duty under s 25 of the Evidence Act 1929 to control inappropriate questioning. The Bill rephrases an 'improper' question as an 'inappropriate' question. The Bill clarifies the definition of an inappropriate question to include questions that are expressed in language that is too complicated for the witness to understand.

(i) Amending the Evidence Act 1929 to repeal s 34CA and to insert a new provision, s 34LA, to provide for the admissibility as a limited exception to the hearsay rule of out of statements of a young child or a witness with disability in sexual cases where the witness is unavailable to be called to testify about the events in question owing to young age and/or disability.

The Bill deletes s 34CA of the Evidence Act 1929 and replaces it with a new s 34LA. Section 34CA has a long and complex history.

The present s 34CA was inserted in 2008 by the Statutes Amendment (Evidence & Procedure) Act 2008. It replaced the original version of s 34CA that was inserted into the Evidence Act 1929 in 1988 by the Evidence Act Amendment Bill 1988 in response to the 1986 South Australian Government Task Force on Child Sexual Abuse. The present s 34CA has been the subject of varied interpretation by the courts since its commencement and regular judicial calls for legislative reform.

Section 34CA has proved difficult in its application since 2008. The Bill addresses some of the difficulties that have arisen in its application by providing a new regime dedicated to the admission of pre-recorded investigative interviews of certain vulnerable witnesses, as well as provisions to admit recorded evidence of that class of witness taken during a pre-trial special hearing. In light of the inclusion of these schemes in the Bill, and the difficulties in application of the section that have been raised by the Court of Criminal Appeal on several occasions, the Government has reconsidered the previous approach to s 34CA of the Act.

The genesis and true purpose of the original s 34CA that emerged from the 1986 Task Force was to admit an out of court statement as an exception to the hearsay rule in relation to child sexual abuse victims when the time, content and circumstances of the statement provide sufficient safeguards of reliability and trustworthiness. The new s 34LA achieves this purpose. Unlike the previous incarnations of s 34CA, it does not require that the maker of the out of court statement be available for cross-examination.

Section 34LA will apply only where the maker of the statement is not to be called as a witness. It provides that a statement that was made out of court by an alleged victim of a sexual offence who, at the time the statement was made, was a young child of or under the age of 14 years or a person with a disability that adversely affects their capacity to give a coherent account of their experiences or to respond rationally to questions, is admissible to prove the truth of the facts asserted in the statement. The section will operate to make statements admissible regardless of the age of the person or the person's capacity to give evidence at the time a court is considering the admission of the statement. This is to take into account the scenario where, for example, a young child makes an contemporaneous complaint of sexual interference, and for whatever reason, there is a delay in the matter proceeding to trial. At the time of trial, the young child no longer falls within that definition, however due to the passage of time or for other reasons, he or she may have no memory or ability to recall or repeat the relevant statement.

The effect of the new section is that a complaint, allegation or account of sexual abuse that is given by this class of witness can be presented to a court by the person to whom the statement is made, or a person who was present when it was made. The vulnerable witness is not required to give evidence about the alleged offending or to be available for cross-examination. The section is a very limited exception to the hearsay rule. If the vulnerable witness is to be called as a witness, s 34LA has no application—however the statement may be admissible as an initial complaint pursuant to s 34M of the Evidence Act 1929. The section does not operate to make admissible a formal investigative interview of a vulnerable witness with a police officer or psychologist. There are other provisions in the Bill to deal with those investigative interviews.

The section is intended to apply in a very rare class of case, where the young child whose cognitive development is not such that they could give evidence, or the person with a disability who similarly does not have the capacity to give evidence, says something out of court, that amounts to an allegation of sexual offending. The timing, content and circumstances in which the statement is made bespeaks its reliability. The making of the statement may, for example, be accompanied by sexualised conduct by the vulnerable witness. There may be accompanying evidence that supports the content of the statement—such as eye-witness, medical or forensic evidence like DNA evidence. In this rare class of case, the timing, content and circumstances in which the statement is made can be adequately tested by examining the person to whom the statement was made or the person who witnessed the statement being made. Issues of competence of the maker of the statement under s 9 of the Evidence Act 1929 do not arise—it being assumed in s 34LA(1)(a) that the oral evidence given in the proceedings by the person who made the out of court statement would be admissible as evidence of the matter.

(j) Clarifying the criteria for determining the competence of a witness under s 9 of the Evidence Act 1929 to give sworn or unsworn testimony in court

Where a child is called to testify in court, s 9 of the Evidence Act 1929 applies to determine whether that child can give sworn or unsworn evidence (this will include evidence given at a pre-trial special hearing held pursuant to s 12AB of the Bill). The Bill amends s 9 to provide that it has no application to statements made out of court that may be admitted as evidence in proceedings as an exception to the hearsay rule. Section 9 will still apply to an audio visual record of an investigative interview or pre-trial special hearing admitted pursuant to s 13BA of the Bill as the witness's evidence. In that scenario, it is entirely up to the court how it will determine the witness's competence.

(k) Clarifying the operation of s 21 of the Evidence 1929

The proposed amendment to s 21 of the Evidence Act 1929 simplifies the law governing the grant of an exemption to a close relative of an accused from a lawful obligation to give evidence against the accused.

The Bill in summary includes the following changes to s 21.

First, to define or clarify 'obligation' in 21. The 'obligation' to be caught by s 21 is only a 'legal' and not a 'moral' obligation. This particular amendment adopts the view of Stanley J in the recent case of R v G, AP (2014) 119 SASR 125.

Secondly, to provide that a court need not be satisfied itself that a prospective witness who is legally obliged to testify, is either aware of his or her right to apply for an exemption under s 21 or is incapable, by reason of age or cognitive impairment, of understanding his or her right to apply for an exemption under the section. This should be an issue for a judge's discretion.

Thirdly, to clarify that the court's power under the existing s 21(3a) does not require a court to consider exercising the power to exempt a prospective witness who is a young child or is cognitively impaired, regardless of whether an application for an exemption has been made. The power should be only discretionary.

Fourthly, in line with the preferred terminology to use a more appropriate term for 'mentally impaired', namely 'cognitive impairment'.

Finally, to stipulate that a failure to discharge whatever duty or procedure is prescribed by s 21 provides no ground for a convicted person to appeal their conviction.

(l) Clarifying s 34M of the Evidence Act 1929 in relation to initial complaint

The Bill amends s 34M of the Evidence Act 1929 to make it plain that an initial complaint of sexual conduct by an alleged victim, no matter how delayed, can demonstrate a consistency of conduct—though the degree of consistency of conduct will vary from case to case. The amendment adopts the view of Kourakis J (as he then was) in R v H, T (2010) 108 SASR 86, 105]-[106].

The amendment to s 34M clarifies that initial complaint evidence can be used to demonstrate consistency of conduct in any case, even where the complaint is made many years later. The degree of consistency of conduct that is demonstrated in a particular case and the weight to be given to the evidence of initial complaint will be a matter for a properly directed tribunal of fact to determine.

(m) To tighten the restrictions on access to audio visual records and transcripts of interview, involving vulnerable witnesses, especially to legally unrepresented accused

The Bill expands the meaning of 'sensitive material' in s 67H of the Evidence Act 1929 to include the audio visual records of investigative interviews and pre-trial special hearings, along with the transcript of those records, of witnesses in trials of sexual offences or violence offences who are young children or persons with a disability that adversely affects their capacity to give evidence. It provides that access can be given to such material by a court order, but only for proper and approved purposes.

The Bill also amends s 69 Evidence Act 1929 to provide that a court must be cleared when an audio visual record of an investigative interview or pre-trial special hearing of this class of witness is being played.

(n) Providing a procedure by which recorded investigative interviews with vulnerable witnesses can be reviewed, assessed or checked for training purposes

The Bill allows Regulations to be made to provide a procedure by which recorded investigative interviews with vulnerable witnesses can be reviewed, assessed or checked for training purposes, including by external specialists, for quality assurance purposes, subject to strict confidentiality and privacy requirements.

(o) Amendment of the Declaration of Principles in s 6 of the Victims of Crime Act 2001 to include specific reference to both physical and intellectual disability

The Bill amends the Declaration of Principles in s 6 of the Victims of Crime Act 2001 to include specific reference to both physical and intellectual disability. The Bill amends s 6 of that Act to provide that the considerations required to be given to a victim include the needs of the victim that arise because of the victim's physical or intellectual ability.

Conclusion

The Disability Justice Plan and the present Bill reflect the Government's commitment to provide a modern and fair criminal justice system that is more responsive to the interests of people with disability, whether as victims, witnesses, suspects or defendants, and to ensure they are better served by the justice system.

I commend the Bill to Members.

The explanation of clauses will be included by the Office of Parliamentary Counsel.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal

Part 2—Amendment of *District Court Act 1991*

4—Amendment of section 50B—Certain trials of sexual offences to be given priority

This clause amends section 50B of the *District Court Act 1991* to broaden the category of victims that are captured by the provision.

Part 3—Amendment of *Evidence Act 1929*

5—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause replaces the definition of mental disability with that of cognitive impairment and inserts a definition of communication partner for the purposes of the principal Act. It also alters the definition of young child by increasing the age of a young child from 12 years to 14 years and makes other amendments of a consequential nature.

6—Amendment of section 9—Unsworn evidence

This clause amends section 9 to provide that, subject to the principal Act, section 9 does not apply to a statement made outside of a court admitted as evidence in any proceedings under an exception to the rule against hearsay at common law or under the principal Act.

7—Insertion of section 12AB

This clause inserts section 12AB which requires a court to convene a special hearing as a proceeding preliminary to a trial (a *pre-trial special hearing*) when—

- the evidence of a witness to whom new section 12AB applies is necessary for the purposes of the trial of a charge of an offence to which the section applies; and
- the facilities necessary to take the evidence of the witness are readily available to the court and it is otherwise practicable to make arrangements for a pre-trial special hearing; and
- the arrangements can be made without prejudice to any party to the proceedings.

12AB—Pre-trial special hearings

The clause sets out the various arrangements that must be made by the court for a pre-trial special hearing, including—

- that a hearing be convened as a proceeding preliminary to the trial of the charge of the offence for the purpose of taking the evidence of the witness in any setting that the court thinks fit in the circumstances (including an informal setting);
- if the witness has a physical disability or cognitive impairment—that the evidence be taken in a particular way (to be specified by the court) that will, in the court's opinion, facilitate the taking of evidence from the witness or minimise the witness's embarrassment or distress (including, if the witness has complex communication needs, with such communication assistance as may be specified by the court);
- that an audio visual record of the evidence be made;
- that the taking of evidence at the hearing be transmitted to the defendant by means of closed circuit television;

- if the defendant attends the hearing in person—that appropriate measures be taken to prevent the witness and the defendant from directly seeing or hearing each other before, during or after the hearing; and
- may make provision for the witness to be accompanied at the hearing by a relative, friend or other person for the purpose of providing emotional support; and
- may specify that the hearing is convened for any (or all) of the following purposes:
  - (i) examination of the witness;
  - (ii) cross-examination of the witness;
  - (iii) re-examination of the witness; and
- may make provision for any other matter that the court thinks fit.

However, the new section seeks to ensure that an order for a pre-trial special hearing must not be made if the effect of the order would be—

- to relieve a witness from the obligation to give evidence; or
- to relieve a witness from the obligation to submit to cross-examination; or
- to prevent the judge or defendant from observing the witness's demeanour in giving evidence (but the observation may be direct or by live transmission of the witness's voice and image); or
- to prevent the defendant from instructing counsel while the witness is giving evidence.

The section sets out special rules that apply in the event that the witness is accompanied by a person for the purpose of providing emotional support or communication assistance and sets out the manner in which an application for a pre-trial special hearing order must be made. The defendant is able to object to any such application on the ground that the witness does not fall into the category of witness who may apply for such special hearing. The section also provides that, subject to proposed section 13BA, an audio visual record of the evidence of a witness made at a pre-trial special hearing is admissible as evidence of the witness in the trial of a charge of an offence to which this new section applies.

The following definitions are included for the purposes of this new section:

trial of a charge of an offence to which this section applies means—

(a) the trial of a charge of a serious offence against the person; or

(b) the trial of a charge of an offence of contravening or failing to comply with an intervention order under the *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009*; or

(c) the trial of a charge of an offence of contravening or failing to comply with a restraining order under the *Summary Procedure Act 1921*;

witness to whom this section applies means—

(a) a young child; or

(b) a person with a disability that adversely affects the person's capacity to give a coherent account of the person's experiences or to respond rationally to questions.

8—Amendment of section 13—Special arrangements for protecting witnesses from embarrassment, distress etc when giving evidence

This clause proposes changes to section 13 to substitute a reference to mental disability with a reference to cognitive impairment.

9—Amendment of section 13A—Special arrangements for protecting vulnerable witnesses when giving evidence in criminal proceedings

This clause amends section 13A to make the language consistent with proposed section 12AB and to enable communication assistance to be provided to a vulnerable witness if required, also consistent with that proposed section.

10—Insertion of section 13BA

This clause inserts new section 13BA.

13BA—Admissibility of recorded evidence by certain witnesses in certain criminal proceedings

Proposed section 13BA gives the court power, in the trial of a charge of an offence, on application by a party to the proceedings, to order that the evidence of certain witnesses be admitted in the form of an audio visual record that has been made pursuant to proposed section 12AB or Part 17 Division 3 of the *Summary Offences Act 1953*.

The proposed section sets out the circumstances in which an audio visual record may be admitted into evidence and makes it clear that the court's discretion to exclude the evidence is preserved and sets out the range of circumstances in which a witness cannot be further examined, cross-examined or re-examined on the evidence admitted in the trial.

The new section also sets out the explanation that a judge must give a jury when admitting evidence in audio visual form and the nature of the warning that must be given in relation to the admission of that evidence.

11—Amendment of section 13C—Court's power to make audio visual record of evidence of vulnerable witnesses in criminal proceedings

This clause proposes amendments to section 13C of a consequential nature.

12—Insertion of section 14A

This clause inserts new section 14A.

14A—Entitlement of witness to be given communication assistance in certain circumstances

Proposed section 14A establishes a scheme to enable the court to order that the evidence given by witnesses with complex communication needs may be given with assistance designed to facilitate the taking of evidence from the witness.

In the event that the assistance ordered by the court is to take the form of a communication partner, the partner must be approved by the court and must take an oath or affirmation that the partner will communicate accurately with both the witness and the court.

13—Substitution of section 21

This clause deletes the current section and substitutes a new section.

21—Competence and compellability of witnesses

The substituted section makes certain changes to the process by which a close relative of the accused who is required by law (whether by subpoena or other process) to give evidence against the accused may apply to the court for an exemption from that requirement.

The changes to the new section include an ability for the court to grant an exemption either on an application or on its own initiative in certain circumstances. However, the court will not be required to make any inquiry about whether a prospective witness is aware of his or her right to apply for an exemption or is incapable (whether by reason of age or some reason) of understanding his or her right to apply for an exemption.

14—Amendment of section 25—Disallowance of inappropriate questions

This clause proposes to amend section 25 by substituting references to an *improper question* with references to an *inappropriate question* and adding a question that is expressed in language that is unnecessarily complicated to the categories of inappropriate questions that are included in subsection (1).

15—Repeal of section 34CA

This clause deletes section 34CA

16—Insertion of section 34LA

This clause inserts new section 34LA.

34LA—Admissibility of evidence of out of court statements by certain alleged victims of sexual offences

Proposed section 34LA is concerned with the admissibility of out of court statements made by certain victims of sexual offences. The provision imposes various conditions on the admission of the out of court statement.

The conditions are as follows:

(a) the person who made the out of court statement is the alleged victim of the sexual offence;

(b) the person will not be called as a witness in the proceedings because the judge is satisfied that, at the time the person made the out of court statement, the person was—

(i) a young child; or

(ii) a person with a disability that adversely affects the person's capacity to give a coherent account of the person's experiences or to respond rationally to questions;

(c) the out of court statement was not made by the person to an investigating or other authority as part of a formal interview process conducted in relation to the alleged offence;

(d) after considering the out of court statement, the circumstances in which it was made and any other relevant factor, the judge is of the opinion that the evidence has sufficient probative value to justify its admission.

Subsection (2)(b) applies regardless of the age of the person or the person's capacity at the time the judge is considering whether to admit the evidence of the out of court statement in the proceedings.

Evidence of the out of court statement may be used to prove the truth of the facts asserted in the statement and the admission of the evidence must be accompanied by a warning to the jury to treat the evidence with particular care because it has not been tested by way of examination or cross-examination of the alleged victim.

17—Amendment of section 34M—Evidence relating to complaint in sexual cases

This clause proposes to amend section 34M of the Act to refine the direction required to be given to the jury when evidence referred to in the section is admitted in a trial.

18—Amendment of section 67H—Meaning of sensitive material

This clause proposes to amend section 67H and the meaning of *sensitive material* for the purposes of Part 7 Division 10 of the principal Act. The amendments accommodate the audio visual record of pre-trial special hearings ordered pursuant to proposed section 12AB and the recording of interviews with certain vulnerable witnesses pursuant to proposed Part 17 Division 3 of the *Summary Offences Act 1953*.

19—Insertion of section 67HA

This clause proposes to insert a new section after section 67H.

67HA—Court may give access to certain sensitive material in certain circumstances

New section 67HA provides that a court may, if of the opinion that giving access to sensitive material of a kind referred to in section 67H(1)(a) that has been or may be admitted as evidence in proceedings before the court would assist a medical practitioner or psychologist to prepare an expert report for the court or provide treatment or therapy to the witness, make the sensitive material available to the medical practitioner or psychologist (as the case may be) subject to such conditions as the court thinks fit.

20—Amendment of section 69—Order for clearing court

This clause amends section 69 of the Act to ensure that the court's power to clear the court extends to occasions where evidence from an alleged victim of a sexual offence is a child and the evidence is admitted in the form of an audio visual record.

Part 4—Amendment of *Magistrates Court Act 1991*

21—Amendment of section 48B—Certain trials of sexual offences to be given priority

This clause amends section 48B of the *Magistrates Court Act 1991* to broaden the category of victims that are captured by the provision.

Part 5—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

22—Insertion of heading to Part 17 Division 1

This clause inserts a new division heading.

23—Insertion of heading to Part 17 Division 2

This clause inserts a new division heading.

24—Amendment of section 74D—Obligation to record interviews with suspects

This clause amends section 74D of the principal Act to update and substitute references to videotape recording and audiotape recording to audio visual record and audio record respectively.

25—Amendment of section 74E—Admissibility of evidence of interview

This clause amends section 74E of the principal Act as a consequence of the separation of Part 17 into Divisions.

26—Insertion of Part 17 Division 3

This clause inserts Division 3 into Part 17 of the principal Act

Division 3—Recording interviews with certain vulnerable witnesses

74EA—Application and interpretation

This clause sets out the category of vulnerable witnesses and the type of offences that the scheme for the recording of interviews applies to in proposed Division 3.

74EB—Obligation to record interviews with certain vulnerable witnesses

This clause sets out the way in which an interview under proposed Division 3 must be conducted.

74EC—Admissibility of evidence of interview

This clause sets out the requirements that must exist in relation to evidence of an interview conducted under proposed Division 3 to prevent the evidence being inadmissible and preserves the discretion of the court to rule evidence inadmissible in its entirety or in part, whether or not those conditions have been met.

27—Insertion of heading to Part 17 Division 4

This clause inserts a new division heading.

28—Amendment of section 74F—Prohibition on playing recordings of interviews

This clause amends section 74F of the principal Act to update and substitute references to videotape and audiotape to audio visual record and audio record respectively

29—Insertion of section 74H

This clause inserts a new clause

74H—Regulations

Proposed section 74H inserts a power to make regulations for the purposes of Part 17.

Part 6—Amendment of *Summary Procedure Act 1921*

30—Amendment of section 104—Preliminary examination of charges of indictable offences

This clause amends section 104 of the *Summary Procedure Act 1921* to update and substitute references to videotape and audiotape to audio visual record and audio record respectively.

The clause also makes amendments to alter the categories of victims that are captured by the provision.

31—Amendment of section 106—Taking evidence at preliminary examination

This clause amends section 106 of the principal Act to increase to 14 years of age the threshold below which certain considerations need to be made before granting permission to call a witness for oral examination at a preliminary examination.

Part 7—Amendment of *Supreme Court Act 1935*

32—Amendment of section 126A—Certain trials of sexual offences to be given priority

This clause amends section 126A of the *Supreme Court Act 1935* to broaden the category of victims that are captured by the provision.

Part 8—Amendment of *Victims of Crime Act 2001*

33—Amendment of section 6—Fair and dignified treatment

This clause amends section 6 of the principal Act to provide that the considerations required by the section to be given to a victim incorporate the needs of the victim that arise because of the victim's physical or intellectual ability.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Transitional provision

This clause makes an amendment of a transitional nature relating to the effect of the amendments by Part 3 of this measure to the *Evidence Act 1929*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

INTERVENTION ORDERS (PREVENTION OF ABUSE) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:43): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009; and to make related amendments to the Bail Act 1985, the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 and the Evidence Act 1929. 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) (15:44): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009 came into operation on 9 December 2011. The act reformed a system of domestic and personal violence restraining orders by creating a new type of order, called an intervention order, and broadening the range of people that could be protected by those orders.

An intervention order can be made to protect people from violence and threatening and controlling behaviour. The act acknowledges not only physical forms of violence but also emotional and psychological harm and an unreasonable and non-consensual denial of financial, social or personal autonomy. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

This Bill contains a number of amendments that will assist in the continued effective operation of the legislation as well as implement an election promise and address concerns raised by the decision of Justice Peek in *Police v Siaosi* [2014] SASC 131 ('*Siaosi*').

Many of the amendments are administrative in nature and have come about as a result of comments from the Chief Magistrate, the Commissioner of Police and government agencies. The Bill will also facilitate the electronic transfer of information between South Australia Police ('SAPOL'), the Courts and relevant public sector agencies by allowing the provision of the 'prescribed details' of an order rather than a copy of the order itself. This will reduce inefficiencies associated with manual paper-based processes and duplicative data entry across the criminal justice sector.

Section 31 of the Act is also amended to implement the Government's election promise to give courts a sentencing power to require perpetrators of domestic violence to bear the financial burden of an intervention program.

Currently intervention programs are only available in metropolitan Adelaide and are fully funded by the Government. The amendment to the Act gives the Court a discretionary power to order that a defendant, upon conviction of a breach of an intervention order involving physical violence or a threat of physical violence, to make a payment of not more than the prescribed amount toward the cost of any treatment program ordered as a term of their intervention order. This cost recovery service will allow perpetrator programs to be expanded to regional areas.

The risk of having to pay for treatment could also act as a deterrent for breaching an intervention order. The amendment has therefore been drafted to include a requirement that the Court inform a defendant that there is a possibility that the Court can order them to pay for their court mandated treatment if they breach the intervention order by an act, or a threat of, physical violence.

Under section 18 of the Act a police officer may issue an interim intervention order against a defendant if it appears to the police officer that there are grounds for issuing the order and the defendant is present before the police officer or in custody. If the defendant is not present or in custody then the police officer would need to make an application to the Court for an interim intervention order under section 21 of the Act.

At the behest of the Chief Magistrate, section 21 has been amended so that, in court proceedings for the making of an interim intervention order where the applicant is a police officer, the Court is not bound by the rules of

evidence, but may inform itself as it thinks fit. In doing so, the Court must act according to equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the case without regard to technicalities and legal forms.

There is precedent for this approach. In South Australia, when determining whether to make a problem gambling family protection order under the *Problem Gambling Family Protection Orders Act 2004* the Independent Gambling Authority is not bound by the rules of evidence.

Section 18(7) of the Act also requires a person against whom a police interim intervention order is issued to notify the Commissioner of Police in writing of an address for service. However, as it is not currently an offence to fail to provide this notification, SAPOL is unable to enforce this requirement. To assist police in the service of intervention orders, the Bill makes it an offence to fail to notify the Commissioner of Police of an address for service or to provide a false address. The maximum penalty for this offence will be a fine of $750 or an expiation fee of $105.

Another change that will assist police with serving intervention orders is the amendment to section 34 of the Act. Section 34 provides powers for police to facilitate service of unserved intervention orders. Currently, a police officer may require a person to remain at a particular place for so long as may be necessary for an intervention order to be served.

However, in some circumstances, such a requirement may be operationally impractical, particularly in small, rural and remote areas. To provide greater protection for victims, the Act amends section 34 so that a police officer may also require a person to accompany them to the nearest police station for the purpose of service of an intervention order. If this occurs, police have an obligation to ensure that the person is returned to the place at which the request was made or taken to a place that is near to that place, unless to do so would be against the person's wishes or there is good reason for not doing so.

The Bill also amends section 26 of the Act so that the Commissioner of Police is notified of all applications for variation or revocation of an intervention order. As the primary enforcer of all intervention orders, it is important that police are aware of any variation or revocation applications so that they can intervene and provide assistance to the victim if necessary. This will provide additional protection for a victim of domestic violence who may have been pressured to file an application to vary or revoke an intervention order.

The amendments to section 12 and Schedule 1 of the Act address issues raised by the decision of Justice Peek in *Siaosi*.

Siaosi was a Magistrate's Court appeal against the conviction of a charge of contravening a term of an intervention order and sentence. The term of the intervention order in question was that the person was prohibited from entering or remaining 'in the vicinity of' specified premises. Justice Peek held that the term 'in the vicinity of' was not within the powers conferred by section 12(1) of the Act.

As a result of this decision, SAPOL and the Chief Magistrate have requested amendments to the Act to enable police and the Courts to issue orders that contain the term 'in the vicinity of'. The requested amendments do two things. Firstly, section 12 of the Act is amended to allow an intervention order to prohibit a person from being on, or in the vicinity of certain premises or localities. Secondly, a transitional provision is inserted into Schedule 1 of the Act to validate any existing intervention orders that include a term that purports to prohibit the defendant from being within the vicinity of premises at which the protected person works or resides or within the vicinity of specified premises frequented by a protected person.

The amendments to section 23 of the Act require the Court, when determining whether to confirm, vary or revoke an interim intervention order, to make inquiries about the existence of any relevant *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth) orders or *Children's Protection Act 1993* orders and consider how the final intervention order and that existing order would interact. The Court is also required to take such steps as it considers necessary to avoid inconsistency between the orders.

In cases where a parenting order made under the *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth), to the extent that it provides for a child to spend time with a person, or requires or authorises a person to spend time with the child, will be inconsistent with the terms of the intervention order, South Australian Magistrates have the power, under section 68R of the *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth), to revive, vary, discharge or suspend the parenting order to remove any inconsistencies related to contact with children. If there are no concurrent proceedings on foot in the Family Court, the exercise of this power by a Magistrate would remove the need for the applicant to commence new proceedings in the Family Court to vary the parenting orders.

Finally, the Bill makes consequential amendments to the *Bail Act 1985*, the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988* and the *Evidence Act 1929* in areas that also impact on victims of domestic violence.

Section 21B of the *Bail Act 1985* is being amended to give the Court the power to order attendance at a treatment program as a condition of bail. At present, the Court may only make attendance at a treatment program a condition of bail if the defendant consents. The amendment aligns the *Bail Act 1985* with the position in the Act so that where a defendant is the subject of an intervention order applications as well as on criminal charges, the Court can order that the defendant attend a treatment program even if the application for an intervention order does not proceed. As the requirement for consent is being removed, there is an additional obligation on the Court to consider the view of the defendant before ordering them to attend a treatment program as part of their bail conditions.

Section 13B of the *Evidence Act 1929*, which deals with the cross-examination of certain witnesses, is being amended to include an aggravated assault where the form of the aggravation is as set out in section 5AA(1)(g) of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*. That is, that the offender committed the offence knowing that the victim of the offence was:

- a spouse or former spouse of the offender; or
- a domestic partner or former domestic partner of the offender; or
- a child of whom the offender, or a spouse or domestic partner or former spouse or domestic partner of the offender, has custody as a parent or guardian; or
- a child who normally or regularly resides with the offender, or a spouse or domestic partner or former spouse or domestic partner of the offender.

The amendment offers greater protection to victims in domestic violence situations.

The amendment to section 10 of the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*, which was requested by the Chief Magistrate, reinstates a provision that was deleted in 2013 to make it clear that a court may treat a defendant's participation and achievements in an intervention order program as relevant to sentence. Although there is nothing to prevent a court from taking this into account currently, I am happy to reinsert the provision as requested to make it clear to a court, as well as to a defendant, that successful participation in an intervention program is a relevant consideration in determining sentence.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause proposes the insertion of a number of new definitions into section 3. Definitions of a f*inal intervention order* and an *interim intervention order* will clarify the distinction between the two types of intervention order. A definition of intervention order (being an interim intervention order or a final intervention order, as the case requires) is also inserted. Other amendments are consequential on the insertion of the various definitions.

5—Amendment of section 5—Objects of Act

This proposed amendment will delete an otiose phrase from the current section.

6—Amendment of section 12—Terms of intervention order—general

The proposed amendments to section 12 will allow for an intervention order to prohibit a defendant from being on, or in the vicinity of, certain premises or a locality.

7—Amendment of section 13—Terms of intervention order—intervention programs

The proposed amendments to section 13 require a court, on making an intervention order the terms of which may require the defendant to undertake an intervention program, to endeavour to ensure that the defendant understands his or her obligations under the order and the consequences of a failure to comply with any such requirement.

8—Amendment of section 14—Terms of intervention order—firearms

The first 2 proposed amendments to this section will enable the firearms terms of an intervention order to relate to any firearm, ammunition or part of a firearm to reflect the current law in this State. The final proposed amendment is consequential on the insertion of the definition of a *final intervention order* in section 3.

9—Amendment of section 15—Terms of intervention order—date after which defendant may apply for variation or revocation

These proposed amendments are consequential.

10—Amendment of section 18—Interim intervention order issued by police

Currently, this section requires the Commissioner of Police to give a copy of any interim intervention order issued by a police officer to the Principal Registrar and each person protected by the order. The proposed amendment

will still require the Commissioner to give a copy of any such order to each protected person but, instead of being required also to provide the Principal Registrar with a copy of the order, the Commissioner may notify the Principal Registrar in writing of the prescribed details of the order or provide the Registrar with a copy of the order.

11—Amendment of section 19—Revocation of interim intervention order by Commissioner of Police

This proposed amendment is similar to the previous amendment proposed to section 18. The Commissioner will be required to give a copy of the notice of revocation of any interim intervention order issued by a police officer to each person protected by the order and to notify the Principal Registrar in writing of the prescribed details of the order.

12—Amendment of section 21—Preliminary hearing and issue of interim intervention order

It is proposed to insert a subsection that provides that, in proceedings relating to an interim intervention order where the applicant is a police officer—

- the Court is not bound by the rules of evidence but may inform itself as it thinks fit; and
- the Court must act according to equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the case without regard to technicalities and legal forms.

Further proposed amendments to section 21 provide that the Principal Registrar must notify the Commissioner of Police in writing of the prescribed details of an interim intervention order, or give the Commissioner a copy of the order, and give each protected person and (if the applicant is not a police officer) the applicant a copy of the order. Other amendments proposed to this section are related or provide clarification.

13—Amendment of section 23—Determination of application for final intervention order

The proposed amendments to this section clarify when the section is making provision in relation to a final intervention order and when it is dealing with an interim intervention order or a final intervention order. On the hearing of an application for a final intervention order, the Court may—

- confirm the interim intervention order issued against the defendant as a final intervention order; or
- issue a final intervention order in substitution for an interim intervention order issued against the defendant; or
- dismiss the application and revoke the interim intervention order issued against the defendant.

If a final intervention order is to be made and the defendant or a person protected by the order is a child or the parent of a child, the Court must make inquiries about whether there is any relevant Family Law Act order or Children's Protection Act order and look at how the final intervention order and that other order would interact. The Court must take such steps as it considers necessary to avoid inconsistency between the intervention order and any Family Law Act order or Children's Protection Act order.

Other amendments provide for notification of the prescribed details of a final intervention order and the provision of copies of the order in similar terms as in previous provisions.

14—Amendment of section 24—Problem gambling order

The proposed amendments provide that the Principal Registrar must notify the persons listed below in writing of the prescribed details of a problem gambling order made in conjunction with a final intervention order, or give each of them a copy of the order:

- the Independent Gambling Authority;
- the Commissioner of Police;
- the proprietor or licensee of any premises specified in the order; and

give a copy of the order to each protected person and (if the applicant for the order is not a police officer or a protected person) the applicant.

15—Amendment of section 25—Tenancy order

These proposed amendments are consequential.

16—Amendment of section 26—Intervention orders

This clause deals with court procedures relating to both interim intervention orders and final intervention orders, as the case requires. A number of amendments proposed to this section are consequential. Another requires the Court to allow the police a reasonable opportunity to be heard on an application to vary or revoke an interim intervention order before the Court determines the application. The amendment also sets out the requirements of the Principal Registrar relating to notification and the provision of copies of orders or notices of revocation of an order.

17—Amendment of section 30—Registration of foreign intervention orders

The first proposed amendment makes it clear that a foreign intervention order registered in the Court is deemed to be a final intervention order issued under the principal Act. The other amendment relates to notification of the registration of the order and the prescribed details of the order.

18—Amendment of section 31—Contravention of intervention order

It is proposed to insert a new subsection (2a) into section 31. The proposed subsection will provide that if a person is found guilty of an offence under subsection (1) or (2) where the act or omission alleged to constitute the offence involved physical violence or a threat of physical violence, the Court may, in addition to imposing a penalty for the offence—

- order the convicted person to make a payment of not more than the prescribed amount toward the cost of any intervention program the person is required to undertake in accordance with the intervention order; and
- make any other order that the Court thinks fit.

Another amendment updates a cross-reference.

19—Amendment of section 34—Powers facilitating service of intervention order

The amendments proposed to section 34 clarify the powers and obligations of a police officer in relation to the service of an intervention order on a person subject to the order.

20—Amendment of section 36—Power to arrest and detain for contravention of intervention order

It is proposed to amend this section by deleting subsections (2) and (3). Those subsections are unnecessary as the provisions of the *Bail Act 1985* apply to a person arrested and detained for contravention of an intervention order.

21—Amendment of section 40—Dealing with items surrendered under intervention order

This amendment is consequential.

22—Amendment of Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

It is proposed to insert a clause in Schedule 1 that will validate any intervention order in force immediately before the commencement of section 6 of this measure that includes a term that purports to—

- prohibit the person the subject of the order from being within the vicinity of premises at which a protected person resides or works; or
- prohibit the defendant from being within the vicinity of specified premises frequented by a protected person.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Amendment of the *Bail Act 1985*

1—Amendment of section 21B—Intervention programs

This amendment would allow a bail authority to set as a condition of a bail agreement that the person undertake an intervention program without requiring the person to consent to the imposition of such a condition. The substituted subsection (2) does require the court to satisfy itself, before imposing any such condition, that—

- the person is eligible for the services to be included on the program in accordance with applicable eligibility criteria (if any); and
- those services are available for the person at a suitable time and place,

and to give consideration to any representations made by the person in relation to the program.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*

2—Amendment of section 10—Sentencing considerations

This amendment would make it clear that a court may treat a defendant's participation and achievements in an intervention program as relevant to sentence.

3—Amendment of section 19A—Intervention orders may be issued on finding of guilt or sentencing

This amendment is consequential.

Part 3—Amendment of *Evidence Act 1929*

4—Amendment of section 13B—Cross-examination of certain witnesses

This clause amends the list of offences to which section 13B of the *Evidence Act 1929* applies by the addition of certain aggravated offences under section 20 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*. The section applies to

an aggravated offence under section 20 if the aggravating circumstances are those referred to in section 5AA(1)(g) of that Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (IMPLEMENTATION OF CORONER'S RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:45): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Children's Protection Act 1993. 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) (15:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

On 9 April 2015, the State Coroner handed down the findings of the Inquest into the Death of Chloe Lee Valentine. The Coroner's findings included 21 recommendations for change. On 13 April 2015, the government resolved to support 19 of those recommendations. Recommendation 22.13 was supported in principle and recommendation 22.9 is currently the subject of further investigation.

The Children's Protection (Implementation of Coroner's Recommendations) Amendment Bill 2015 seeks to amend the Children's Protection Act 1993 to implement three of the Coroner's recommendations, namely recommendations 22.2, 22.11 and 22.12. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Recommendation 22.12

The Bill amends the objects of the Act to make it plain that the paramount consideration in the administration of the Act is to keep children safe from harm and that maintaining a child in her or his family must give way to the child's safety.

The Bill also removes the fundamental principles set out in section 4. The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that the objects of the Act are clear, and are not complicated by a further section setting out other matters to be considered when implementing those objects.

Recommendation 22.11

The Bill amends the Act to recognise cumulative harm as a relevant factor in making decisions about the care of a child. The Bill provides that in assessing whether there is a significant risk that a child will suffer serious harm or a child has been abused or neglected, relevant officers will take into account not only the current circumstances of the child but also the history of the child's care and the likely cumulative effect of that history.

This amendment provides for proper consideration of the effect of the kind of chronic neglect that was present in the life of Chloe Valentine by ensuring notifications and episodes of neglect and abuse are not considered by decision makers in isolation.

Recommendation 22.2

The Bill will amend the Act to include convictions for particular offences within a new definition; qualifying offence. This will capture any person who has a conviction in respect of a child previously born to them, or for whom they were guardian, for criminal neglect, endangering life, causing or creating risk of serious harm, manslaughter or murder. This definition also captures convictions for an attempt to commit the preceding offences, offences to which the finding of a Court under Part 8A of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* applies, as well as corresponding offences in other jurisdictions.

The range of qualifying offences is broader than the Coroner's recommendation.

Under the Bill, the Chief Executive must, if he or she becomes aware that a child is residing with a parent who has been found guilty of a *qualifying offence*, issue an instrument of guardianship in respect of the child. The child specified in the instrument will, for all purposes, be under the guardianship of the Minister for a period of 60 days. As soon as practicable within that period, the Minister must apply to the Youth Court for a care and protection order under

Division 2 of the Act. If additional time is required to investigate the child's circumstances, the Bill makes provision for the Court to grant an extension of time on application of the Minister.

Under the Bill, a newborn child who has not yet been discharged from hospital will be taken to be residing with a person if the child is likely to reside with the person, for example the biological mother, on being discharged.

While the Coroner's recommendation focussed on the actions of the biological parents of a child, it is noted that a person that has committed a *qualifying offence* may reside or intend to reside in a household with a child that is not their own and this may pose a significant risk to the safety of the child. For this reason, the Bill further provides that if the Chief Executive becomes aware that a child is residing with a person (other than the parent of the child) who has been found guilty of a qualifying offence, the Chief Executive must issue a *restraining notice* to the offender unless the Chief Executive is of the opinion that it is inappropriate to do so in the circumstances.

Under the Bill a *restraining notice* may prohibit the offender from:

- Residing in the same premises as the child;
- Coming within a specified distance of the child's residence;
- Having any contact with the child except under supervision;
- Having any contact at all with the child.

Consistent with the *instrument of guardianship*, a restraining notice will apply for a period of 60 days and the Minister must, as soon as practicable, apply to the Youth Court for a care and protection order. As is the case for instruments of guardianship, the Minister can apply to the Court for an extension of time.

In order to bring these amendments into practice, the Bill requires a Court that finds a person guilty of a qualifying offence to provide information relating to that finding of guilt to the Chief Executive as soon as practical after the person is found guilty.

I commend the Bill to Members

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Children's Protection Act 1993*

4—Substitution of section 3

This clause substitutes section 3 of the principal Act, clarifying the objects of the Act so that keeping children safe from harm is the primary object, or the paramount consideration. Further objects are set out in new subsection (2), but they are secondary to the need to keep children safe from harm.

5—Repeal of section 4

This clause repeals section 4 of the principal Act.

6—Amendment of section 5—Provisions relating to dealing with Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander children

This clause inserts a new subsection (a1) into section 5 of the principal Act. This is a relocation of current section 4(5) and is consequent upon the repeal of that section.

7—Amendment of section 6—Interpretation

This clause inserts a new subsection (4) into section 6 of the principal Act. The new subsection makes it clear that, in assessing the risk of harm to a child for the purposes of the Act, or the fact of whether a child has been abused or neglected, the accumulated effect of any harm across the course of the child's history must be considered, and not just the circumstances existing in relation to the child at the point in time of the assessment.

8—Amendment of section 37—Application for care and protection order

This clause inserts new subsection (3) into section 37 of the principal Act. The new subsection (consequential upon the insertion of new Part 5 Division 3) requires the Minister to apply to the Youth Court for a care and protection order under Part 5 Division 2 as soon as is practicable after he or she issues an instrument of guardianship or a restraining notice under new Part 5 Division 3. The new subsection also sets out the grounds for such an application, namely that the initial instrument or notice was properly issued.

9—Amendment of section 38—Court's power to make orders

This clause inserts new paragraph (ea) into section 38(1) of the principal Act. The new paragraph allows the Youth Court to revoke an instrument of guardianship or restraining notice where an application contemplated by section 37(3) has been made.

10—Insertion of Part 5 Division 3

This clause inserts new Part 5 Division 3 into the principal Act, as follows:

Division 3—Chief Executive to take action in relation to persons with qualifying offences

44A—Interpretation

New section 44A sets out key terms used in the new Division 3.

Of particular note is the definition of *qualifying offence*, those being the offences that enliven the requirements of the new Division. Those offences are murder, manslaughter, criminal neglect, an act to endanger life or causing serious harm, or an attempt to commit such an offence, where the victim is a child and the offender a parent or guardian of the child. It does not matter whether the offence was committed before or after the commencement of the new Division.

44B—Application of Division

New section 44B provides that new Division 3 only applies to children born in the State after the commencement of the new section who are not the subject of a guardianship order under another Act, for example the *Guardianship and Administration Act 1993*.

44C—Temporary guardianship instruments and restraining notices

New section 44C(1) requires the Chief Executive to assume guardianship of a child if the Chief Executive becomes aware that the child is residing with a parent who has been convicted of a qualifying offence, being the offences defined in new section 44A. Those offences include interstate offences. This is achieved by Chief Executive issuing an instrument of guardianship.

New section 44C(3) requires the Chief Executive, if he or she becomes aware that a child is residing with a person who is not their parent but who has been convicted of a qualifying offence, to issue a restraining notice to the person, prohibiting the person from doing the things specified in the notice, such as residing in the same premises as the child.

The new section also makes provision in relation to procedural requirements for instruments of guardianship and restraining notices, and creates an offence for a person to contravene a restraining notice. The new section also provides that a newborn baby will be taken to reside with a person if the baby is likely to reside with the person when the baby comes out of hospital.

As soon as practicable after the Chief Executive issues an instrument of guardianship or a restraining notice, the Minister must make the application referred to in the amended section 37 of the principal Act.

44D—Court may grant an extension of time

New section 44D allows the Youth Court to extend the guardianship period or restraining notice period (that is, the period of time an instrument or notice is in effect) if the court thinks it appropriate to do so.

44E—Evidentiary

New section 44E provides an evidentiary presumption in respect of instruments of guardianship and restraining notices.

44F—Information to be provided to Chief Executive

New section 44F requires a court that finds a person guilty of a qualifying offence to provide to the Chief Executive prescribed information relating to the finding of guilt.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

THE UNITING CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA (MEMBERSHIP OF TRUST) AMENDMENT BILL

Referred to Select Committee

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) (15:47): I bring up the final report of the select committee on the bill, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

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) (15:48): I move:

That the report of the select committee be noted.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:48): Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and I thank the Attorney for his observations. I rise to speak to the Uniting Church in Australia (Membership of Trust) Amendment Bill and the report of the select committee. I note just a little bit of history. This bill goes back to an extract of the minutes of a Resources Board meeting for the Uniting Church on 5 September 2013, where there was a recommendation for a revision of The Uniting Church in Australia Act 1976-1977 that a review be undertaken of the act and action initiated to amend the act to bring it up to date, noting in particular the need to amend section 11(4). It was agreed to give further consideration to this recommendation and it was given to a certain individual to investigate further.

Obviously, there were some internal investigations done within the hierarchy of the Uniting Church, and that took a little bit of time. I note that on 19 August 2014, the Uniting Church wrote to the Attorney-General in regard to section 11(4), which states that 'No person who has attained the age of seventy years shall be eligible for appointment as a member of the Trust'. That is the main item we are dealing with in amending this act.

The church was concerned that they were losing some very good people in their tenure to serve on the Property Trust of the Uniting Church of Australia. This legislation came to this place and was debated and, subsequently, the select committee was set up with members from either side of the house and advertising for submissions was put out. We had one response, and it was from the Uniting Church, and I will read that response. It reads:

To the Secretary:

We write to you on behalf of the Uniting Church in South Australia in response to your call for submissions on the Select Committee on the Uniting Church in Australia (Membership of Trust) Amendment Bill.

As officers of the Uniting Church in South Australia we fully support the proposed change to the Act relating to the 70 year old clause. I wish to thank the Select Committee for its consideration of the matter and would like to reiterate the desire of the Church to have the amendment made.

Following a review of The Uniting Church in Australia Act 1976-1977 ('the Act'), the Uniting Church in Australia Property Trust (S.A.) ('the Property Trust') agreed to pursue this amendment to the act. For your convenience, please find attached an extract from the minutes reflecting this decision and a copy of the letter sent to the Attorney-General requesting the change to the Act.

The Uniting Church is well aware of the limitations of keeping the Act in its current form. In 2010 the first cohort of baby boomers entered an older age group of 65. In our experience this demographic includes a vibrant, productive and engaged workforce with much to contribute. Within our 300 congregations in South Australia many of our retirees have enjoyed long careers in which they have accumulated diverse skills and experience in professional, business and leadership arenas. Once retired they seek opportunities to contribute to the community in a meaningful way, on a part time or voluntary basis.

It seems clear that legislation that limits an individual's ability to contribute to society based on their age is discriminatory and outdated. In the case of the Uniting Church, the legislation in its current form limits our available Volunteers to serve on the Property Trust. Just recently the Property Trust farewelled two experienced and highly valued members who concluded their tenure on the Trust and would have continued to serve, if not for reaching 70 years of age.

The Uniting Church (S.A.) believes removing the age limitations of the Act will be a step towards recognising the changing needs of Australia's population by creating opportunities for our older people to remain engaged in the community. As well it will better reflect the current thinking of the Uniting Church in respecting people of all ages and valuing volunteers.

Do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss the matter further—

etc., and it was signed off by Deidre Palmer, Moderator of the Uniting Church in South Australia; Nigel Rogers, Secretary of the Synod, Uniting Church in South Australia; and Peter Battersby, Property Officer of the Uniting Church in South Australia.

I would like to acknowledge some of the comments I made on 17 March when we debated this bill in this place. I talked about my father's long service to the church and I want to acknowledge that. He served 60-plus years as a lay preacher and, sadly, he passed away recently.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:54): I thank the honourable member for his contribution.

Motion carried.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:55): Now that the house has received the report, I too, having read the report, commend a recommendation in it that there be speedy passage of this through the Legislative Council. I just want to say that, in indicating support for that, we do not in any way ask or call upon the Legislative Council to compromise their opportunity to debate any of the bills.

It appears simply that, in the absence of there being any objection to the passage of this legislation after the requisite advertisement and no request for submissions to be put, it would be unreasonable to impede any further the Uniting Church's desire to enable some of its older members to continue on the trust. In those circumstances, I would ask the Legislative Council to respectfully consider the matter as promptly as possible so that there can be quick passage of the bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL 2015

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:57): I rise again to speak in support of the Supply Bill and to continue my remarks about Collective Impact and the launch of Together in the South's work last Wednesday 29 April, work that members of our southern community and, indeed, our broader South Australian community can be very proud of, work that is absolutely focused on proactively supporting and enabling our youngest and most vulnerable citizens to flourish rather than simply reacting to the worst of circumstances, work that is underpinned by the deep emotions that so many of us find invoked when we experience children not being supported in the way they should be, work that is urgent and pressing and work that is all of our responsibility.

As mentioned, this launch followed months of planning by a collective group of leaders from our community, community organisations including Junction Australia and Anglicare, City of Onkaparinga, Flinders University and government in our southern community, every one of whom was and is deeply committed and determined to work together to shift the social and emotional issues that some of our youngest and most vulnerable citizens are experiencing.

Together SA is a South Australian organisation pioneering groundbreaking, Collective Impact work in South Australia and providing backbone support to collective impact initiatives. Collective impact is an extremely successful, highly collaborative, results-driven model of social change that brings together large sections of our community, business and government to work together in a focused way to achieve lasting and effective results with and for people on difficult and urgent social issues. It takes collaboration to a new level of action with constant agreement about effective, aligned and measured activities that make a real and sustained difference on issues that communities are passionate about.

Through the Promised Neighbourhoods Institute in the US, the Tamarack institute in Canada and in various states and territories of Australia, it is bringing people together to change lives and communities. A key element of the work is that it is place-based and absolutely puts people at the

centre of the work in a way that engages and empowers them and develops their ability to lead in their community. The model ensures that data, measurement and strategies are developed in a manner that is accessible to all involved.

Successful Collective Impact approaches utilise certain elements, two of which I will talk about today; the first is the collaborative development of a common agenda or shared vision for social change. Typically, a community utilising Collective Impact will have a shared understanding of the specific problem or problems they wish to solve and a burning desire to do so, and they will work together with all sectors and all affected by the problem to devise and enact shared strategies for change.

This means working hard and sometimes uncomfortably together to establish agreement on what the problems are and how they will be solved, with an ongoing focus on ensuring everyone involved is on the same page. As you can imagine, this is not always an easy task, particularly when bringing together people who have been active in community service and work for many years and have done great work in that space, yet may have operated in a competitive tendering environment for a long period where results are often closely linked to numbers of interactions alone, rather than number and effectiveness of interactions.

A shared measurement system is essential for assessing the impact of collective action. Importantly, Collective Impact groups must be willing to initiate and continue with work that delivers results even if it strays away from what we have always done. Developing a single measurement system for progress that is agreed to by all players through which players share key data and which informs the actions keeps the work on track for success.

Results Based Accountability (RBA), a measurement system for results at both a program and population level, is a system which is being increasingly and successfully used as the measurement system to underpin collective impact approaches. It is also increasingly being used across local government, community organisations, and government departments in South Australia to measure success in a way which measures real results for the people for whom programs are developed. 'Put concerned people in one room, agree upon statistically definable goals, and then coordinate action and spend the dollars to hit the targets,' said journalist Peter Goodman when summarising collective impact models in Cincinnati in the US.

Importantly, Collective Impact works. It is at the cutting edge of social innovation and is the model being rolled out around the world to fix the biggest, pressing, and most difficult problems facing communities. Interestingly, what the United States' experience of collective impact shows us is that often it is not about bringing more money to fix a problem. It demonstrates that when you address service duplication and bring government, community organisations and groups, and business together with the community in the centre of the work to work on specific problems, you often find that the resources were likely already there, just not being used or mobilised in a coordinated way.

Collective Impact has had great success worldwide. It is focusing and mobilising resources well and in a highly targeted fashion, and I am very proud to be helping with bringing it to South Australia. As I said, last week I was privileged to be heavily involved in the launch of Together in the South at Wirreanda Secondary School in our beautiful southern suburbs in my electorate of Reynell. More than 130 community members, business leaders, community service workers, government department leaders, and many other dedicated people came together to talk about making Collective Impact work to address pressing early childhood issues in our southern community. Incidentally, we were incredibly well fed by the lovely catering students of Wirreanda Secondary School and had country acknowledged by outstanding year 9 student, Cheyenne.

It was a great privilege to have both the Premier and the Minister for Social Inclusion at this important event as we launched a new way of thinking about social change. Drawing on the work of brilliant Master of Social Work students, David and Miranda from Flinders University, who have broken down complex data to deliver a suburb-by-suburb analysis of how children in the south are faring, we heard about exactly how local children are doing in our community, and local residents and service providers generously and courageously led the way in sharing stories around the data.

Our focus was particularly on the social competence and emotional maturity of children, factors that are well tracked by the Australian Early Development Census and give a good indication

of how children will succeed in the future. We were also pleased to welcome Dr Geoff Woolcock, from the Logan Child Friendly Community Consortium, to discuss how collective impact is working in Logan in Queensland. Logan Together is a massive undertaking by community and stakeholders, with community members and everyone from the Red Cross to Griffith University to Volunteering Queensland coming on board.

Logan Together is focused on children between the ages of zero and eight in two distinct areas of disadvantage in Logan after it was recognised that these children fell well below the Australian average for rates of healthy development. The work of Logan Together is sparking more Collective Impact work across Australia as they take the initial step forward. Dr Woolcock talked us through the progress of Logan Together and the ways they have brought the community on board. His expertise in this area is quite unparalleled, and his assistance in launching collective impact in South Australia was and will be invaluable.

Every one of us in this place and thousands of people in our communities want the very best for our youngest people. We are collectively distressed when we see children not being supported to do and be their best. I was inspired by the collective will of every person present at our southern event to together take a pledge to support our southern children. Our pledge was to ensure that 'Every child is safe, healthy, active, ready to learn, and getting along with others.'

I was incredibly inspired that together we collectively took responsibility for improving the emotional and social wellbeing and success of over 6,000 children between zero and eight years old (2,000 of whom have been identified as vulnerable) in the suburbs of Hackham West, Christie Downs, Huntfield Heights, Noarlunga Downs, O'Sullivan Beach/Lonsdale, Christies Beach, Hackham and Morphett Vale.

I urge all of my colleagues in this chamber to support the important work of Together SA and the Collective Impact approach to address areas of concern in our community. The work is steeped in our collective commitment to work together in a focused, new and aligned way to achieve real results for our youngest South Australians. It is work that can transform our communities, work that will finally shift the most difficult issues with and for our most vulnerable youngest citizens, work that is urgent, work that can and will make a real difference, and work that our southern community will take forward alongside and with these 2,000 children in our hearts and minds.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:05): I rise to offer my contribution to the Supply Bill. When campaigning for the seat of Fisher late last year, I was very careful not to make promises that could not be kept. My main commitments to the people of my electorate were based on providing honest representation, contributing to relevant debate that helped build a strong community, and to be a positive role model to all community members, but importantly to women and young people who, in terms of numbers, fit into groups that benefit very strongly from role models that are real, have courage, honesty and positive behaviours.

I ask the representatives in this place to ensure the swift passage of the Supply Bill as a way of supporting work in our communities that contributes to healthy citizens and informed and sound decision-making. A strong community attracts investment by private enterprise. This investment is also influenced by its public officers and how they represent and invest in their own communities. I too have spent many hours each day talking to constituents in Fisher about local issues that affect them. I am very careful not to impart any bias into the conversation, and I let them have their say in their own way. I support them to be honest with their inquiries.

Particular areas that are important for my community in relation to supply include health, education, and the built, natural and social environment. I will come to health later and briefly talk to the latter areas of education and environment. Some of the vital areas that must be invested in relate to the support of:

- crime prevention programs which assist with real and perceived safety that is vital to all;
- attendance and communication at school, and communication with parents;
- enabling the participation in mentoring and leadership by school principals;

- provision of adjunct programs that support delivery of the school curriculum in a way that is meaningful and retained by students across the lifespan; and
- delivery of support services to at-risk families, such as early childhood services, therapeutic family support, and, broadly, preventative, interventional and restorative domestic violence services.

We must ensure the passage of support from this house is done in a way that is useful and honest. Berating, personal attacks and general undermining of the good people that work in our public services should not occur. It is not useful to tar all good people that operate in these services with a negative brush.

In terms of pensioner concessions, it has been a major issue in my area, related to the number of people who have to rely on our goodwill and good governance to ensure that their incomes are not affected. Many people who live in my area are on fixed incomes. What they have been experiencing in the last few months has been an ongoing attack on them from all areas of government that is inconsistent and oftentimes untrue. I would urge all members of government and the opposition to ensure that the information they provide to pensioners within their electorates is honest.

In health, we must work across the health continuum in a coordinated and best practice fashion. Fear and false information is causing enormous anxiety and, in turn, leading to potentially poor health outcomes. I also attended the Channel 7 forum on Monday night referred to by the member for Kaurna. There were other members from this house in the audience as well and I too was surprised at the misinformation that was occurring and has clearly occurred previous to that forum.

In terms of health, we must ensure that we attack several areas to ensure best outcome. We must stop entry to our hospitals that is unnecessary. Every day our hospitals receive hundreds of people from nursing homes who could receive good quality care within their own environment, the environment that they live in and have invested in. Nursing home patients are extremely vulnerable and this entry to hospital must be addressed.

I am keen to see us invest better in health promotion programs. Access to primary health is also vital. In terms of Transforming Health, it is important that we focus our attention on the areas that would most benefit from health reform, and we have done so with our reform of the emergency departments, day surgery procedures and service delivery at particular sites within Adelaide. Some of the key areas also for prevention of negative health outcomes include areas such as: road safety and other trauma, drugs and alcohol, heart and other cardiovascular diseases. I would particularly like to talk to cancer and preventative and research-driven evidence-based public health policy.

In a cash-strapped environment, South Australia needs to get all it can from the health dollar. How best to do that requires evidence. Health is just too complex to make decisions by winging it on the run. The evidence needs to come from local data holdings on population service needs and performance and from applied research. This includes behavioural research, as exemplified for tobacco control, for instance. Relevant data holdings and research exist across government, non-government organisations, universities, the private sector and SAHMRI.

A strong collaboration is needed across the health sector to provide the required evidence. A competitive environment is counterproductive. The collaboration is needed fast to tackle large and pressing budgetary pressures. The new SA NHMRC Advanced Health Research and Research Translation Centre should get behind the Transforming Health initiative by forging the statewide collaboration required between all components of the health sector to harness and bring together the evidence and give direction to the Transforming Health initiative to achieve the outcome of: best care, first time, every time.

Without this evidence, efforts are in danger of being misdirected and missing the mark. Continued strategic investment in epidemiological, behavioural and policy research and evaluation is critical to achieving this by addressing the risk factors for optimising health outcomes and reducing disparities. We must have equity. The National Preventative Health Research Strategy 2013-18 states:

An effective national effort to build health and prevent illness must be based on sound evidence of what needs to be addressed and what approaches are likely to be effective, the key to the success of this work is through government and non-government support.

The research base for promoting wellness and preventing illness should be as broad as possible. It should include not only health and social sciences, but also areas such as economics and finance, law, environmental sciences, transport and urban design. This will support healthy public policy, features of which include whole-of-government approaches to coordinate appropriate policy.

Public policy and research need to support problem-based approaches as a strategic priority to reduce disparities. Research needs to focus on tracking the effects of policy implementation and interventions to ensure a diligent health system into the future.

Research that informs strategies to promote health intervention, reduce health disparities and drive public policy is vital within the state. This is driven through scientific and behavioural research. Currently, we have some highly beneficial units across the state, at both government and non-government levels, that need support and need to be encouraged to improve the health of all South Australians. After all, healthy and informed Australians make good choices and ensure a positive future.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:15): It is always a sort of surreal experience speaking on the Supply Bill which, as other members have identified, is an opportunity for us to give the government a cheque for $3 billion without actually having any understanding of what they are going to spend it on other than that some of the things are going to presumably be similar to things they have been spending money on up until now.

When approaching the bill, you consider: should I support this bill or should I not? Of course, the opposition is supporting the bill because that is what we do. We do not have any alternative because the consequences of not supporting the bill would be that the public servants would not get paid between 1 July and whenever what is sure to be another miserable government budget is passed through the parliament. The appropriation I am sure will be considered in due time, but the Supply Bill gives them some pocket money to keep going until they feel the need to put forward their budget and get it through the parliament.

So, what should they spend their money on? What programs would it be useful to spend the money on? In my portfolio areas, the thing that immediately occurs to me that would be useful for the government to allocate some of this money to that we are granting them—this $3 billion—is maybe meeting or keeping some of their election promises which, it is quite apparent on current trajectory, are unlikely to be achieved.

The one immediately at front of mind of course this week is in relation to police stations. We understand that the commissioner has a desire to review the operation of the eight metropolitan satellite police stations. Indeed, there has been, of sorts, a form of community consultation. The consultation closed a couple of weeks ago and now, two weeks later, remarkably, in a very short space of time, the government's proposition that was put to the community to consider and come back with—that these eight police stations should, in fact, close—has been unmoved by the results of that community consultation, and this is disappointing. It is disappointing for a range of reasons but primarily because—I want to keep to this track—the government is failing once again to meet what would be considered to be election commitments.

Not all of these eight police stations came about as a direct result of government election commitments in marginal seats, but a number of them certainly did. In my electorate, back in the days when the Labor Party was interested in the seat of Morialta, they committed to a new police station at Newton, which was eventually delivered. On 30 June, it is going to be shut down.

Back when the Labor Party cared about the seat of Bright and was trying to give a parliamentary career to their bright, young star Chloe Fox, they promised a police station would be built at Hallett Cove. Eventually, two years after the election in 2008, lo and behold, the police station was delivered. Now, six years later, it is going. It is going to be closed on 30 June—next month.

In fact, that one may even be closing before then because, while most of these police stations are subject to leases, the lease of the one at Hallett Cove expired on 31 July last year, and it is had

a month-by-month contract ever since. I ask members of the house: if the government knew on 31 July last year that their lease was expiring at the Hallett Cove Police Station and they really were committed to its future, would you not have had somebody in Treasury thinking, 'Why are we paying a month-by-month lease on this piece of government infrastructure? Why don't we get a proper new lease and see what sort of good deal we can get?'

I am concerned that the police station at Firle also has been on month-by-month renewals since 7 December 2013. The rest of these stations are certainly closing on 30 June this year, and some of them have leases extending. Newton is on 8 May 2017; North Adelaide, 30 June 2016; Blakeview, 30 May 2017; Pooraka, 30 June 2015—that one closes on the date that the police station is set to close, so that one is good at least—Tea Tree Gully, 28 February 2017; and Malvern, 31 January 2016.

To use Newton as my case study, because that is in my electorate so it is the one that I know reasonably well, I would like some indication from the minister about what will happen to that shopfront. The station is closing on 30 June. Firstly, how much are we going to spend on fulfilling our commitments on that lease, which is not due to expire until 8 May 2017? Will it be an empty shopfront, a Le Cornu's North Adelaide-style, in the Mercury Plaza at Newton dissuading people from going to the pizza shop or the Chinese restaurant next door? Will it be used for other purposes? I would be interested to know, and certainly—

Mr Duluk: Put a big fence around it.

Mr GARDNER: And put a big fence around it, like North Adelaide, is the suggestion that has come forward. One would hope not. One would hope that common sense will prevail, but there is likely to be a cost in giving up that lease.

More to the point, though, just eight years ago this was an election promise from a government, which at the time and since was proud of its record on law and order, which talked loudly about how it was the one out there fighting for new police stations and opening new police stations. The Labor Party criticised the former Liberal government which, having had to contend with the extraordinary economic and fiscal ruin of the State Bank, had to make some tough decisions, and the commissioner at the time had to make some tough decisions as a few of those stations closed. It is the Labor Party that now has that incredible record of rhetoric on law and order that is now closing police stations that were opened just five or six years ago: Newton, Hallett Cove.

There are also some specific issues that merit consideration in relation to some of the stations. In terms of the public consultation process, the government commented yesterday that only 40 submissions were received. I will accept also that some of these police station shopfronts will have had more submissions than others; indeed, some of these shopfronts have more merit than others. The Malvern one for example, I am aware, was not one that had just two or three people come in each day. The Malvern one, we are aware, had in the order of 10 times that number coming in every day to report, and there was a lot of proactive work being done there. I know that the community in Unley is very disappointed at the announcement that their police station will be closed. The member for Unley has been a firm advocate, and will continue to be so, for its retention, although with seven weeks before its closure date it appears that that may be difficult at this stage.

The member for Adelaide is another member of parliament who put in a submission in relation to North Adelaide; it was one of 40. It was a submission on behalf of over 1,000 residents who signed the petitions, over 1,000 residents who have invested in the fight to keep the North Adelaide Police Station open. In relation to the North Adelaide Police Station, I identify some of the concerns that I am aware the member for Adelaide, Rachel Sanderson, raised in support of her local community and her constituents.

There were concerns that a number of members of that community feel disconnected from government services, and the loss of another face-to-face option will just exaggerate this. She identified that, whilst online options are fine for many people who might wish to report offences, older people often do not wish to or cannot use those facilities. It is identified also, from the member for Adelaide's perspective, that the closest stations, if the North Adelaide station is to close, as it appears it will be, is Hindley Street or Angas Street.

Many older and younger people who have been at these public meetings with the member for Adelaide identified that that is not suitable for them; in fact, the ease of parking around the current North Adelaide station was an incentive for people to engage with that service. Local residents also reported concerns about safety in the area and the proactive, positive engagement that the North Adelaide uniformed officers in that station had with traders and members of the general public.

I make some further comments, particularly in relation to the Newton station. Newton and Firle both service a significant number of ageing residents in the eastern suburbs from non-English-speaking background. A very high proportion of the Morialta and Hartley communities are ageing migrants.

One of the things that we understand as members of parliament is that one of the first things that you lose as you are ageing is your second and subsequent languages. A number of people find it harder and harder to express themselves over the telephone, the use of the internet for this cohort is particularly challenging, and a face-to-face meeting is what they expect and deserve. The point that I made to the commissioner is that, for this section of the community who often are reliant on public transport, these sorts of stations are particularly useful and important, and for both of them to go is deeply disappointing.

Further, the other point which is worth making and which I made to the public consultation as I had made it to the police commissioner, is that a number of these stations are there as a result of election promises by the government. Having been established to fulfil those election commitments, it strikes me that those communities who were promised those local stations, received them for a period of time—five, six or seven years—might have every justification to be deeply upset that those stations are now to be taken away again.

The transient nature of the promise that these stations are to be closed, as it appears that they will be on 30 June, calls into question whether any promise by the Labor Party in the area of policing in the lead-up to an election can be trusted. It was only one year and a couple of months ago that Labor's policy documents were bragging about their 24 new police stations—new police headquarters, new police academy, that is terrific, 24 new police stations—that is on page 85 of Labor's big document that the Premier was carrying around everywhere he went, but what does that document stand for?

It might have been a weighty document but it clearly did not mean anything if the government is then going to consequently ignore the very key parts of it that were in there. The 24 new police stations, something to brag about—and get this, under a paragraph saying 'Liberal' with a big cross next to it signifying 'bad': 'Eight police stations closed.' That is what the Labor Party said last year about what the Liberal government had done after the State Bank debacle.

Is the Labor Party saying that they have delivered without a State Bank, the same economic conditions that previously they had only managed to achieve with the State Bank? Or is it in fact that they have so little interest, that they have lost their moral compass to such an extent that they are not only no longer interested in the policy outcomes that they used to care about but they now do not even need a State Bank to deliver the economic and fiscal problems that mean that they have to shut these stations.

The saving is $500,000 a year; that is $500,000 out of an annual $80 million saving that the commissioner is expected to meet, to meet Labor's budget cuts in the policing area. It is a very hard job for him to do that because more and more is expected of our police and, at the same time, they are being asked to do things with new laws and increasing challenges.

The scourge of ice is creating a level of challenge for our police force that is different from those drug epidemics that we have had before, because when we have people who are addicted to ice, the purest form of crystal methamphetamine, we have an arrangement when not only do people often commit crimes to be able to pay for their $100-a-day-hit but the very act of taking the drug itself causes chemical reactions in the body that incite criminal behaviour in a chemical sense. There is a loss of risk aversion in the brain, a loss of consequence-related thinking, an energy level that is extraordinary and accesses the adrenaline and other chemicals that give the body a great deal of energy.

We have this double effect of the scourge of ice and police are reporting incredible challenges in meeting it. We have expectations, as they should be, that are high in the area of meeting challenges posed by domestic and family violence. Frankly, it is disappointing that our community in previous generations may not have had these same expectations. We now have expectations on police that are important, but the police now have to have the resources to meet those expectations.

Much is being asked of police officers and they are being trained more than before. We have just doubled the length of the training course and a significant section of the new training time is going to be dedicated to dealing with domestic and family violence-related responses—as it should be—but it is important to recognise that that does impose significant extra demands on police but, at the same time, police are having $80 million stripped out of their budget by the government.

How does that meet with election commitments? Well, the government's election commitment at 2010, members may remember, was that 300 new police would be recruited. That 2010 election promise was supposed to be delivered by 2013. The promise was there were going to be 1,000 more police than there had been in 2002. They were going to go from 2,400 to 2,700 sworn officers on the beat, on the streets. That was the wording that was in the Labor Party election documentation, and members opposite would remember, because each one of them was elected (with the exception of the member for Fisher who is since the time when Labor used to care about law and order) with these promises, that there would be 300 extra sworn officers on the beat, on the streets.

When it was clear that they were not going to meet that promise by 2013, they extended the deadline a bit. It was 313 by this stage, because there were 13 transit police as well. The member for Stuart will correct me if I am wrong, but I think it was extended first to 2016, and then when they were not going to meet that, it was extended to 2018, and that is the current situation. In Labor's election documents, the promise was that the extra 180 or so recruits who would be needed to meet that promise were going to be recruited and that the 300 target would be met.

So, where are we? We learnt at the Budget and Finance Committee just a couple of weeks ago that, from 2,400 to 2,700, police gave us the number of where they will be in 2017-18: 4,421 sworn officers plus 36 community constables. So, rather than from 4,400 to 4,700, we are going to go from 4,400 sworn officers to 4,457, including the community constables—a total increase, members of the house will be disappointed to hear, given that Labor members were elected promising 300 more officers, of 54.

The recruitment is part of the issue. Recruitment is going slower, so last year the government changed the goalposts to include cadets in the count. The member for Stuart, when he was shadow police minister, kept saying this to the minister in this chamber: 'You are including cadets to meet that target.' The minister said, 'No, we're all good, we're going to meet 300 extra police.'

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Indeed, he did confirm at estimates last year that the original promise excluded cadets. About three or four months after I became the shadow police minister, we finally got the answer to a question taken on notice that the member for Stuart had asked months and months before about cadets, saying, 'Actually yes, cadets are going to be included in the count.' That was the first thing: the shifting of the goalposts of the years.

The second thing is they shifted goalposts to include cadets in their numbers, and now we have the numbers that they are not even going to get anywhere near the target of 300 extra police because, just as the recruits come in, there are going to be sworn officers whose roles are going to rephased into unsworn roles. We are not just talking about a handful of police prosecutors being transferred to private solicitors. There are dozens and dozens of other officers and roles that have been identified that are no longer going to be sworn officers' roles.

Custodial management is one that the Budget and Finance Committee identified, but clearly there are going to be dozens more that have not yet been identified, because otherwise the evidence given to the Budget and Finance Committee by the Director of Finance at SAPOL, Denis Patriarca, that there was only going to be a net increase of 54 sworn officers from 2010 to 2018 cannot be met. There is more coming from the police minister. They are closing stations when not only did they say

that they would not, they actually introduced them just a couple of years ago. They are not meeting their recruitment targets. These were promises; these were matters of faith for the Labor Party with the community.

When Mike Rann was premier, this would never have happened. There were plenty of things we disagreed on with Mike Rann. It was all rhetoric and bluster and everything else, but can anybody in the South Australian parliament or in the media imagine for one second that when Mike Rann was premier he would have allowed his police minister to bring forward a plan that was going to mean that they were not going to meet that election promise of 300 by only having 54 extra police? He at least would have come up with a reasonable excuse, but this government now is just walking around pretending that all of these promises are on track when they are not.

This is a government that has lost its moral compass because it has missed that connection with the community. The community expects their government to deliver on law and order, and it expects a government to be concerned about their safety and their community, on their streets and in their houses.

When a promise is made of 300 extra police or when a promise is made that we are going to deliver a police station, the expectation is that that promise should last past Christmas. The expectation is that that promise should go through to the next election and then we should be looking at what else we can do for the community. I fear that when we get to the next election, all that will be left is for us to clean up Labor's mess and to clean up the broken promises and shattered election commitments that this government has left in its wake.

Bill read a second time.

Supply Grievances

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) (16:35): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:35): I appreciate this opportunity to say a few more words in conjunction with the Supply Bill. I would like to speak about infrastructure, and I am prompted to do this because of the government's announcement this morning that they are going to start to develop a strategy for the support of greater copper production and the copper industry in this state. Of course, my colleagues and I warmly welcome that, but what I would really like to say is that, after 13 years in government, it comes as a great disappointment that this government is now announcing that they are supportive of and are going to start to develop a strategy to look after the production of copper. It is a section of our overall mineral resources industry in this state, and they are just starting to get around to developing a strategy and they are going to put a very serious plan in place.

Of course, that is good, but after 13 years we actually need things to be done. We actually need some action. Do you know what we need for our mineral resources industry? We need some productive infrastructure to be built so that the private players in this industry can have the support they need to get on and do the work they do. Please remember that the government does not create any jobs in the mineral resources and energy sector: private industry does that. The government does not create many jobs in any sector, apart from the Public Service: the private sector does that.

The private sector is incredibly important, whether it is small businesses. We have 140,000 small businesses in our state who deserve support so that they can employ people, and they deserve support so that they have every opportunity to be successful, not because we want the businesses themselves to be successful as the end goal but because we want them to be able to provide secure employment. Secure employment is what allows people to get mortgages, to feel comfortable that they will be able to afford to look after their family, and to grow and prosper. Businesses need support so that they can offer secure employment to people.

It might be small business or all the way through to the extraordinarily large multinationals such as BHP or some other company like that. Rio Tinto is a very proud Australian company that is a multinational: it does not operate in South Australia. All the way through, we need to provide

productive infrastructure so that those companies can get on and do their business. For the government to announce that they are going to create 5,000 extra jobs in mining is absolutely ridiculous because, first, the government does not produce those jobs (private industry does) and, secondly, since that announcement has been made we have lost over 4,000 jobs in the mining industry. It is absolutely preposterous.

Deputy Speaker, it might interest you to know that I was at the SACOME awards night a few weeks ago. It was a fantastic night which supported and gave credibility and respect to an enormous number of key players, including, I might add, SACOME's very strong focus on enhancing the career opportunities of women within the mining industry. I notice that BHP has announced that their new head of Olympic Dam in South Australia, to succeed Darryl Cuzzubbo, is a woman. Her name is Jacqui. I read it in the paper this morning, but I apologise to the house that I have forgotten her last name; however, I congratulate her and BHP. At this dinner, the Premier said:

> We've set an ambitious target [for jobs growth in the mining and resources industry] and it's up to all of you to deliver.

That is what he said to the dinner. I do not know how many people were there—probably 1,000 people. It was a packed event. It was quite extraordinary but, really, that does explain exactly where the government's head is at with this. The government is saying now, 'We're going to produce a plan and we're going to develop a strategy for copper,' when what they should have been doing over the last 13 years was start to put an investment plan in place and create and actually undertake investment to put in place productive infrastructure; if they had started that on day one, we would have lots of that in place at the moment.

That is exactly what they should be doing and there is no shortage of much-needed examples. Every member of this house would be aware of the fact that quite a few industries have been calling out for a new deep sea port in South Australia so that we can export. The grain industry and various resources industries are very interested in that, but the government has not progressed it at all. The government has not gone on with that at all.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I thank the member for Davenport for just reminding me that the new head of Olympic Dam for BHP is going to be Jacqui McGill. Thank you, member for Davenport. The new deep sea port in South Australia is absolutely critically important so that the private sector can get on and do its job. That is what the government should be doing.

Another very important piece of infrastructure for our state is the Strzelecki Track, which runs from Lyndhurst to Moomba. We have all heard the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy quite rightly extolling how fortunate we are to have very good, very capable, strong companies working in the Cooper Basin trying to create wealth. I accept that those companies are really facing an uphill battle at the moment because of the decline in prices—largely oil prices, but gas is not going great either.

Nonetheless, if 13 years ago the government had started a plan to seal the Strzelecki Track, which is, in my opinion, the single most important piece of infrastructure for our state, the minute the sealing was done and it could take double and triple road trains up and down the road, all of a sudden overnight we would attract a whole swathe of business back into our state from Queensland. The Cooper Basin is supported and serviced from South Australia and from Queensland, and what we have had over the last decade or so is the South Australian road getting worse and worse and the Queensland roads and, in fact, the New South Wales roads as well, getting better and better, so much so that there is now bitumen to the border from Brisbane.

All the way from Brisbane to the South Australian border to the Cooper Basin there is bitumen, so Adelaide-based transport companies are deliberately driving via Broken Hill to get to the Cooper Basin—an extra 1,000 kilometres approximately—just to avoid driving on our road. On the one hand, that explains how dreadfully bad the situation is at the moment, but on the other hand the upside is that, as soon as that road is upgraded, business starts to flow back into South Australia. All of a sudden, servicing the Cooper Basin from South Australia and from Adelaide and from other regional centres becomes economic again for those companies and they do not do it out of

Queensland or they do not lose business to Queensland companies who have the advantage that their government in Queensland has sealed their roads.

It is important that I put on the record that I have been advised by the Minister for Transport that South Australia has put an application to Infrastructure Australia for funding. The estimated cost of that project is about $450 million, but what I have not been told so far is what share of that $450 million the state government has offered to contribute. If it were 10 per cent, quite understandably the federal government would probably say, 'No, go away, we've got better opportunities.' If it were 50 per cent, the federal government would probably say, 'Yes, that's a very good opportunity.' If SA puts up 50 per cent, and the federal government puts up 50 per cent, that would make great sense.

I am obviously not in a position to make commitments or promises on behalf of anybody, but that is where my head is at. I fear that the reason the state government will not divulge what share of the $450 million they have offered to contribute is that it is probably too low. They probably know it is too low and, even though they know it is too low, they will probably try to blame the federal government if their application is knocked back.

There are many opportunities. I am sure most members of this house would have seen an article in *The Advertiser* newspaper yesterday about infrastructure. Very interestingly, there were a dozen examples in that article written by Paul Starick and Peter Jean yesterday and, let me tell you, Deputy Speaker, half of those examples have a direct impact upon the electorate of Stuart, so I am incredibly passionate about this topic. We need to get our skates on as a state with regard to developing infrastructure. The government has got to stop talking about it and actually get on and do it.

Let me just add that the bridge over the gulf in Port Augusta needs to be duplicated. I accept that would be a project of hundreds of millions of dollars and it would take a while to get that money, but in the meantime sealing Yorkeys Crossing around Port Augusta would be tens of millions of dollars and the government must get on and do it. It says it does not meet their priorities. It says the cost-benefit analysis does not add up but, let me tell you, if they were to consider the potential impact of the freight being stopped between Sydney and Perth and between Adelaide and Darwin, if our bridge was out for a significant amount of time, they would then all of a sudden realise that $20 million or $30 million to seal Yorkeys Crossing would be an extremely good investment, not only for Port Augusta, but for our state and our nation.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (16:46): I rise also to say a few words about the Supply Bill in my grievance. I probably do not have enough time to get through everything, but I would like to talk about a few things that are at the heart of the constituents in my electorate. The first one I want to talk about, because I have had a lot of correspondence to my office about this, is pensioner concessions and putting it on the table and being clear, as opposed to some of the rhetoric that is coming from the other side about this issue.

It has been made abundantly clear by the federal government that they are cutting some of the pensioner concessions for local government rates. They have conceded they are cutting it by 10 per cent. I would love it not to be the case and would love to try to get that money back for pensioners in my electorate, so I will do everything in my power, although it is a federal matter. They are taking 10 per cent.

The rhetoric coming from Treasurer Koutsantonis though is implausible and also too hard to stomach because he wants to cut all of the money from pensioners. Let's just have a look at the maths. Pensioners get a $190 concession on their council rates. The feds, as I said, are taking $19 of that away which leaves $171, and that is what Treasurer Koutsantonis is taking back. He wants to claw that back and we know why. It is because of years of mismanagement of this state's economy. He cannot afford to pay it anymore and he wants that money in his coffers to pay back the debt and deficit that he has built up over the journey. We need to be clear on this.

The pensioner concessions are valued at $190. The feds are taking back $19, but Treasurer Koutsantonis and this state Labor government are taking back $171, and I will do everything in my power to prevent that and make sure it does not happen because I think it is very unfair and unjust to the pensioners in our community.

There are other things as well. Speaking of wanting to claw back money, the Treasurer is seriously looking at proposing a land tax on all South Australian family homes. He is looking at getting $1,200 a year on average from land tax from South Australian family homes which, again, is unconscionable. None of this, I might add, was proposed before the state election. None of this was put forward before the state election; this has all come after. No-one knew this was the plan and in the thoughts of the Treasurer at the time, and it really is quite hard to deal with.

Speaking of things that the Treasurer did not bring forward and put on the table before the state election in 2014, I refer to the closing of the Repat. Again, a lot of people in my community are coming to me aggrieved about this, and the big concern is where all these facilities that are at the Repat are going. A few of them have been spotted and dotted around, but the health professionals within the Repat and the people who go there are very confused, and they do not know where all these things are going. Some great work is done by urologists at the Repat and by all the other professions, and they have not been told exactly how this is going to be absorbed into the system, so it is of great concern. People in the system have every right to be concerned with the way this has played out.

I was at the forum that has already been mentioned here today which Channel 7 put on down at Morphett Vale the other night. It was great to be at the bowling club, listening to what the local community had to say about the massive downgrading of the emergency department at Noarlunga. Whilst some on the other side want to say, 'No, it is going to be okay; this is fine,' there is a clear downgrading of the Noarlunga emergency department. They are not going to be taking all emergency cases; in fact, if it is a life-threatening case, you will be shipped off to Flinders.

We know Flinders has a history of ramping ambulances and emergency vehicles, and they are often full to overflowing in their emergency department. Rightly, people of the south are concerned that in emergency situations they are going to be bypassed at Noarlunga, because they cannot deal with them due to the downgrade there, and they are going to be sent to Flinders. Just because the minister says, 'Somehow, the ramping is going to end; we are going increase the volume of work that is going to happen at Flinders but the number of patients ramping on the ambulance emergency entry will decrease,' it does not make sense.

People are not that silly; they know if you increase the volume of patients at Flinders, which is already full to overflowing, they are going to have more problems, especially in their emergency department. Also, before the election, $31 million was promised to the Noarlunga Hospital. Now, after the election, the Treasurer comes clean and says that in fact they are only getting $7 million. That is another great concern for the people of my electorate.

The member for Morialta mentioned police stations. Again, this is something that was not mentioned before the election, but a pen goes through the police station in Hallett Cove and it is being closed. That police station services a large part of the community in my electorate (being Sheidow Park and Trott Park). People who need to get to a police station find it very convenient to get across to that neck of the woods, especially if they travel by public transport. They can get a bus across to the Hallett Cove shopping centre and be served at the police station. It is a very good facility for those people.

The point is that the closing of the police station—and you will hear reasons why from the other side—was not mentioned before the election. It is funny how these things happen. Pensioner concessions—they did not mention that before the election. The closing of the Repat and the downgrading of the Noarlunga Hospital—they did not mention that before the election. Cutting eight police stations, including the one at Hallett Cove, was not mentioned before the election. This is really intriguing. And, as I pointed out, the proposal that the Treasurer was looking at to put a $1,200 land tax on the family home—none of this was mentioned before the election, and it is no coincidence.

We have to look at the reason this is happening. As we come up to the budget for this year, we can look at last year's budget. The budget that Treasurer Koutsantonis returned was a $1.2 billion deficit—that's right, $1.2 billion in deficit, and the state is heading towards a $14 billion debt. Last year, they budgeted for a $900 million deficit and then they had an additional $300 million overspend, blowing the deficit out to $1.2 billion. There was an overspend of $300 million in a year—unbudgeted spending, just money out the window.

What could you do with that $300 million? You could do a lot for the Repat, you could do a lot for pensioner concessions, you could do a lot for the Noarlunga emergency department, and you could do a lot for police stations and the like. You could also stop wanting to put a land tax on the family home, as is being proposed by the Treasurer. You can see why taxation is the answer for this government: that $300 million overspend in one year.

We are looking at the figures for this year as well. Originally, the government projected a $479 million deficit this time last year. They then updated and said, 'We are bringing it back to $185 million; aren't we going well? That is a $294 million improvement.' Do not be fooled, Deputy Speaker. This is all because they are having a fire sale of a very valuable asset in the Motor Accident Commission (MAC). They have found that it is working quite well, they have built up a bit of equity in the MAC, and they think, 'You know what? We need to get our hands on this.'

The Treasurer cannot believe his luck. As well as taxing everyone as much as he can to try to claw back money, he is going to get rid of the MAC and bring some more money into his coffers. When the budget comes down, remember that this government would have ripped out of the MAC over $800 million, which they took just to improve their bottom line.

We need to be aware that the Motor Accident Commission does some wonderful work in this community and in our society across the state. They do great work in sponsoring and supporting local country communities through sport in particular. I know they sponsor the country football association in a number of ways and they actually have a road safety round this year to make country people aware of the importance of road safety, which I think is a great initiative, but that money will be ripped out when the MAC is sold or closed down. However the Treasurer plans to do it—he still has not let us know—that money is going to come out of those sorts of sporting operations.

They also heavily fund Schoolies Week, which we know is really important for our young children, to keep them safe. A lot of money comes from MAC to help run that and without that money it would be hard to see how Schoolies will go ahead, which is a big concern for the state. We need the Treasurer to explain how those things are going to stay in place and where the money is going to come from. My concern is that the only way the Treasurer can get money back, once he has sold off the MAC and spent all the money to cover the debt that he has built up with the deficit budgets that he keeps rolling out, once he has used that money to prop up his mismanagement of so many years of this state, the money out of MAC will not be there anymore.

How are they going to get it back? I fear they are going to add another tax to our car registration. When we get our CTP, another tax will have to be put on top to make sure that they can get the money back to keep funding this. So, there are two options. One is that there will be no more money for sports, for Schoolies and all the great work that MAC does as far as making road safety awareness a highlight of our community. That is one option. The other option is another tax from this government, and I fear which way it is going to go. It is a big concern.

South Australians have had enough. They were not told about it before the election. They were not told about any of these extra taxes and charges that were being put down before the election and, lo and behold, as we roll around to another budget, let us see how many more taxes and charges are increased.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (16:56): I also rise to speak on the Supply Bill. Just to set the scene: our debt levels are expected to rise to $13.2 billion in the 2016-17 financial year, which is the highest level in this state's history. We are borrowing an estimated $95 million this year just to pay for general government operations, so that is our overheads. There is an expected interest payment this year of $527 million on borrowings and South Australia has the highest unemployment rate in the nation at 6.7 per cent. So, it is a bleak picture that we have under this 13-year Labor government.

I would like to talk about the O-Bahn proposal and the effects it will have on Rymill Park and my residents and business owners in the city. I am going to quote directly from information they have emailed to me. So, from the East End Coordination Group submission regarding the project, I quote:

The project will shift 31 service routes directly on to Grenfell Street, a street which is struggling to cope…access for residents, business users, those wishing to use the car park on Union Street becomes a nightmare and genuine safety issues for residents in particular are already present. There are at least 10 ingress/egress points in that short section of Grenfell Street which are grossly impacted already in peak time. The project will double the

number of buses using this section. There will be at least 80 O-Bahn peak hour buses now travelling between East Terrace and Frome Street each morning and afternoon, on top of the regular services, and the impact therefore on Grenfell Street seems not to have been considered at all.

The East End Coordination Group agrees with the basic principles for improved, faster and especially more environmentally friendly public transport.

The principle of a major super highway, or re-aligned Rundle Road, is an anathema to our community. The residents are very outspoken about the environmental vandalism to one of the best of Adelaide's parks, the sanctity of Rymill Park being lost, the destruction to the parks, and especially safety issues of pedestrians crossing this major road particularly with children, interference with access to the lake and the children's park. The park lands are a major feature for Adelaide which all visitors remember. The park lands are parks which host events; they are not an event space which is a part-time park. The park lands were purchased in perpetuity, in fee simple, by the people of Adelaide for the people of Adelaide. They belong to the people of Adelaide.

Traders are especially concerned at the huge net loss of car parking.

There has been no modelling on the economic impact to the East End traders who believe that there will be a negative impact associated with both of these government initiated projects…

There is no indication that this project is part of a well considered guiding plan for transport to and from the East and North East Suburbs.

The community as a whole does not like, or want, the project in its current form…However this project appears to be a 'done deal', on the 'announce and defend' policy, rather than a true consultation process with the community who are generally outraged.

The community consultation period of 30 days is completely inadequate for such a major proposal that will have a huge permanent impact which in all probability cannot be reversed should the solution to the perceived problem not be found in practice to be appropriate.

We request a full and open consultation based on proper evidence that there is a problem to the East End because of O-Bahn traffic.

That is, the East End coordination. Now, from a resident:

Dear Rachel

I have been following the O-Bahn project and attended the Bowling club meeting. The information put out was a disgrace. It contained typos and was full of technical jargon and misleading/erroneous statements. After a half hour discussion with the Civil Engineer leading the project he agreed it needed serious amendment.

An eight lane highway—1 tram, 1 bus and 2 general lanes in each direction through Rymill Park, adjacent to the lake, children's playground and BBQ area is stupid and unacceptable. I also believe that no responsible government who treated all citizens equitably could justify this expenditure now in light of the high rate of homelessness, the reduction of medical services, especially in rural areas and the very serious inadequacy of all services and general well-being in the Aboriginal communities.

That was from a resident. Another resident brought up a few different issues. With the tunnel, there is no mention of emergency rescue, firefighting provisions, breakdown recovery, etc., in the proposal. Will there be separate tunnels for each direction? What happens if the tunnel is blocked? Will the proposed new roads be able to cope without the tunnel?

With the further increase in O-Bahn bus services, one of the implied benefits is the ability to run more O-Bahn bus services, but there is no mention of the intention to improve parking at the three O-Bahn stations and (to quote the member for Hartley) there will probably be a three-minute extra walk to get to the bus stop to save 2½ minutes on the bus. It is just ridiculous.

On the government's core argument, the government took a proposal to the last election for an O-Bahn tunnel that saves four minutes and had no impact on the Parklands. This new proposal saves seven minutes but involves wholesale change to the East End Parklands. Saving three extra minutes for 31,000 O-Bahn commuters does not justify the destruction of Rymill Park. The government has no mandate to redevelop the Parklands.

On events more generally, events in the east Parklands that may be negatively affected by this project include the Tour Down Under sprint race along Rundle Road, given that it is closed and will not be there; the 3 Day Event showjumping, as a new road through Rymill Park cuts right through their circuit; and the Spirit Festival next to Tandanya, as the realigned East Terrace will also now cut through that park.

So, the main arguments, and this is now my summary of the points: the destruction of one of Adelaide's most beautiful and much loved parks, Rymill Park, by a six-lane highway right through the middle. There will be a loss of 160 car parks with the closure of Rundle Road, which will have a devastating effect on businesses, workers, visitors to the city and patrons of the very Fringe Festival the government seeks to expand by closing the road.

Currently, the O-Bahn buses are spread out using East Terrace, Frome Road or Pulteney Street to get to Grenfell Street. This shares the load of traffic and allows for road closures, accidents, broken water mains, etc. The government's plan will now funnel all buses through the residential part of Grenfell Street between East Terrace and Frome Road where hundreds of people live in Garden East and there are 10 access driveways that will become incredibly dangerous and difficult to access. There does not seem to be any citywide plan for transport, particularly given the very tram line the government is preserving space for in Rymill Park, between the car and bus lanes, would best suit going along Grenfell Street which, with the extra buses, could not possibly use the same road.

On other issues that concern residents in my electorate, pensioner concessions would be the top one. Pensioner concessions are available on all kinds of different things such as council rates, gas, electricity, water, emergency services levies and public transport, and total in the vicinity of $230 million per year. Since 1993, a federal contribution to this collective concession fund has been made of about $28 million (10 per cent) up until this year.

The provision of concessional payments is a responsibility of the state government, with the proposal to remove the concession payments purely a Weatherill and Koutsantonis decision. This reduction in federal funding towards concessions, which is only 10 per cent of the payment, did not have to result in the complete removal of the council rate concession—state Labor has chosen to do this. This will have a significant impact on approximately 160,000 pensioners and self-funded retiree home owners in South Australia who receive either $190 or $100 respectively in assistance per year on their council rates.

Yesterday in parliament, the state Liberals tabled a petition with over 13,000 signatures of South Australians who are opposed to this cut. The state Liberals have committed to move to block any regulation aimed at removing pensioner concession payments on local government rates, ensuring that all of the 160,000 people who currently are entitled will not be affected. The Weatherill Labor government has tried to claim that this is due to the federal budget, but no other state in the country has abolished the concession despite all facing the same circumstances. It is inexcusable to keep jacking up taxes and ripping away concession payments from pensioners all because Labor are running a record budget deficit and cannot manage the state's finances.

Mr Weatherill wasted $1.1 million of taxpayers' money on a politically motivated ad campaign which would have paid for the $190 concession for over 5,700 people. This government has never had its priorities right, and that is why I came into parliament. There are a lot of other issues in my electorate, such as the North Adelaide Police Station closing, the closing of the Repat and the proposed $1,200 land tax on the family home, which were not mentioned prior to the election.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (17:06): I am pleased to continue to make some additional remarks in relation to the Supply Bill process through the house. Yesterday, I talked about some transport-related issues, transport infrastructure roads, road safety, and those very important matters that we all need to be mindful of in this place. That is absolutely a key area of importance and passion of mine.

Another area of importance, and something that I have spoken about at length and will continue to talk about, is the water prescription process in the western Mount Lofty Ranges. That process has been running probably for over a decade, at least 10 years, probably closer to 12 years. I would have to look it up in my diary, but I clearly remember going to the first meetings held at the Lenswood research centre, where government officials came out and started raising the issue of water prescription in the western Mount Lofty Ranges. I probably had been elected for only a year or two, so it has been running for over a decade, maybe 12 years.

I have to say that it has been an absolute shambles. The way the government has handled this matter has been an absolute shambles. The process has run for over a decade and not been finalised: it has been a mess. The department initially got the science wrong. It did not understand

the perplexities of the resource. It had to go back and rework a whole lot of technical information and form smaller community committee groups to work through each of the individual regions within the Greater Western Mount Lofty Ranges region. We are at the point where allocations have been made to each individual farmer, but we are getting to the pointy end of the process where the water levy amount is being pitched by the local NRM board.

Irrigators received a letter three or four months ago saying that the water levy was going to be $7 per kilolitre. That raised the ire of local farming industry groups, and then they received another letter saying that the NRM board decided to reduce it to $6. We are still not tremendously happy with that.

I have spoken to my colleagues and talked to the member for Ashford, who is Chair of the Natural Resources Committee in the parliament, and it is my understanding that the Natural Resources Committee, which has some oversight of these matters, particularly the natural resources management levies they charge each and every landholder in the region, and also some oversight in relation to water allocation levies, is working through that process, looking to take some evidence on it and make some recommendations.

I have to say that this whole process has been running for more than a decade in an important part of the state and, as I said, the government has made a complete hash of this, a complete mess of this process. It is really an illustration of how the government has managed things overall in the past 13 years since it has been in government: it has made a hash and a mess of pretty well everything it has touched over that period of time.

If we look at the different situations that each one of the ministers has facing them at the moment—each one of the ministers along the front bench—it is like a fire burning on all fronts. They have bushfires burning on all fronts in government. The Deputy Premier would be interested in this metaphor or this comparison because he likes talking about television shows here in the house. Some of us are old enough to remember the show *Bonanza,* and there have been reruns recently, but I cannot remember on which channel. In the opening scenes of *Bonanza* they have a map, and the map starts burning from the middle and then burns outwards. I think about that map, and to me it illustrates how this government has been handling the very important issues of state: it is a small fire starting in the middle and it is just expanding and burning on all fronts.

As I said, if we look at the different areas of responsibility that ministers have—the Deputy Premier, the Attorney-General—the leader highlighted in his Supply Bill speech the absolute shambles that the court buildings are in. It was only a year or two ago that we went for a tour through the Supreme Court buildings, and the conditions that the judiciary and their staff have to work in are appalling up there on Victoria Square. There is salt damp, and the big cream brick building at the back that was probably built back in the sixties should be pulled down and a more modern facility built. As the member for Morialta pointed out, it is something that the government talked about before the election.

Then we come to the Minister for Health. He is in more trouble than the early settlers with the transition to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, and the EPAS system that has been costing the state hundreds of millions of dollars is still not working properly. I do not think it has worked properly in any hospital. He talks about it being in Noarlunga Hospital, but I think the staff are having issues with it.

Then we go next door to the Treasurer. Well, we do not really have to talk about the world of trouble that the Treasurer is in. This state has never had a problem with the income it has received. It is never had a problem with income—$16 billion—but it is the inability of this government to control its spending. This Labor government, for 13 and a bit years, have never been able to manage or control their spending. The only thing that kept them out of trouble in the early years was windfall revenue from the GST coming in well and truly in excess of the budgeted figures. But we still see this government push on with an old, outdated, failed economic model of tax, borrow and spend.

Mr Duluk: They're socialists.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: They are absolute socialists.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not interject or listen to interjections.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I remember reading a quote—I think it was from Winston Churchill—that no Western country will tax itself to prosperity. He said that trying to tax yourself into prosperity is like standing in a bucket, holding onto the handles of the bucket and trying to lift yourself up off the ground. That is the illustration I think Winston Churchill gave. In a modern, 21st century economic environment, no government will tax itself into prosperity.

You see the actual model that should be adopted, and that is the New Zealand model by Prime Minister Key in New Zealand, and the leader has travelled to New Zealand and spoken to him firsthand. They actually lowered their taxation rates in an endeavour to stimulate some economic activity and spend money in the right areas of government to stimulate economic activity. That is what the government always talks about, wanting to stimulate economic activity, but they have the wrong model in place.

People have talked at length about the land tax on people's homes, averaging out at $1,200 a year. That is just the thin end of the wedge; if they bring that in, they will start hammering away and it will be $2,000 or $2,500, and it will be never ending. This government has the wrong economic model in place—all Labor governments have since the Whitlam years, as I pointed out in my earlier contribution.

Time expired.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (17:16): I also rise to speak on the grievance debate as part of the Supply Bill. I will probably not be using references to Churchill or the early settlers, as my colleague the member for Kavel did, but—

Mr Gardner: Too late.

Mr DULUK: It is too late—he has beaten me to it. But, like many on this side of the house have already done this afternoon, I would touch on infrastructure and road funding, and I did this yesterday in my main contribution on the debate.

I would like to mention specifically the Darlington South Road project, which is a project that is having a big effect on my electorate. As the house knows, this major road infrastructure project will shortly commence, being the Darlington project. The project will involve a 2.3-kilometre section of Main South Road between the Southern Expressway and Ayliffes Road being upgraded, and it represents one of the largest current infrastructure projects in this state. I must say that this is a long-awaited project and is an 80:20 funding project between the commonwealth and the state. It is a welcome relief for commuters, especially commuters of the southern suburbs, to see this project finally underway after many years of discussion.

My electorate takes in many suburbs, including, particularly in terms of this project, Darlington and Bedford Park, and these two suburbs will be substantially affected by the upgrade. My office has been approached by residents, residents' groups, businesses and community and sporting clubs who are concerned, and they are well-founded concerns, in relation to certain aspects of the project. Those concerns are that many of their concerns are not being taken into account by the planning and development team, because it is the residents, communities and interest groups of Bedford Park and Darlington who will be most severely or adversely affected by what overall is a very good project.

On behalf of the residents who have contacted me in relation to the Darlington upgrade, I would like to put their concerns on the record to the house. In no particular order, these are just some of the concerns that have been raised with me: a dedicated dual lane for peak afternoon traffic from the university, being Flinders University, entering Sturt Road and turning right onto South Road—unfortunately, the current design concept does not consider this a necessity, as it currently does exist, as we have at the moment people turning right onto South Road from Sturt Road.

The concept plan indicates that all Flinders University traffic, including that from the Flinders Medical Centre, will now only be able to exit onto South Road heading north via the Sturt Road slip lane and onto Shepherds Hill Road. Many residents have contacted me about the importance of retaining the current turn right option onto South Road from Sturt Road, and I support this concern of the residents.

The Bedford Park residents triangle, which is bordered by Sturt, South and Shepherds Hill roads, has essentially become a permanent car park area for both university and medical centre users alike, namely, staff and students respectively. Mainly, this is because on-site car parking at both Flinders Medical Centre and the university is vastly inadequate. I believe due consideration needs to be applied to additional parking and this should be managed with the project team along with Flinders University and Flinders Medical Centre. This is certainly required for residents who live in that Bedford Park triangle. Under the current concept plan, the residents on Shepherds Hill Road will need to contend with increased peak hour traffic flow with cars passing their property at a rate of about every two seconds, creating an impossible task when reversing out of or entering a driveway, as one can imagine.

Collaboration and research on Flinders University car parking and exit points does not seem to be part of the project team, and it is a shame it is not, as the current concept really is just looking for one solution, having all those cars exit onto Shepherds Hill Road, and this is vastly inadequate. The major changes proposed for Shepherds Hill Road will also create a ripple effect as traffic using the Women's Memorial Playing Fields need to enter and leave via Shepherds Hill Road, as do hundreds of residents in Eden Hills, who can only enter or leave their part of Eden Hills via Mill Terrace.

Another key concern for residents and businesses of South Road, Brookside Road and Watervale Court at Darlington is the loss of the ability under the current concept to turn right onto South Road for northbound traffic. In addition to penalising these residents, the Sturt River Caravan Park, Lucas Earthmovers and McDonald's at Darlington will be particularly impacted by the loss of the ability to make a right-hand turn.

For local McDonald's franchise operator Mr Alan Brodie, who employs over 120 permanent and part-time staff at the McDonald's at Darlington, the consequence of the current Brookside Road proposal will mean that, potentially, all northbound traffic that currently turns onto Brookside Road to enter the Darlington McDonald's will cease, as vehicles no longer will be able to re-enter northbound lanes and, instead, must turn left, southbound. Essentially, in the morning if you go and get your coffee from McDonald's and you are heading into the city for your commute, you will go into the drive through and will have to turn left, head back to where you came from, and somewhere find a place to do a U-turn to get back onto the expressway to go to work. I am sure the member for Kaurna can sympathise with his constituents who may use the McDonald's at Darlington.

Mr Picton: I think they want the upgrade, not the McDonald's coffee.

Mr DULUK: As they come off the upgrade, they might want to use the McDonald's.

Mr Picton: They'll use McDonald's at Seaford.

Mr DULUK: Maybe they may want an additional coffee by the time they get to Darlington.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DULUK: This change will have a large and detrimental effect on businesses that rely on the current turn right option. We are talking about over 1,000 vehicles each day that use Brookside Road. Mr Alan Brodie has collected over 500 signatures on a petition calling for a turn right option to remain as part of the concept plan, and I support his position and know he has submitted this to the project team.

Other concerns of Bedford Park residents include lack of residential car parking within the suburb. Given the proximity of the suburb of Bedford Park to both Flinders University and Flinders Medical Centre, parking in and around the streets of Bedford Park is always at a premium. Under the construction of the project, the current car park on the west side of South Road used by staff at Flinders Medical Centre will be converted into the project's site office. The reduction in parking areas will increase demand for parking in local residential streets and, of course, this is going to impact on the development of the site.

Access and egress for residents, especially those who rely on Flinders Drive, has been a hot topic of concern for many residents. Current access issues include restricted egress and access to the local area known as Bedford Park South, lack of turn right options onto South Road from Bedford Park South, and reliance on a new access point under the proposal to Flinders Drive over the Francis

Street reserve (a local reserve and park used by families and local residents). Under the current concept, to leave Bedford Park South, it is proposed that a road goes through an existing reserve onto Flinders Drive, and to me and to the residents of Bedford Park South, this is completely unacceptable.

Access over Flinders Drive at peak times will be slow. The current plans allow for non-residents to cut through the residential streets and do not allow for easier parking for the existing residents of Bedford Park South. Other issues are how the new concept plan will integrate with public transport services and there is a lack of detail surrounding sound walls and revegetation of the project site.

The existing service road for Bedford Park South is critical to local traffic movements, especially when there is banked-up traffic at the Flagstaff Road intersection and this also needs to be considered. The current concept also sees a loss of amenities for residents of Bedford Park South, including a doctors and dental surgery, and food and restaurant outlets that are going to be compulsorily acquired under the project. For many long-term residents of Bedford Park, losing these services will be a shame. The project team must also ensure that public transport services are maintained.

Last week I had the pleasure of visiting Warriparinga reserve and being shown around the significant Indigenous, cultural, environmental and educational site formerly known as Laffer's Triangle by the friends of Warriparinga reserve. The friends of the reserve have raised their concerns with the current concept plan, namely further erosion of their open space, the impact it will have on native vegetation and further noise in what used to be a peaceful haven, including open space, the Living Kaurna Cultural Centre and Fairford House.

As I put on the record from the outset, I do support this project, but bear in mind that, like any large infrastructure project, consideration of that project needs to be weighed up against those who will most be impacted by it and, in this case, it is those residents of Darlington and Bedford Park.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (17:26): In a few short minutes, I would like to touch on a couple of subjects in relation to my electorate. I would like to talk about the extension of SA Water services, particularly down the Western Fleurieu. I would particularly like to talk about extending the water as far as Wirrina, as a minimum but, more than that, I believe it is past time that a plan was developed to take it the whole way through to Cape Jervis, including Second Valley and Rapid Bay.

I say this because these are areas of considerable growth. The government is looking to extend economic growth, of course, but SA Water seems reluctant or tardy in dealing with this matter. On the Southern Fleurieu Peninsula, the towns of Yankalilla and, from the east, Victor Harbor, Port Elliot, Middleton and Goolwa are all serviced by Myponga reservoir, which is a considerable reservoir. Many of you, if not all of you, have been through there on South Road, on the way down south. I am of the opinion that Myponga reservoir has adequate capacity. Indeed, it has the capacity to shift water back and forward between reservoirs to the south of Adelaide and, if necessary, back to Myponga, I am told. Of course, with the desalination plant effectively mothballed, there is always the capacity to produce more water if needed.

Wirrina residents comprise a considerable number of permanent residents but also a large number of absentee ratepayers who have holiday homes down there. You have the marina, the resort and the list goes on. The resort and Wirrina are currently serviced by their own dam and their own treatment plant which has been taken over by the Yankalilla district council. We arrived at this solution several years ago when the whole Wirrina group—houses, resort and the rest—were all looking like they were going to have no water.

Much to the credit of the District Council of Yankalilla, they took this on and it was a good outcome; however, it is proving to be extraordinarily expensive for those residents. The scheme is billed out to the Wirrina community through the council and it has proven to be an absolute nightmare. There are a number of people down there who are not on high incomes, and the high cost of this current process is driving many of them to worry about whether they can stay there.

My answer is simple. Whilst SA Water has a huge network of water supply across South Australia, and by and large does a pretty good job in supplying water needs, in my view, it needs to

think outside the square and look at extending that water service down the Fleurieu to provide the good people and the good businesses, in the Wirrina community particularly, with a steady supply of mains water.

It is going to cost money—of course it is going to cost money; it costs money to do everything—but it is a long-term investment for considerable growth in that area, and I hope that they would give consideration to doing that. I am being lobbied very regularly by residents down there who wish to have that water extension put on, so I ask members of the house to think about what I have said and I ask the government, through SA Water, to put forward a plan to do something similar to what I am talking about.

Distributing and reticulating water on Kangaroo Island, I also believe, could also boost economic activity and investment considerably if the water system were expanded. A few short years ago, SA Water had a plan to put in additional storage by the town of Kingscote. I objected strongly to that plan—not that I object strongly to putting in increased storage, but that plan was, in my view, foolhardy and in the wrong place—and they did not go on with it.

I understand that there are plans drawn up to put in a thing called a 'turkey nest' dam east of Parndana to provide additional water. I am also advised that there is, as part of the super-duper golf course on Dudley Peninsula, a plan to put a pipe through to that golf course. I am hopeful that it would also service properties and whatnot in between where the line would come through—probably from the airport corner—and I am very much of the view that that water supply should be made available to American River and the water supply should be extended to Emu Bay. Both of these small places have huge potential for growth and huge potential for more residential capacity and it would, indeed, lift things extraordinarily well if that were to be put into place.

Once again, it is in SA Water's charter, as I understand, to look at the potential for future growth in their market, and it is simply no good, when they are paying hundreds of millions of dollars into the government treasury every year, not to be putting investment even more into rural areas. I acknowledge that they do expand their network but, in my view, there needs to be substantial investment in extending the water reticulation in those areas I have mentioned today on the western Fleurieu and on Kangaroo Island. I look forward to having some discussions with people over where we might go with that but, as I indicated, I am being lobbied extensively in relation to the western Fleurieu and I await the outcome of the major project status on Kangaroo Island with the golf course and potentially the water going through to the proposed golf course. I support strongly that, and I think it would be a great thing.

This government has not done much right in that area on the island, but they just might be able to get this going. In fact, the one I take my hat off to over the past few years as part of the current state government is former minister Conlon, who was successful in putting a couple of million dollars a year into roads. It has been going on for a number of years, but since he finished in his capacity as minister for infrastructure, little or nothing has happened apart from a few fluffy glossy documents and a few other foolish things, in my view, and they really cannot hang their hat on anything whatsoever.

The other thing I would like to briefly pick up on in the time I have left is the proposal that has been put in for an operation to swim with the tuna—or tuna feeding—down off Victor Harbor, to be run by Oceanic Victor. I am greatly in support of this. It will be a terrific thing for the region, and indeed it will be terrific for those people visiting down there to be able to do what is proposed. I hope it is successful. We had a proposal like this a few years ago in another part of the electorate which fell over.

I am actually attending a lunch on the 27th, I think, in Victor Harbor, which is almost booked out already, where the proponents will speak to the local business community and others, including the mayor. There will be a number of us involved in that on the day. I have spoken with agents for the proponents, and I met with them in Adelaide last week and discussed it. I think it is a great thing. Granite Island is really struggling, with the demise of the penguins, the lack of a cafe and general down-and-out syndrome. This could be the saviour of the island, if the cafe is put into a very professional situation again and the people who go out there on the only horse tram in the Southern Hemisphere have something to do.

It is family entertainment. It will be moored out to sea somewhat, by necessity, and people will be able to go out on boats, go out to the platform, have a look at what is going on and feed the fish, etc. I make the point that this would be a highly professional outfit. Victor Harbor's waters are not known for their kindness in getting on and off boats. That is something they will have to deal with around the Screw Pile Jetty, as a lot of surge comes in there. I talked earlier about the platform being out to sea somewhat. With something like that, you simply have to have the platform (such as they do with the tuna pens at Port Lincoln) out to sea so that the currents go through and things are dispersed, so to speak. I look forward to that project, and with those few words I conclude my remarks.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

At 17:39 the house adjourned until Thursday 7 May 2015 at 10:30.