

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Wednesday, 23 March 2016**

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:02 and read prayers.

*Parliamentary Committees***SELECT COMMITTEE ON JUMPS RACING**

The Hon. **L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (11:03)**: By leave, I move:

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

Motion carried.

*Motions***SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:04)**: By leave, I move:

To amend the motion standing in my name to insert the words 'in the opinion of this house' after the word 'That' first appearing, and add the following parts 2 and 3 after '(i) any other related matters':

2. In the event of the joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
3. That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

So that the motion reads:

That in the opinion of this house, a joint committee be appointed to inquire and report into—

1.
  - (a) the impact upon service delivery of the government's budget savings targets for SAPOL;
  - (b) the intended and potential consequences of organisational reforms proposed for SAPOL;
  - (c) the civilianisation of police positions previously undertaken by sworn police officers;
  - (d) the potential impact upon service delivery of closing police stations and the reduction of opening hours at others;
  - (e) the government's election commitment of \$5.3 million to demolish and rebuild a new Henley Beach Police Station which will operate 9am to 5pm weekdays, rather than the recently extended hours of 8am to 11pm seven days per week;
  - (f) progress in achieving the government's election commitment to recruit an additional 313 police officers by 30<sup>th</sup> June 2018;
  - (g) the resources available to SAPOL to meet the government's target of an additional 313 police officers by 30<sup>th</sup> June 2018;
  - (h) the use of SAPOL resources to hold prisoners and remandees on behalf of Department of Correctional Services; and
  - (i) any other related matters.
2. In the event of the joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
3. That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

Leave granted.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** At the outset, let me be very clear that I am exceptionally supportive of SAPOL, as I know other members of this house are—both political parties are. Everybody should be. We have the best police force in the nation.

Moving for this select committee is not about trying to give SAPOL a hard time at all. They are the best police force in the nation, but they are not above scrutiny either. It is the right of members of parliament, and of parliament itself, to look into police activities, and it is my strong belief that it is the government's lack of resources and budget cutting that is forcing SAPOL to make decisions and go down directions which SAPOL would not otherwise be pursuing. It is really not about SAPOL; it is very much about the pressure put on to SAPOL by government pressures which are leading to unsatisfactory outcomes, both for SAPOL and for South Australia at large.

We know that in the current forward estimates period, SAPOL's budget has been cut by \$261 million, and that is an enormous slice of money. That is a huge amount of money out of the SAPOL budget. It is inconceivable that that would not have a direct impact upon service delivery and SAPOL's decisions, starting with the commissioner and all the way through the organisation, with regard to how best it can support and serve South Australians under such a very harsh regime.

We hear all the time from the government that the budget blowouts in health are because they are unavoidable because people get sick, people have accidents, and people require health services. Unfortunately, the government still finds it possible to just say that regardless of the demand upon SAPOL they just have to cut their budget nonetheless. The amount of \$261 million over the forward estimates period is a very significant budget cut, and it is leading to very significant and, potentially, negative organisational reforms.

SAPOL should always be reinventing itself. SAPOL should always be questioning the way it works. Should some things be done that are not done now? Should some things that are done now not be done? Should some things that are being done be done differently? Or, in fact, should some things that are being done continue in the same way?

Of course they should always be going through that sort of introspection, and I have no doubt that Commissioner Stevens and his senior team would be doing that all the time, whether there were budget cuts or not, but the fact that there are such harsh budget cuts will change the outcomes of those decisions, because there will be some paths that they will be forced down because they have no other choice because of budget cuts.

I believe that the proposal to very significantly civilianise the South Australian police force fits into that category. Not to say at all that there should be no civilians in SAPOL—far from it: of course there should. There are activities that civilians can do just as well as sworn officers, and it is quite appropriate that you would pursue that course of action and essentially not waste a sworn officer on some of those activities, and yes, of course, as time goes on, that list and those types of tasks need to be reviewed and considered. But the very dramatic increase, which is something like recruiting 50 per cent civilians, is clearly budget driven. These are the sorts of things that need to be looked into.

The reduction of hours of operation at police stations and the closing of police stations is a very emotive, hot-button issue. I do not say that no police station should ever close or should ever have its hours reduced; of course there will be situations where that should happen. As the community around that station changes, as technology changes, as officers' skills and capacities change, of course there will be instances where that is completely appropriate, but there seems to be a very strong requirement to close police stations because of budgetary constraints and/or to reduce their hours.

Deputy Speaker, I bring your attention to the Henley Beach Police Station, which is being rebuilt at the moment at a cost of \$5.3 million. The opposition strongly supports that. We believe that was a police station that needed to be upgraded and that the range of activities happening in the broader surrounding area of the Henley Beach Police Station warranted a rebuild. But that rebuild was announced in the dying days just before the last 2014 state election and, at that point in time, the member for Colton and the Premier told everybody in South Australia that this was an absolutely necessary investment and, essentially, a necessary resource for SAPOL, and the hours of 8am to

11pm seven days a week, with this new upgraded, state-of-the-art police station, were actually what Henley Beach and the surrounding district needed.

Now, of course, as we all know, those hours have been reduced down to nine to five, five days a week. We are all open-minded and we can all understand that technology improves and community expectations improve and police capacity improves, but to make that bold statement in the dying days of the election that this upgrade and the extended hours were absolutely necessary for community safety and to now say, 'Actually, they are not at all. Now it can be business hours,' really does beggar belief. I think that is just one example of many that this committee, if the government agrees to establish it, could look into and that the community of South Australia would benefit from straightaway.

We need to have a very thorough, objective and impassionate decision-making process about reinvestment and rebuilding police stations and their hours of operation, not having the government come out to shore up a very marginal seat in the last couple of days before an election and offer money, extended hours and extended support to the local community through SAPOL and then two years later say, 'Well, actually it's just not necessary anymore, so we're not going to do it.' That is not what I would call a thorough, objective and impassionate review of how policing should be operating, and I am confident that the local community around the Henley Beach Police Station has exactly the same opinion.

The Recruit 313 election promise—which was made by the government back in 2010 as an election commitment and was originally to be delivered by 2014, that is, that the government would recruit an additional 313 police officers net on top of current sworn officer population at the time—is something that has been outrageously dealt with by the government. As I said, made in 2010, to be fulfilled by 2014, and now the government says it will fulfil it by 2018.

That commitment was to grow the number of sworn police officers by 313 and now the government is trying to suggest that cadets should be included in that number, which was very clearly not the case at the time. I fear that the government might also try to include civilians in that recruiting promise and say, 'Oh we've recruited a lot of civilians and a lot of cadets and some police officers and the total of all of them adds up to 313, and so we have fulfilled the promise.' Well, that would be completely unacceptable. The promise was very clearly for 313 additional net sworn officers.

The government still says—the Premier has restated, and the police minister has restated—that it will fulfil that promise, and I welcome that, that is a terrific thing, but the commissioner has also made it very clear in his statements to the Budget and Finance Committee that he would need an additional \$8 million per year in his police budget to be able to fulfil that promise, and if he does not get that \$8 million per year extra in his police budget, he will not be able to fulfil that promise on behalf of the government and, as I said earlier, we know the government is reducing the police budget by \$261 million dollars over four years.

Two successive police commissioners have said that it will not be possible to fulfil the government's Recruit 313 election commitment with existing resources and yet the government says it will still fulfil that commitment, so nobody really knows how. It is not possible for the commissioner to be saying that he cannot get enough sworn police officers, that he is actually going to recruit more civilian officers. The government is saying, no, they are still going to recruit 313 extra sworn officers. The commissioner says that he needs \$8 million more in his budget and the government says, 'Well, actually, you are going to have \$261 million less in your budget over four years.'

Those statements, which have all been made to this parliament and/or to parliamentary committees, cannot all be true. I think it is very obvious that this proposed select committee should look into that. The promise that the government says it is still going to keep, based on all the evidence we have, cannot be kept. The government should just come clean and say, 'Look, we can't do it anymore,' or should come clean and say, 'We are still going to do it and we're going to give the commissioner and SAPOL the resources that they need so that they can fulfil that promise.'

The resources that the government has given to the Department for Correctional Services has meant that the Department for Correctional Services has had to put extraordinary pressure on police, and DCS remandees are being held (from time to time) in police cells at Sturt, Port Adelaide

and Holden Hill. That is putting undue pressure on those police stations and on police resources. That is a very important issue that needs to be looked at.

Again, that is a government resources issue: not providing resources to the Department for Correctional Services is putting SAPOL under extraordinary pressure and requiring SAPOL to make decisions that they would not otherwise want to have. That lack of resources from the government is having very negative consequences on both of those departments—both SAPOL and the Department for Correctional Services.

Very regularly, all of us here in this house speak in glowing terms about SAPOL. On particular anniversaries and particular events and particular situations, any number of us have spoken up. I have many times and I stand by every single thing I have ever said in this house—in general, but specifically about SAPOL at the moment.

If members of this chamber really believe everything that they have ever said in support of SAPOL, they will support the establishment of this committee. If members here really believe that SAPOL are as good as we want them to be and that SAPOL deserve the resources that they need so that they can do the job required of them, then they will support this select committee to look into it so that SAPOL knows that they genuinely have their support. I do not mean just on nice days when we are wearing different ribbons on our jackets and things like that when people stand up, but that they honestly support SAPOL and they want SAPOL to have these resources so that SAPOL can get on and do the job that we want them to do on behalf of all South Australians.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:20):** I rise today to advise that the government does not support and cannot support the motion put before the house by the member for Stuart. As he knows, I have a lot of respect for the member for Stuart, and I know that he always brings a lot of sensible debate in this area to this house, but to suggest that someone opposing this motion does not support the police is a little offensive, I think.

I do not know if anyone could argue that I do not support the police and have not supported the police throughout my work in this house since I have been elected but, moving on, we do not support the motion before the house generally because it is so broad ranging. What it essentially does is undermine the idea of an independent police commissioner which is what we have in this state. The conventions are that we respect that convention.

This government is very proud of its record in delivering results for both community safety and our highly respected police force. It should be noted that SAPOL's budget in 2015-16 would rise to almost \$850 million which is the highest ever funding allocation for SAPOL. What this record investment translates to is that South Australia continues to have more police per capita than any other state in Australia, except the Northern Territory.

What is more, this investment in our police force has contributed to cutting victim-reported crime by more than one-third for the 10-year period to 2013-14. These results could not have been achieved if not for this government's ongoing support for police to deliver safer communities for all South Australians.

As members would be aware and, as the member for Stuart outlined quite comprehensively, South Australia Police are conducting an organisational review to keep up with community expectations. The nature of policing is obviously rapidly evolving and it is important that SAPOL is able to modernise to meet future challenges rather than just leaning back on the old ways of doing things, and this is what the Commissioner is doing.

Let me be clear that these are operational matters for the police commissioner to determine and not an opportunity for members opposite to push for yet another committee. I would add that the police commissioner regularly appears before the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee and the chair gives a lot of leeway particularly to the forensic examinations of the member for Hartley to ask wide-ranging questions regularly of the police commissioner. Also, the Budget and Finance Committee hears regularly from the police commissioner, among others, on broad ranging questions.

Not only is it not the business of this government to instruct the police on how to do their job, the idea of a committee that is set up in order to tell the police how to do their job is frankly unnecessary. The commissioner and I and the government would rather have coppers on the beat

keeping our community safe rather than police sitting around waiting for people to come in to do these simple administrative tasks, and that is why the police commissioner is making these changes to police station hours, not for any other reason other than getting coppers out on the beat. For these reasons, I and others on this side of the house oppose this motion.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:23):** I rise today to support the member for Stuart's motion to establish a select committee to inquire and report into a number of police related matters. Listening to the member for Little Para, stating that the member for Stuart comes into this chamber with sensible debate and input, I think is testament to why we should be supporting this select committee.

Select committees are not there to undermine SAPOL. We all acknowledge the great work that SAPOL do. They keep us safe, they do the best with what they have and the resources that are allocated to them and, yes, we have an independent Commissioner of Police. However, there are growing concerns about some of the directions that SAPOL are having to work under—budgetary cuts, for example. It is not an increasing budget that continues to go into SAPOL to reflect the increasing crime, increasing drug problem that we have on our streets and the increasing concerns with many jurisdictions that SAPOL deal with.

This is an avenue which I believe could provide some answers—and I will particularly talk about my electorate of Chaffey—about the current situation with police station hours and future plans for police stations, particularly in the Riverland and the Mallee. I have asked the previous minister for police questions in this chamber, and I am still waiting on answers. Those questions were about a town like Renmark, with a reasonably large population (about 8,000). It is concerning that the station is now only manned when an officer is available.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** Staffed.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** That might be staffed, but this is all about the budgets that they have to work under. When people go to a police station it is not just about SAPOL issues. Whether it is licensing issues or filling out forms, there is a myriad of paperwork that has to be signed in today's red-tape world led by this current government. It shows us that there are fewer resources put into, as the member for Little Para would say, coppers on the beat. What we are seeing now is a reduced number of police in cars on the beat, because we do not have administration staff or police officers who are actually in the station giving support to those local communities.

The administration headquarters was previously moved to Murray Bridge; again, that is a reduction in SAPOL service in my electorate. We are now seeing a reduced number of senior SAPOL officers who are dealing with the bigger picture. I must say that there is a growing concern of people who are worried about operating hours, particularly in Renmark and Loxton. Those stations are seeing a decline in the services that they offer. Loxton is the hub for a very large area between the Riverland and the Mallee, as is Renmark. It covers a very large area with a reasonably dense population, and yet we are seeing fewer and fewer police in those stations in those areas.

Previously, I raised the issue with the police minister in the local media because of local concerns. He said he would look into staffing numbers. He said it was the responsibility of the police commissioner, but I do note that I still have not received a written answer from him or from the new police minister. We have a growing concern about drugs, particularly in the Riverland, and that requires a stronger police presence. I note a recent campaign, Operation Acidify, which Berri police ran for more than a year (2014 and 2015), has culminated in the arrest of 183 people for drug offences, including possession and trafficking of a controlled drug.

Obviously, it has been very widely supported, and I have been a very strong advocate for the anti-methamphetamine stance, which is sadly on most people's doorsteps right throughout the state. Regional communities seem to be much more impacted, but it is the good work of SAPOL that is addressing this issue. It is a growing issue, but we are not seeing SAPOL numbers growing to deal with this issue. It is a scourge on society, but SAPOL is saying that they are doing the best they can with the resources they currently have.

In terms of police issues and drug diversions, since Operation Acidify another 88 people have been found, particularly with possession and with intent to sell. That is the issue. SAPOL are

dealing with the issue but not with resources that I find satisfactory. They are dealing with this issue in the best way they can.

Again, the police minister reconfirmed the government's election commitment to recruit an additional 313 sworn officers. The member for Stuart has already gone over that, so I will not repeat what he has said. However, it was an election commitment and it is something that has been left wanting. I know that the member for Colton was very proud of the pre 2014 election announcement about the upgrade or the rebuild of the Henley Beach Police Station. That has now been downgraded to almost just office hours. It was a huge investment which was going to be open for extended hours and which now has been wound back.

They are the sorts of concerns—the moving promises whereby the reality turns into just a half a promise being committed. On the matter of police numbers, police presence, the issue with the manned hours of police stations, particularly in the electorate of Chaffey, the Riverland and Mallee, I am sure this is a reflection right around the state where we are seeing police who are spending more time behind a desk filling out regulatory requirements than actually out there doing what they are expected to do, that is, to keep our community safe from the scourge of drugs, people doing the wrong thing, making sure that our roads are safe and making sure that people are abiding by the law.

The member for Stuart's select committee ask, I think, is a very sensible ask, and I commend this to the house. I think that the government should be supporting it because SAPOL is calling out for more resources, it is calling out for more help. We have had added pressures on SAPOL with corrections, we have added pressures on SAPOL with the increased drug use. We have the increased drug-driving issue that is sadly becoming more and more dominant than ever before as our testing stations pick up more people now who are using drugs while driving. This select committee is warranted, and I commend the member for Stuart for bringing it to the chamber.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:31):** I rise to support the member for Stuart's proposal by way of motion to establish a select committee. The reason we need this is because the government makes promises, and ministers, the Premier and other members go out and make promises about what they are going to do to support the police in South Australia to undertake their work. They put out press releases, they make election promises, they make announcements, they stand arm in arm with the police and tell them that they are, obviously, going to be supported in legislative powers, and the like, and then, in the next breath when it does not suit them or they run out of money or they get into trouble or there is a policy that does not suit them, they say, 'This is for the commissioner. This is an operational matter.'

That is why we have to have this inquiry, because the government keeps making promises and then changes it. It made a commitment last year, supported by the police commissioner, in respect of workers compensation for police officers who are injured or hurt in the course of their duty. The police commissioner said, 'I can't afford that in my budget. I don't support it.' What happened? The new police commissioner comes in under the weight of public outrage about that, and the minister steps in and the government says, 'Okay, we'll change our mind. We'll do a bit of a backflip on that, we're going to support it.'

I am not unhappy that it did, but do not come in here and announce one thing at one stage about what is a policy position and then do a backflip, or then say, 'It's an operational matter.' Civilianisation of the police force is an important issue. Certainly the police commissioner has the day to day running and operation of the police force. Where was the commissioner's autonomy when the government announced just weeks ago that it was going to introduce a policy to ensure that up to one half of the new recruits on the police force were to be female?

The feminisation of the police force may be a very good policy, but where was the police commissioner in having the running and autonomy of his (in this case 'his'; one day there will be a female police commissioner, I am sure) role in determining his workforce? So, they make promises, they make commitments and then they backflip. They made a promise about police under Recruit 300 just before the 2014 election, and now, of course, they have not complied with that, they have not reached it, they got nowhere near reaching it, and the police commissioner says, 'If I've got any hope of doing it I'm going to need another \$8 million a year.'

They are left with this embarrassing position of having made a promise and they have not lived up to it, so now it becomes an operational matter. Now it is his problem. That is not acceptable, because the people of South Australia were given a promise, a commitment and a policy direction and then the government just hides behind the police commissioner. Today, we are going to be debating bills in respect of the forensic responsibility of taking gunshot residue, forensic procedures and giving police new roles. Is there any extra budget for that? Not that we have heard. On the one hand, they give these obligations and autonomy and they take it back when they think something is good news and, when it is bad news, it is all the police commissioner's fault. We want some answers. We need a select committee.

I want to particularly address the new police station at Henley Beach which, of course, is one of the terms of reference of the inquiry. I cannot believe that we have a report by the Public Works Committee that was published nine months ago in this parliament supporting a new police station, in which it found that there was a need for a rebuild. It was at that time operating between 8am and 11pm seven days a week and the patrol base was operating 24 hours, seven days a week. Obviously, the infrastructure was dated, it having been established back in 1962, and it needed to have modern amenities. There were a number of reasons why that was necessary which justified spending a \$5.3 million GST-exclusive allocation to do that. That was good news and important and accepted by the Public Works Committee as being necessary to facilitate the services for that district.

The coastal areas of Henley Beach, Grange, Semaphore and Glenelg are all areas where there is public amenity and 24/7 activity, where there are licensed premises operating and where there has been an encouragement for the development of vitality and socialising of those regions but, in the next breath, the government are announcing that they are going to pull back the hours and take it to a daytime service only. It is incredible. Here is what the government said on 10 March 2014 during the election campaign in announcing a new police station:

A re-elected Labor government will build a new \$5.3 million police station—

Then it says:

Premier Jay Weatherill said that the new Henley Beach Police Station will boost community safety for the local area.

The new police station will increase the emergency response capability, help reduce crime and have capacity for additional police.

The member for Colton made statements in support of this, obviously, saying:

The Henley Beach area is very popular, particularly during summer, and it is important that local residents feel safe in their community.

He went on to say:

The Henley Beach Police Station has been an asset for the local community since 1962—but is not big enough to cater for our growing police force...Many local residents have told me that community safety is a concern for them, and Labor is committed to ensuring that we have a well-resourced police force with the best facilities.

Henley Beach Police Station currently has 40 staff working at the site providing a 24-hour presence.

We need it. The area is growing. The demand is there. We want more police to be there and now what is going to happen? For over 12 hours a day, it is going to get cobwebs in it. That is just not acceptable. It undermines the justification for spending the money in the first place.

We prioritise the redevelopment of facilities in growing areas of social attraction for families and young people to enjoy these amenities and then the government has cut underneath and said, 'Sorry, police commissioner, you are not going to get the extra money, you are not going to get the extra police, we are not going to make that extra provision for you. You are going to have to cut the budget.' So, what does the police commissioner do? He closes down the police station after 5 o'clock.

What are we going to do for all those restaurants and all the people who are taking alcohol and enjoying the convivial environment they are in which, unfortunately, does attract some elements that can be disruptive? What is important is that the patrons and the visitors to that area, particularly around licensed premises, need that protection. It is just unconscionable that the government goes

out and makes these grandiose promises and then does not deliver on either the personnel or allowing the police commissioner to have sufficient resources to get on with his job.

In a week or so's time when we have dealt with this other legislation, he is going to have more jobs to do and, I expect, precious little resources to do it. I do not blame the police commissioner, but I do say that this parliament has to seize themselves of taking responsibility on this. The police commissioner is supported as having an autonomous role, and that is why he is a commissioner. He has independence of prosecution and independence of investigation without executive interference—all that, and we understand the reason for that.

However, the government just marches in, makes promises of support, undermines it when they fail to deliver and then blames the police commissioner, because he is then forced to reduce the service delivery that has been promised by this government. It is totally unacceptable, it needs to be investigated and I commend the member for Stuart for taking it up.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the next speaker, I am not sure which group is in the gallery, but we do welcome them to parliament this morning and hope they enjoy their time with us. It is the Karawatha Community, who are guests of the member for Reynell. Thank you very much for joining us in parliament this morning.

#### *Motions*

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

Debate resumed.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:40):** I rise to reinforce the points made by my colleague, the member for Little Para, who was himself a long-serving police officer, so he probably knows more about policing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** It was eight years, wasn't it?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Well, he certainly served as a police officer—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I can't hear the member for Colton.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —and we should all be very proud of his contribution to the police service while he was there. We are not going to support this motion. We only have to look at the member for Bragg's contribution, which was riddled with errors to a very great extent.

**Mr Whetstone:** Succinct.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** It might have been succinct, but it was incorrect what she was saying.

**Mr Whetstone:** What was incorrect?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I will just go on. The member for Bragg spoke in one instance about workers compensation and us coming in and doing this, and on one hand we want it to be an operational matter so we can let the commissioner do what he wants and, in her view, absolve ourselves of any responsibility. Last time I remember, workers compensation is not an operational issue.

**Ms Chapman:** Not now.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** It never has been an operational issue, Vickie, and you know that.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*



**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The deputy leader was heard in silence and I would ask her to listen.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** The member for Bragg also talked about women police officers, insinuating that that was the idea of government when it was clearly the commissioner's idea, and I support his idea. It was only a few weeks ago that we were celebrating the contribution of women in the police force in South Australia, and it appears that the member for Bragg is saying to us that we have directed the commissioner, and that is not true. There are just two mistakes, and I will leave it there, because I could go on and on, but I am not going to.

**Mr Pederick:** Go on.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** It seems to me that the opposition are purely speculating. It was only as recent as yesterday, when reading the *Hansard* from the other place, that the Minister for Police was asked a question about the 313 police officers that was a commitment of the state government prior to the election. He confirmed that that commitment still exists and those police officers will be delivered.

**Mr Whetstone:** When?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** It's going to be done.

**Mr Gardner:** It's already been delayed five years.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Can you sit down, member for Colton. Members are aware of the standing orders: 131 specifically precludes you speaking over another speaker. I would ask you to listen to the speaker in silence and I will ensure you are given the same courtesy. We have guests in the gallery, which is another reason I think we should observe the standing orders. The member for Colton.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and I would very much appreciate them showing the same courtesy that I showed them—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Just go on with your speech.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —when they were speaking.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On with the show.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** The member for Stuart said something like—I will paraphrase him here and he will correct me if I am wrong—that by not supporting this motion we are not supporting police. I think the member for Little Para said he found that offensive. I find it highly offensive, because we only have to look at the record of the opposition those many, many years ago when they were actually in government as to what happened with the police service during that period of time, and you let it run down.

**Ms Redmond:** Rubbish!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen, you are not in your seat; do not open your mouth again, please.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** The opposition even removed police officers from the APY lands. We finished up reinstating those, as we did with—

**Mr Whetstone:** Let's talk about Henley Beach.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Well, I am going to get to Henley Beach—

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

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I showed him courtesy too, as difficult as it was, Deputy Speaker. The member for Little Para also reinforced the point that the 2015-16 police budget will rise to approximately \$850 million. That is the highest level that has ever occurred in this state in our police force. So, we stand by that particular record. The evidence shows that we not only stand by it, but members of our community—

*Ms Redmond interjecting:*

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

**Ms Redmond:** I was talking to him.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It doesn't matter. You weren't; don't tell fibs.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —have benefited from this, because we have seen a commensurate reduction in criminal offences, and that is a good thing. We support the police, and we will always support the police. We will also support the police to operate as the commissioner and the force sees fit. That is their responsibility; it is not for us to interfere with them. I was certainly offended by the comments of the member for Bragg that we pick and choose when we want to intervene.

In relation to Henley Beach, I will say this: staffing hours are a generally a matter for the commissioner. I have had some concerns expressed by my constituents in relation to a reduction in police hours, as it appeared in the paper. I did the right thing: I spoke with the minister's office about this. I have spoken with local police officers as well, and I have passed on those concerns, going through the proper channels to do so.

We know the commissioner has undertaken an organisational review, and it is quite appropriate for him to do so. I do not think it is very helpful for this parliament to intervene during that operational review with the matters proposed in these terms of reference. I think it is just a nonsense. More importantly, I think, quite clearly, the opposition are just wanting to play politics with this particular matter.

On the Henley police station, I remember it being built because I lived just over the road. It used to be a paddock before they put the police station there—I think it was old railways land. It was an old station, it was a tired station, and it needed to be replaced. What the member for Bragg has to realise as well is that its primary purpose is as an operation base for patrols. It has been built in such a way that will increase the number of patrols that can operate out of that venue.

The simple fact is that the reason we have been able to reduce crime stats in this state is because we have police out in the community, and that is where they need to be. The member for Bragg also raised the issue about Henley Beach being a 24—

**Mr Pengilly:** He's kidding himself.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** The only joke here is the member for Finniss. The member for Bragg also spoke about the transformation of Henley Beach, which is something I am very proud of—

**Mr PENGILLY:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am sure this won't be frivolous, member for Finniss.

**Mr PENGILLY:** I am sure it won't, because the member for Colton is reflecting on another member.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am going to keep listening to him.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. The member for Bragg said that Henley is a 24/7 area of heightened activity. If there was an incident in Henley Square, and the police station was staffed with two police officers, as it normally was, they would not attend that incident. They would get onto the phone to the patrols that were out there and have them attend. The same will occur—

**Ms Redmond:** You're joking.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** No, I'm not joking; they would not—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Colton, it is unparliamentary to make interjections or to respond to them. Everybody needs to remember the standing orders.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** They would not leave their post. They would get onto the phone to ensure that patrols attended that area. During those busy periods, we see an increased presence, quite appropriately, of patrols visiting our coastline.

The matter of operating hours is really a matter for the commissioner. I have put my views through the right channels to the minister's office on this particular issue. But, at the same time, it is not appropriate for the government to interfere on what is an operational review that is being conducted by Commissioner Stevens.

The member for Bragg talks about broken promises. I cannot see where we have broken one single promise. In fact, it was reinforced yesterday by the Minister for Police in another place, that we remain committed to recruiting the additional 313 police officers by 30 June 2018.

I do not see that this motion is appropriate. I do not think that the house should waste its time on this particular motion. I think we all ought to show the support that we should for the commissioner with respect to the consultation that he is going through in regard, in the first instance, to this operational review, and the outcomes of that operational review. I certainly, on this side, will not be supporting this motion.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:50):** Of course, I am very disappointed that the government will not support this motion. I listened to the words of the member for Little Para very closely, and he is a person for whom I have respect, and a friendship with as well, but that does not mean that we agree on everything.

The issue about the independence of the commissioner goes without saying. There is nobody in opposition who does not think that the police commissioner should not have independence to make the decisions that he (or one day she) needs to make. Every single thing I said in moving this motion was about the fact that the government's resources are not supporting the commissioner, so that he is not able to make the decisions that he should be able to make to fulfil what our community expects.

For the government to talk about police per capita on the one hand and say, 'Look how wonderful the government is because we have more police per capita than any other state,' and then at the same time say, 'We have more police per capita than any other state, so we can cut their budget; we are doing okay, we can drag them back,' does not make sense at all. I remind the government that former police commissioner, Gary Burns, back in February 2013, said that judging police forces by sworn officers per capita of state population is not a realistic, not a fair and not a useful way of comparing police forces between states.

There are many things that members on the other side spoke about when they were trying to explain why they are not going to support our South Australian police by supporting this committee, but what they did not do was address the foundation of this motion; that is, that a joint select committee is sought in an effort to support SAPOL to identify where the government is not providing police with the resources they need and to encourage the government to support SAPOL better. Now, what member of parliament could not agree to do that?

I think the government is fearful of any investigation whatsoever of the impact of its resources upon SAPOL. For the government to say repeatedly, 'We are going to stick to our commitment to recruit an extra 313 net new police officers in South Australia,' is absolutely ridiculous when, at the same time, we have them cutting the police budget by \$261 million over four years. At the same time, the commissioner is saying, loud and clear, that he cannot deliver on that promise for the government unless he gets an extra \$8 million per year in his budget.

It is preposterous for the government to say that they are still going to deliver on that promise unless, of course, they are going to adjust the promise again. Initially, the promise was going to be that it would happen by 2014; now it is going to happen by 2018. Initially, the promise only referred to sworn officers, and specifically excluded cadets; now the government includes cadets. So, perhaps the government is now going to try to say that if they recruit additional civilians to work in SAPOL that that will form part of their delivery on the promise. If that were to be the case, that would be absolutely ridiculous and completely unacceptable.

I think it is fair to say that if members on either side of this chamber support police officers and support SAPOL as an organisation, that they would support the establishment of this committee, because this committee is all about supporting SAPOL. This committee is about trying to identify, very clearly, where and how government budget cuts are forcing the police commissioner to make decisions he would not otherwise make.

I support the police commissioner wholeheartedly in making bold, innovative, technology-adopting changes to SAPOL so that our police force can stay with the times and be innovative. It is not about having 6'4" blokes go into pubs, bashing people up and kicking them out of the way, as it might have been 150 years ago; it is now a high-tech business. It now requires a whole range of people with a whole range of skills.

The commissioner needs to have the flexibility to adjust SAPOL, but he cannot do it with his hands tied behind his back because the government continues to cut his budget. I think it is a great shame that the government is not going to support the establishment of this select committee which would support our South Australian police force.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 18  
Noes ..... 22  
Majority ..... 4

#### AYES

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

#### NOES

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

#### PAIRS

McFetridge, D.	Hildyard, K.	Pisoni, D.G.
Vlahos, L.A.	Sanderson, R.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.

Motion thus negatived.

#### *Bills*

### **SUPPLY BILL 2016**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (12:00):** Obtained leave

and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the consolidated account for the financial year ending on 30 June 2017. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (12:01):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

A Supply Bill will be necessary for the first three months of the 2016-17 financial year until the Budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and the Appropriation Bill 2016 receives assent.

In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill.

The amount being sought under this Bill is \$3,444 million.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides relevant definitions.

Clause 3 provides for the appropriation of up to \$3,444 million.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 February 2016.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:02):** I rise to speak on this bill to indicate that substantially we will be supporting the bill and—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I have just been asked to establish that you are the lead speaker.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Correct. The government introduced this bill on 24 February indicating that it was to deal with 'minor errors, omissions and other technical deficiencies in legislation', and it is fair to say that after having the briefing with representatives from the Attorney-General's Department and, indeed, the minister's office, that for a substantial part of this bill, that is exactly so. I also had sought some further data in respect of some of the matters and confirm that that information has been received, and I thank those officers responsible for preparation of the same.

Essentially, the areas of reform and amendment to legislation cover a number of areas, and I will summarise those to indicate our agreement to the same. One is in respect of forensic procedures, and essentially the legislation catches up with the current contemporary terminology, but also to some degree allows for other qualified persons to undertake various procedures. This is in two categories: one, to enable police officers of a lower rank to be involved in some of these, including the taking of tests; and, secondly, from the Coroner to police officers. We do not take issue with those. Probably there will be some questions about justification in doing that but essentially we do not take issue with that.

There is a second tranche of reform to deal with the new and contemporary use of 'cognitive impairment' instead of the term 'mental disability', and that has required some amendments, and we support those. I note that yesterday we were dealing with the Mental Health Act and a review of some of that legislation, so I am not quite sure why that is not being updated as well in our health legislation.

Nevertheless, in the criminal law and in respect of the protective laws for our citizens, a whole new tranche of legislation has come into effect largely to enable vulnerable parties, people with a cognitive impairment, to be able to have offences against them successfully prosecuted by lowering the bar of admissibility of the evidence obligations.

The third area relates to a liability for an apology and is to clarify in the Civil Liability Act so that there is full legal protection given to a person in civil proceedings to deal with a circumstance where an apology is given. It purports to come from a request of the State Ombudsman on 20 November 2014 in which he did an audit of state government agencies. It was a fairly scathing report, I might say. In any event, two years later that is being implemented.

I point out here that although he expressed concern about the reticence of people coming forward and saying, 'I am sorry, I apologise for what has happened,' even if they do not take direct responsibility for having inflicted some harm or hurt to somebody, there is clearly benefit in being able to have parties come together and for one or other to acknowledge at least that they are sorry for what has happened and in a way to heal that issue, that rift, before it gets into ugly litigation or a greater confrontation between the parties.

Unsurprisingly, this piece of legislation comes to the parliament, not just because the Ombudsman has asked for it, but because most often what he is dealing with is an apology from government departments or departmental officers or people in the purview of responsibility to the government who have acted either inappropriately or have failed to act or neglected to act, and their conduct or their omission has resulted in somebody missing out on something.

Everyone can read the Ombudsman's report each year because his job is to be a recipient of concerns and complaints by the general public. Largely, they are taken up in areas nowadays of prisoners who complain about some loss of benefit in the prison; the education department, which can be anything from not having the right teacher to a parent's complaint for their child at school, across to serious errors of conduct on behalf of a departmental officer or a school; and finally, areas in Department for Families and Communities which have had an explosion of complaints for obvious reasons. Other smaller departments have some response as do local governments.

Remember nowadays that we have a separate complaints person, a health and community services complaints commissioner, for the health department, with private health and community services in a separate wing of that complaint structure. Of course, we have a number of other integrity offices—the Office for Public Integrity, ICAC and a separate police ombudsman which, for obvious reasons, is to protect the integrity of criminal intelligence and the like. So, we have a pretty busy process. Civil liability applies to everyone, including the government. I will make the point here that the people we are trying to get to say sorry are people who work for the government.

Next is the areas to remit a case for resentencing, which relates to a Full Court decision and which requires amendment, and we support that. As to accessibility to court records, I will come back to that in a moment. There are some electoral reform amendments which we have accepted and which reflect the intent of what the original amendments to the Electoral Act were to do. We have some vulnerable witness legislation amendments, particularly to the Evidence Act, again to deal with definitions, for example, of complex communication need and the like. Some of these may not help a lot, but we will support the government in the hope that they do.

This amendment will remove the current maximum age for a juror to be 70. So you can be selected and go on a jury when you are over 70, but you have the right to opt out pretty much automatically from jury duty if you do not wish to do it; and that is something that we accept. Obviously, we welcome the contribution of the mature aged in serving in this capacity. There is an expiry issue in relation to subordinate legislation—we have no problem with that—and then there is the updating of languages for electronic recording.

The two areas in the bill which I particularly wish to address are the amendments to the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009. With that bill being opened, I propose to move amendments which are standing in my name (filed 8 March) which relate to the duration of intervention orders, and I will address those in committee. They are for the government to be aware that that is to incorporate what I had in a private member's bill but which I have now withdrawn, and I will be seeking to have those amendments made to the act via this bill.

The second and most controversial area is in respect of the government's proposal to change the rules of accessibility to court records. The government will have seen the amendments tabled that oppose the changes to the Magistrates Court Act, the District Court Act and Supreme Court Act

proposed by the government. We will be seeking to delete parts 7, 12 and 17 of the bill relating to the government's initiative (which is the kindest way I can describe that) in this bill.

The third area is not the subject of the material within the government's proposals but an area to which I will seek to move in a third set of amendments to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 while it is open. I will be seeking to make provision for the protection of children against prosecution of pornographic charges. I do so in light of the government's introduction of a new level of proposed criminal offences, namely, offences under the Summaries Offences Act, dealing with sexting and revenge pornography.

This is consistent with advice that we have received during our consultation, in the circumstances where child pornography laws will still prevail and where children have been charged with pornography charges, and where there is the need to ensure that they be protected in the circumstance where, if I could say, a mere sexting offence could suffice and be protected against an unfair prosecution as a child offender charged with pornography charges. We will introduce a clause to require the Attorney-General to be the gatekeeper and give consent before that can occur.

Members may be interested to know that in the course of the government's promotion of the need for revenge pornography legislation and the acknowledgement that we do need to protect against unfair prosecution, even of sexting offences, where there has been inappropriate material published between, if we can say, two consenting children (that is persons under 18), the government acknowledged that one has to be careful and not over-zealous in declaring something as criminal conduct from the point of view of prosecuting children for what is juvenile, irresponsible behaviour.

We have a whole regime of laws that relate to youth offending, and we, in this civilised community, accept that they should be given a second chance. They even have a separate court, even though we have been fighting for a judge, of course, to stay as head of it. Nevertheless, we recognise the significance of understanding that young people will do stupid things—not all of them, but some of them will do stupid things and when they grow up or they mature or they learn from their lesson they should be given a second chance.

That is the principle that undermines criminal justice for children, and I certainly support it. I think that this will be an important initiative to protect, particularly as we are going to go into the realm, with that set of legislation, which will have our support but which will attract still the opportunity for children to be prosecuted. When the Attorney-General was questioned about children being prosecuted, children being on the child offenders' list, he has made this statement publicly that there are no children on the child offenders' list.

I have no reason to doubt that is the case now, but what we now find out is that a child was on the list, and the only reason he is able to stand up publicly and say that there is no child on the child sex offenders' list is because that child has now turned 18. If he was fully frank with the public he would have said, 'No, there are no children on the child offenders' list, but it has occurred, and we want to make sure that, in certain cases, children are protected against that.'

As it turns out, I am advised—and I have no reason to doubt—that the person who was on the offenders' list, the child who is now an adult, has been convicted of serious pornography offences. As I say, I have no reason to doubt that it is a situation where the prevailing circumstances, the seriousness of the offence, would justify that occurring, but for my satisfaction, consistent with the way we should be treating our youth, I want there to be some protection and for someone to have a look at it before a prosecution proceeds of the serious charges of pornography against the child—not the sexting offences because I think the DPP and others can deal with that responsibly and we do not need to have a separate gatekeeper. However, for that reason I will be proposing a third amendment to this bill.

Let me return to the government's proposal that we change the law in respect of accessibility to court documents. At present, remember, we have a situation where our courts, like our parliament, are under the scrutiny of the public. One of the great opportunities the public has to scrutinise what we do or what happens in courtrooms, to ensure that there is a public accountability and a transparency of what we do, is that we have open courts and we have open parliaments. People can come in here and sit in the parliament or sit in the courtroom and view what happens, listen to how it works, to be able to shine a light on the accountability of those processes.

Largely, we do not have star chambers in our state. We do not have secret hearings. We have special provisions when a child might give evidence in a court, or indeed when there is a circumstance in the parliament when there are committee witnesses giving evidence, for example, to a committee, which we protect against the public glare at the time until the committee concludes its reporting and then, of course, that material can be available once it is tabled in the parliament.

The government has inquiries from time to time—royal commissions and the like—and those inquiries sometimes receive evidence in secret, that is, they are not in a public environment. We have the royal commission happening at the moment in respect of children's services in this state conducted by royal commissioner Nyland and she has elected to hear a number of witnesses and receive evidence without the glare of public attendance. There can be good reason for the exception, but that is the exception.

One of the other ways that we do it is to make sure that what we say in courtrooms via judgements of judges or what we say here via our able people in *Hansard* is placed on an electronic record on a website so that it is available for the public to view it, read it and know what is going on. This is the means which is probably the most instant for most people who do not, frankly, have all day to sit in courtrooms or parliament or, indeed, even to go online and read it all. Representatives from the media come here and go to courtrooms and read the reports and judgements and look at the court files and protect us by having the capacity to publish information about what is going on in these important institutions.

It is particularly important in courts because we have a separation of powers and an executive which is supposed to be accountable to the parliament. We have the judiciary independent of interference by the executive. The Attorney-General cannot ring a judge and say, 'I want this person to be guilty.' The Attorney-General or the Premier cannot ring the police commissioner and say, 'I want that man prosecuted.' None of the ministers can ring commissioners of inquiry and say, 'Dud this person.'

We protect against executive interference, and the way that we do that is to make sure that these people have autonomous responsibility and they are protected by law from interference. Any of the ministers—or any of us, for that matter—cannot ring up the DPP and say, 'I want this person's backside. I want this person charged. Please proceed in that manner.' It is very important that we have that separation.

When the press, for example, or someone else wants to know what is happening in a criminal court, they can go down and watch and they can go and look at the court file, which will disclose a number of things. A number of them are pretty straightforward, such as: the name or names of the accused; the charges which they are required to respond to and for which they are being held to account; sometimes, some of the particulars of the offence; and early judgements and decisions of the courts as the criminal case progresses (on applications for adjournment, remands in custody, bail, committals to higher courts, and all those things). They can follow it and see what is happening, and that is a very important process.

Currently, if somebody goes down and gets information and reads the particulars of what somebody is charged with or the determinations that are there, or goes online (because some of this information is online), they can then either publish it if they are members of the press or members of parliament, for example, or the general public can go down and find this information and bring it to the parliament and raise concerns, etc. It is a transparent process. It is there for public accountability.

To ensure that criminal cases, in particular, are not derailed by information that is being worked on by the police or the DPP's office, there is frequently a situation where the prosecuting officer, whether it is the police or the DPP (sometimes it is the RSPCA, so there are certain other people who have prosecuting powers but, anyway, the prosecuting authority), goes down to the court and says, 'I want to make an application for the suppression of certain information. I want an order excluding people from having access to a certain set of pleadings, witness statements and viewing of evidence, and I want protection from that because it is going to interfere with the proper proceeding of that case and lawful prosecution.'

Sometimes it is other parties involved in the case: someone who might represent the defendant or someone who might represent a witness. Their counsel, or sometimes they make the



application themselves saying, 'If this information gets out I will be unfairly prejudiced and I want a suppression order on my name, as the accused,' or a witness who says, 'I am going to be at risk in some way; I want protection.'

They have a process where they go down to the court, as we do in protecting certain witnesses automatically, like child witnesses, and they can make an application to the court to say, 'I need this document sealed,' or, 'I don't want there to be access to this material,' or, 'If there is access to this material, I want there to be an order saying there can't be any publication of that material,' usually pending the determination of the trial or inquiry. All of that is a totally appropriate process.

What has the government done here? What are they doing now to say that they need to amend this law in the Magistrates Court, District Court and Supreme Court where criminal cases are heard? Many members would know that every criminal case starts in the Magistrates Court and then is committed up to higher courts if it is a serious offence—largely; I am generalising here. Each of these courts frequently deal with this, and the biggest workload, of course, initially is with the Magistrates Court.

Often it is magistrates who are asked in the first instance to actually hear applications to either suppress evidence or to grant suppression orders in relation to certain information. It is a heavy workload, and we have an incredible number of suppression orders in South Australia. Some of it is because of the way that we count suppression orders. One case can have a number of suppression orders that are actually repeated over a period of time, and we count each one of them once. That can distort some of the comparisons with other states, but still we are pretty much known as the suppression state of Australia.

Our judicial people are very mindful of the importance of protecting people's rights and protecting the integrity of the prosecuting process to ensure that bad people do not get off and hopefully innocent people are not caught. They are pretty good at doing that and they are regularly called upon to do it. However, the government comes along and says, 'We need to make it harder for anyone, including the press'—because it is acknowledged in the second reading explanation that the press are included—'to protect against the giving of sensitive or private records held by a court.'

We already have a process to do that. In fact, the DPP has significant powers already—indeed, a responsibility already—to ensure that his cases are not derailed and/or his victim and witnesses and the like are not in some way prejudiced. As I said, he has the right to go into court to have information kept secret and sealed until that occurs.

What the government says is, 'We think it is also important that the defendants have the right to be heard on an application before the material gets out.' However, we are not talking about civil claims here, we are talking about criminal cases. Of course, the defendant needs to have rights, and they do. We have lots of laws to protect their rights. However, in this instance it is usually about protecting the records that are under the control of the prosecution, because defendants are not presenting their evidence at this early stage. It is the prosecution evidence that is so critical at this early stage, so I think that is a complete furphy.

I suggest to the parliament that the government bringing in the rights of a defendant suddenly to have a say about whether a document should be kept under wraps or whether evidence should be protected against publication, or a member of the press being given access, is a complete red herring.

It is quite unacceptable for it to be used as an excuse to restrict another party from what is the fundamental, basic requirement: that is, that people who are charged with criminal offences are entitled to have a day in open court, and are entitled to know what the charges are against them, etc. There is a long list of things to which they are entitled.

The primary basis of having all these rules is to ensure that innocent people are not unfairly and wrongly convicted, and that guilty people are convicted. It is a fine balance, but it is a very important one. What is completely unacceptable to me is the way in which the government have introduced this reform in the middle of a rats and mice bill. They have said, 'Look, here's a bill that

we just need to tidy up as it has some minor errors, omissions and other technical deficiencies,' and snuck into this bill a provision to shut down real-time access to court information.

I do not doubt for one moment that the new process will so substantially delay the access to information in a timely manner that it will be lost. It will make it inalienable to the public. They won't know what is going on in the course. Remember, the public sit out there and they want to know who has been charged and what they have been charged with, and they might want to follow that hearing.

It might be an employee; it might be a neighbour; it might be someone that they think needs to be cleared or convicted one way or the other before they can advance, or before somebody might even let their children go and stay in their house. These are all fundamental rights of the public to know, and we do rely on members of the press, who have the responsibility to cover these important events.

The government's attempt to isolate the public from their right to know is scandalous. Here is the crunch: not only did they hide it in this little rats and mice bill, there was no mention when the Attorney-General went out publicly and said, 'I'm going to make sure that people who are over 70 can sit on a jury.' That was his bill press release; that was the big story of the day coming with this piece of legislation. There was no mention of what he was going to do in relation to quarantining access to the public.

Secondly, I would like to say that not only had he done that, but he did not even have the courtesy of presenting this bill for consideration to agencies representing the press—not the union, not FreeTV, the Press Association, News Corp, or any of the myriad of people out there who are responsible and are associations, employers or advocates. Not the Australian Journalists Association or union—nobody! Nobody got notice of what was going with this bill.

The audacity of the Attorney-General to even attempt to progress this after introducing it a couple of weeks ago, without even telling the Law Society of South Australia—he is supposed to be the representative on behalf of the lawyers. It will not surprise you to know that we have spoken to the Law Society. The Law Society have actually consulted with the criminal barristers on this issue, and, unsurprisingly, the criminal barristers say, 'Oh, okay; well, that's fine,' because they are representing the defendants. They would love everything to be a secret. The public have a fundamental right to know, and there is a whole structure of legislative protection against someone being unfairly treated, or even exposed to adverse publicity in a criminal trial.

The other thing is that if there is ever an example of the abuse of publication of material, or statements being made about people who are accused in criminal trials before there has been the finalisation of a prosecution, either culminating in a guilty plea, or a conviction by trial, it would be in the conduct of this government. The most scandalous of those cases resulted in the Attorney-General trying to come down here and get rid of juries.

Fortunately, there was sufficient objection by this parliament to that outrageous suggestion that the bill lapsed. What I will say is this: it was the case of Shannon McCooile. We all know the tawdry detail of that case—I am not going to traverse it again, it has been across the newspapers, of course, in every detail over the last six weeks, or so, as Mr McCooile and other witnesses have appeared before the royal commission in respect of children's protection services.

As soon as Mr McCooile was arrested, we had the Premier go out and call a press conference. There were important people there—police commissioners, and all these people lined up behind him—and he stood up there and started talking about the acts of evil of this person. Unsurprisingly, it gets a headline. Single-handedly this government, but in particular the Premier, I would suggest, almost derailed the capacity for a fair trial in that case by making absolutely outrageous statements before they had even got to the committal hearing. The bloke had just been charged. As it turned out, he pleaded guilty to multiple offences: gross, indecent, disgusting offences in respect of child pornography and, apparently, we read that there are even more victims out there still to be considered.

We have a situation, though, where the government—so buoyed up by their own importance and their own audacious approach to what they think they can do anytime, anywhere—can go out and make statements, and yet in the next breath they can say, 'No, we can't have anyone else having access to information.' That is information that is on the court file and supposed to be on the public

record, but, no, no-one else can be trusted with it. We have to ask the defendant whether they want to have a say about whether certain information is available, but the Premier can go out and call a press conference, detail a whole lot of information, and then, I think disgustingly, potentially prejudice a case.

Probably, in a case like that, had he not pleaded guilty, he may well have received advice to go for a trial by judge alone anyway. There would probably be no-one left in the state who could fairly say that they could be independent and without influence as a result of the publicity around that case—even before it got to trial. In any event, he pleaded guilty, and I see in the paper the other day that he has abandoned his appeal in respect of the sentence. I am pleased to say that for those who might have been hurt in some way—the families of those children involved, and his victims—that matter is apparently now at an end.

The government is inconsistent. They have their own set of rules for themselves, and they are wanting to quarantine the public from that scrutiny, that transparency, that sort of sunlight from executives and governments and the like that we expect to be the disinfectant on abuse.

Two significant representatives of the media have been in touch with me and, obviously, are very concerned. One of those is the representative for Free TV Australia. Julie Flynn, the chief executive officer, has sent me a fulsome letter in respect of the deep concern arising out of the proposal of the government in this area. If I were to just refer to a few of the comments made under the hand of Ms Flynn, and complemented by Ms Clare O'Neil, director of legal and broadcasting policy for Free TV Australia, who has been very helpful in her coordinating the advice on this matter. They say this:

These access provisions—

referring to all of the courts that we are talking about—

were originally inserted to ensure that the public (including the media) had a clear right to inspect court records and to provide a mechanism to facilitate that inspection. Over the years, the list of Court records to which the public has a right to inspect has been reduced and the list of records which require the permission of the Court has grown.

There is no uniform approach to accessing court documents across Australian jurisdictions. Generally speaking...for cases heard in open court in jurisdictions outside South Australia, it would be unlikely not to get access to material such as witness impact statements, photographs, and transcripts of preliminary oral evidence...particularly if the material was tendered.

A transparent justice system and the public's right to know are a key characteristic of a democratic society. In *Russell v Russell*, Gibbs J stated that it is the 'ordinary rule' of courts of Australia that their proceedings shall be conducted 'publicly and in open view'; without public scrutiny, 'abuses may flourish undetected'.

This philosophy is reflected in [and refers to certain sections] of the Evidence Act 1929, [in respect of]:

'...a primary objective in the administration of justice is to safeguard the public interest in open justice and the consequential right of the news media to publish information relating to court proceedings.'

The other aspects of their submission on this preliminary viewing, bearing in mind they have only had days to be able to consider this, as the Attorney has not seen fit to consult them, is to confirm that the existing system we have for protection of private or sensitive records is already robust, there is significant oversight of it, it is exercised regularly in South Australia, and the protections are sufficient.

The impact, they confirm, and I think as I have outlined earlier, is that it would directly affect the news of the day—that is, where the people's attentions are to a particular offence or charge—and to be able to deny and delay and frustrate access is simply not acceptable. To go through a hearing and to be able to have the delay of that—to even find the defendant to serve them, to give them notice to come along and have a hearing and have a say, of course, will take weeks, or months in some instances. So, we have a situation where there would be a massive delay.

Who is going to pay for all of this? Who is going to pay for every time a news outlet wants to go along to court and have access to a court record, which will be on a daily basis? Who is going to pay for that? Who is going to send the DPP down there and pay for his representative to be there or the police prosecutor representative, or the counsel who are going to be there, the judge's time, court time? I do not even want to start today on the question of the court infrastructure we have, which is

so appalling already, crumbling at the walls. The fact is that we have delayed justice already, we have shocking infrastructure, and now the government is wanting to impose this type of heavy-handed approach, which will be expensive and will obviously be totally inconsistent with other laws and the rights to access to this information.

Similarly, sentiments have been conveyed by News Corp, who have consulted a number of other personnel in respect of the bill. Their representative, Georgia-Kate Schubert, who is the head of policy and government affairs, has indicated that she is responding on behalf of AAP, ABC, APN News & Media, Australian Subscription Television and Radio Association, Bauer Media Group, Commercial Radio Australia, Community Broadcasting Association of Australia, Fairfax Media, Free TV, MEAA, News Corp Australia, SBS, The Newspaper Works and *The West Australian* regarding this. Well, good on her for taking the initiative and finding out what their view is, but it is pretty comprehensive: this is totally unacceptable.

I think the way in which the Attorney has approached this is shameful. It disgusts me that he has refused to even speak to the very agencies that are going to be affected by this, and has tried to sneak it into this bill. Leaving aside his reprehensible behaviour, the merits of the proposed legislation fail at every count, and therefore we should not support it. Irrespective of the conduct of the Attorney-General, this should not pass because it is wrong, and I call upon the government to understand the significance of what they are doing here, or what the Attorney-General is doing, and presumably of which they have approved because these things have approval by the cabinet to progress this legislation.

I expect that most of the time the cabinet listen to the Attorney-General and say, 'Yes, that sounds sensible, Attorney, we have read your briefing note, tick,' and probably for most of this bill they have done that. They may not have even gone into any detail on it, because nobody knew anything about it until the bill was tabled here in this parliament. That is, as I say, reprehensible conduct and it is bad government, and for any minister who sits in that cabinet, I say this to them: read the documents carefully; do not be fooled. I especially say that to members of the cabinet who are not members of the Australian Labor Party: be alert and be warned because this is coming.

I stood up here some months ago and gave recognition to Peter Greste, who had been imprisoned in an Egyptian gaol, a disgraceful example that had international recognition and outcry as a result of someone being incarcerated, basically, for speaking out against the government. It is not acceptable that the people of South Australia are going to be silenced because they are going to be kept ignorant because the press cannot even do the job that they are supposed to do: to ensure that we have the information that we can rely on.

The public dissemination of information will be undermined and there will be a gross miscarriage of justice to South Australians if this part of the legislation passes. So, I will be asking the parliament to support me in the second foreshadowed set of amendments. With that contribution, I otherwise commend the bill to the house.

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (12:47):** I rise today to make a very brief contribution in favour of the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) Bill. This omnibus bill has been presented to the parliament with many improvements to our legal matters and policing in South Australia, some of which include changes to forensic procedures; providing legal protection to those making an apology to victims of crime; expanding the opportunities for children and other vulnerable witnesses to give evidence through teleconferencing; and many more matters.

I particularly want to speak specifically to the changes which would permit persons over the age of 70 to sit on juries. I would like to thank the year 12 students from St John's Grammar School, who first informed the Council on the Ageing of this discrepancy which prevents those over 70 from serving on juries. I would also like to thank the Council on the Ageing for lobbying so hard to get the provisions which we are about to debate.

There are approximately 4,000 people aged over 70 in my electorate of Fisher, including a number of retirement villages in the region also, so I am really honoured to be speaking in favour of giving those members of my community, as well as others aged over 70 across South Australia, a right to take part in our legal system as jurors when called upon. My understanding of the proposal is that it allows for older members of our community to be the judge of their own faculties. It allows

for those who want to take part in our legal system as jurors to have that opportunity and those who do not think they are up to it, or do not want to take part in that, are able to opt out.

I firmly believe that we have to be consistent in our approach to our population in terms of their capacity to engage in decision-making. Many of our citizens want to work until they are older, over the age of 70; in fact, we are demanding that they do in terms of the legislation that is passing through many levels of parliament. I think that leaving the decision-making up to the person themselves is a good way to go about it. These people participate already in very important boards, on committees, as part of reference groups. In fact, there are people in that age bracket who serve their community very well on councils and also within parliament.

I, myself, have worked with nurses who are actually practising at a very high technical level with their ages advancing towards 80, so I think it is a very unwise thing for us to do as a progressive society to judge ourselves a lack of capacity for people to participate at this level. Fisher itself has a very vibrant and engaged community of older citizens and, in particular, they drive our volunteering sector within the electorate, including many aspects that focus around community wellbeing and community safety such as Neighbourhood Watch, Lions Club, Rotary clubs, and community centre volunteering in numeracy and literacy classes. I do not see that this is any different.

Those people decide that they are able to participate at that high level in our community and they should be allowed to make their that decision around participating as jurors as well. With those remarks, I look forward to the further debate and listening to both sides on this matter. I commend the changes regarding juries, as well as the whole Attorney-General's portfolio bill, to the house.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### VISITORS

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I advise members of the presence in the gallery a little earlier this morning of a group from the West Lakes Current Affairs Group who were touring parliament and listening to our debate. They were guests of the member for Lee, under the guardianship this morning of our education officer, Penny Cavanagh. We thank them for visiting parliament today and we hope they enjoyed their time with us.

#### *Bills*

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:52):** I thank everybody who has participated. I guess we will probably get into some detail in the context of a committee, because I understand we have amendments and we are going into committee. I will make it clear that there is nothing in this portfolio bill which is in any way designed to be anything other than a modest adjustment of arrangements in the way that we do from time to time. We have miscellaneous things come up, we put them in a bucket, when the bucket is nearly full, we take it to parliamentary counsel, parliamentary counsel kindly drafts a set of amendments for us, and rather than call them 'The Odds and Sods Amendment Bill', we call it a portfolio bill. There is no more or less magic to it than that.

My second point is I gather that some people have got concerns about the proposed provisions dealing with access to information in the courts. I want to make it very clear to everybody that the genesis of that provision is by way of an explicit request from the Director of Public Prosecutions. I would have thought that when the Director of Public Prosecutions is making a request of the parliament, it should be dealt with very sympathetically and very respectfully and not treated as an excuse to attempt to ingratiate oneself to media outlets.

The other thing I would like to point out is that the very people who were apoplectic a week or two ago about what they claim to be one of the greatest crimes of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, being silly

busybodies peering into people's records in the health department, the very people who were apoplectic about that have a completely different point of view if it is busybodies going down to the courts to try to find the same material—completely different. That is okay, that is fine, you can go down there and you can find toxicology reports, you can find anything you want down there, and that is all good, and you do not even have to let the accused person know that you are going down there; you can just do it anytime you like. Why? Because you want to.

I get back to the point I have made several times in different contexts: just because something is of interest to the public does not mean it is in the public interest for that to be made public. That is the point. There are a lot of things the public are interested in which they would do well to not bother being interested in, and there are some times, connected with the proper administration of justice, where letting any busybody who wants to go down to the court and peer into files without anybody knowing what they are doing is not necessarily in the public interest.

I regard this as an important, sincere proposition advanced to me because of grave concerns held by the Director of Public Prosecutions about a particular matter which is in the courts presently. The hypocrisy of the histrionic performance a couple of weeks ago about busybodies in the health department inappropriately and unlawfully accessing people's information, and how the world was about to end because of this, the same people—the same people—have gone 180 degrees and said, 'Look, all you busybodies, don't worry about going to the computer in the health department, just head down to the courts.' That is what they are doing. And, can I add one more point on this topic as well?

**Ms Chapman:** Well, wait until the committee.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** This is coming from an opposition, in particular the shadow attorney, who, if my recollection is correct, has chastised me for my lack of action in doing something about civil actions for breaches of privacy. I have taken her chastisement deeply to heart and I intend to do something about that so that she can stop chastising me.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The deputy leader is reminded that she may have her outfit on but that doesn't mean she can speak.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** And may I compliment the deputy leader on her bar attire; it is very good.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You're jealous.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am, because mine is much older than that and does not—

**Ms Chapman:** Mine's 30 years old.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Mine is possibly older than that, unfortunately. Anyway, should I keep going or stop?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You might have to seek leave to continue your remarks, because I do not want to cut you off. I know there is more.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 13:59.*

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **ANSWERS TABLED**

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today members of the West Lakes Current Affairs Group, who are guests of the member for Lee; also the Charles Sturt University of the Third Age, who are guests of the member for Colton; also Mary MacKillop College, who are guests of the member for Dunstan (the Leader of the Opposition); and the Karawatha Over 55s Group, who are guests of the member for Reynell. Also, I believe that the Mayor of Unley is with us as a guest of the member for Davenport.

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:01):** I bring up the 21<sup>st</sup> report of the committee entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time***ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:01):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister clarify when he first heard about the latest delay for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital technical completion? Was it Monday, as he stated yesterday in the house, or was it January, as he is now informing media outlets?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:01):** Oh dear, okay. Let's go through this—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition was, but in January I called a press conference and at that press conference I said that, while—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —the builder was adamant that the hospital would be completed—that there would be technical completion in April—we had alternative advice that was telling us quite differently and that the hospital could be as late as two months, and I think the Hon. Stephen Wade even quoted me quite helpfully on radio because I did not have my transcript to hand. I thank the Hon. Stephen Wade for clarifying that for me on radio this morning. They were my exact words: that the hospital, we thought, would be about two months late.

**Mr Marshall:** Why did you give the answer you gave to the parliament yesterday?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The question over when I found out from the builder about the lateness was yesterday afternoon when I was told by my chief executive. But, as I say, this only confirmed what we already suspected.

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the members for Kavel, Hartley, Schubert, Mount Gambier, Mitchell, Stuart and the leader—could the leader be seated—who opened up on the minister before he had uttered a complete sentence, and one couldn't say that he was debating the matter at that point. The member for Giles.

**STEEL INDUSTRY**

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:03):** Mr Speaker, my question is to the Minister for State Development. Can the minister inform the house of the latest antidumping decisions to support the local steel industry?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:03):** Thank you very much, sir, and I thank the member for Giles for his question. I do not think there is a person in Whyalla or this house who does not recognise his commitment to Arrium steelmaking. The Anti-Dumping Commission has already determined that dumped steel products from China appear to have caused

material injury to the Australian steelmaking industry. This has led the commission to impose duties on those imports to protect local steelmakers from unfair competition. Unfortunately, a not-too-common practice for importers hit by a duty is to find some way of getting around the impost. This is known as circumvention and usually means slightly altering a product such as steel by adding an alloy and claiming it is no longer subject to that duty.

Last Friday, the Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science (Hon. Christopher Pyne) and the Assistant Minister for Science (Hon. Karen Andrews) announced anticircumvention measures had been taken against foreign steel importers who had been avoiding antidumping duties by slightly modifying their products. I congratulate the minister, and the government welcomes that decision.

We on this side of the house are standing up for the steel industry in South Australia, and I welcomed the imposition of duties against dumped steel and said I would fully support any further measures the Anti-Dumping Commission chooses to take to prevent unfair competition. This announcement signals that the commonwealth has been listening. There is no denying that we have been calling for trade remedies to prevent local steelmakers being hurt by unfair practices.

Unfair competition from imported steel 'dumped' at prices below the cost of production, or heavily subsidised by government, is a major threat to our local steelmakers. We cannot be a nation that exports iron ore at the expense of our own steel industry, and that is why we have mandated Australian Standard steel for government projects and initiated an accreditation scheme to certify that, if a product says it is Australian Standard steel, that is precisely what it is. We have repeatedly called on other states and territories to follow our lead and ensure the highest standards on their projects.

As I have said before, and will always say, I am in favour of free trade as long as it is fair trade. I congratulate minister Pyne and assistant minister Andrews on this announcement. I look forward to the outcome of the inquiry initiated last month by minister Pyne into imported steel from Asia and any further measures Australia can adopt to prevent unfair trade hurting our local industries. The report is due to be handed to the minister by the Anti-Dumping Commission by 4 April, and I will update the house on the findings. I support these ongoing investigations and will continue to advocate strongly that we ensure Australian steelmakers and fabricators are not forced to compete on an uneven playing field.

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the members for Florey, Davenport and Chaffey.

**Ms Bedford:** Florey?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, Florey. Unmistakable. I warn the members for Stuart and Schubert and I warn for the second and the final time the leader, the member for Stuart and the member for Schubert. Leader.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** Thank you very much, sir. My question is to the Minister for Health. Why, when asked by journalists last week if a delay announcement on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital was imminent, did the minister's office respond categorically 'No'?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:07):** First, I dispute that is what happened. Given that I had made an announcement in January that the hospital was likely to be up to two months late and my office was then telling journalists, no, that is not the case, I would have thought media outlets would be reporting that there was a contradiction between my office and what I had been saying for the previous two months. But putting that aside, even if based upon what the opposition have said, the reason was it wasn't. The decision to make an announcement was made Monday afternoon.

#### FUND MY IDEA

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:08):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister provide an update on the Fund My Idea program?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:08):** The Fund My Idea initiative is a very successful small grants program that is



run alongside country cabinet committee meetings that we have out in the regions. Over the last few days, I had the pleasure of notifying the successful applicants for Fund My Idea, associated with the country cabinet meetings in the Limestone Coast and in the Barossa, Light and Lower North. I am pleased to have the opportunity to announce these winners now.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is right on the edge.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** In the Limestone Coast—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Mr GARDNER:** The minister is identifying that he is planning on making an announcement of winners at this point. Isn't this more usually done, by convention, under a ministerial statement rather than in a question?

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is misconceived. On this occasion I won't require the member for Morialta to withdraw, but if I get another point of order so thoroughly misconceived I will have no choice but to act. The minister.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. In the Limestone Coast, \$30,000 has been awarded to Gener8 Theatre for a program that works with disadvantaged youth to raise awareness about the drug ice and the harm it can cause, and \$20,000 will go towards establishing a memorial wall in Naracoorte, which pays tribute to volunteers who have lost their lives while fighting bushfires around South Australia.

The Kind Hearted Kitchen, a wonderful initiative that provides nutritious meals to people doing it tough in the Barossa community, will receive \$20,000 to purchase new kitchen equipment. An amount of \$30,000 will go towards a partnership between South Australian tourism identity Cosi and the Light Regional Council to plant roadside trees to beautify tourist routes in the region.

I also inform the member for Giles and the member for Stuart that excellent community projects like these will be supported in the Port Augusta and northern Flinders Ranges region following the recent country cabinet. Applications for this round close at 5pm tonight. Fund My Idea invites communities to put forward their ideas for projects that will run locally. People then vote on ideas, helping to decide which will share in the \$50,000 available each round.

To date, the program has supported 19—I repeat, 19—community-driven projects that may not have secured funding through other means. The great thing about Fund My Idea is that we see the creativity and the passion of people living in regional South Australia come to the fore. I look forward to informing the house on the continued success of this program through the four country cabinet events being held each year.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will not be able to house filing cabinets or adequate records storage due to the construction of its floor? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, in the correct form, unlike the member for Adelaide.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Thank you very much. An internal memo from the executive director of medical services dated 15 March this year states, 'Maximum load across the floor is not built to withstand concentrated numbers of records.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader will withdraw under the sessional order for the remainder of question time.

*The honourable Leader of the Opposition having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:12):** We have been talking for a very long time about the need to have a mixed system when we open the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We anticipate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I won't shout over the top of those opposite, Mr Speaker. We have been talking for a very long time about the need for a mixed system. It is not because of any issues with EPAS. The reason we do not want to have full functionality of EPAS is simply because we don't think it would be conducive to patient safety to be expecting our clinicians to adapt to a new working environment and to work in a completely different environment from that that they are used to, and at the same time be using a brand new IT system. So we have been talking for a very long time about having a limited rollout of EPAS from day one. We expect that that will be for about six months before the full EPAS functionality is rolled out—

**Mr Knoll:** If the hospital gets delayed long enough, it will be ready.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert may withdraw for the next half hour under the sessional order.

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

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. That means there will need to be some paper records kept on site. Obviously, there are a lot of paper records at the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital, because it is a hospital that has been there for 170 years. Over 170 years you do accumulate a lot of paper records; not all of them are going to be relevant. I do not think there are going to be many 170 year olds presenting at the emergency department. So, of course, some of those records—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Some of those records will essentially be of a historic nature and not immediately relevant to clinicians. What the clinicians will have available to them at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital are those paper records that they need to have, basically at their fingertips, or very near their fingertips. We are working towards a temporary storage solution. It is not very complex to erect a temporary storage facility, because it will only be needed for six months. It just needs to be secure, and obviously keep those records safe. Mr Speaker, there is nothing particularly new in this. I know the Leader of the Opposition tweeted about it in July last year, and indeed I recall answering questions about it in estimates last year as well.

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the Premier and the members for Morphett, Adelaide and Hammond. I warn for the first time the members for Kavel, Mount Gambier, Chaffey and Adelaide, and I warn for the second and final time the members for Hartley, Adelaide, Chaffey and Mount Gambier. Has the deputy leader been pursuing another vocation this morning?

**Ms Chapman:** New Federal Court judge.

**The SPEAKER:** Splendid.

**Ms Chapman:** Not you, obviously.

**The SPEAKER:** Alas. Deputy leader.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:16):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Will doctors be able to retrieve the patient records at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital on demand at all times from the offset storage facility where the paper records are apparently going to be kept?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:16):** What they will have is access to the paper records they need to safely look after their patients. That is what is available, and we are working through that with clinicians to ensure that it is available. Can I say, Mr Speaker, that it gives me enormous pleasure to

come in here and answer questions about the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, because it is something this side of the house are enormously proud of.

For members of the opposition who want to take every opportunity to run down the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and to criticise the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, they will go into the next election wearing their criticisms like a crown of thorns. They will be held up to ridicule by the people of South Australia, because they have been criticising this project for the last five to six years, ever since it has been announced.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, the Liberal Party has not been in government since early 2002; it is not responsible to the house for anything that I can think of. Member for Florey.

#### LIVESTOCK AND MEAT SECTOR

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:17):** My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, can you update the house about opportunities in the livestock and meat sector in South Australia?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:17):** I thank the member for Florey for that question, and acknowledge her as a member of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union.

Agriculture is South Australia's most significant industry, worth over \$16 billion each year. There is growing global demand for protein, and South Australia can help meet that demand with our high quality livestock products produced in our clean, green environment. Emerging markets for meat include China, South-East Asia and the Middle East. South Australia is a significant producer of livestock products, as we know, and the latest monthly figures show exports from South Australia in the meat and meat preparation sector are up 15 per cent on last year.

These exports have been a shining light in the South Australian economy; however, we also know it is an industry which experiences fluctuations. I have been talking to industry members, including Graham Smith, Federal Secretary of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union, about jobs in the sector. I notice Mr Smith is in parliament today, and he had the beef at lunch—it is good to see him supporting the industry and jobs in his industry, as he always does.

We know both JBS at Bordertown and Teys at Naracoorte have recently stood down workers. There are a number of reasons behind this, including high prices for sheep and cattle, a shortage of livestock, pressure of drought, and a record price for red meat. The high volume of meat exports, and an increase in the live export trade, has dramatically reduced stock numbers right across the country. Current kill levels mean there is no room to allow for restocking. What this means is that we need to brace for some more hard times ahead in the red meat sector. But people like Mr Smith are optimistic and tell me the industry will improve again with time, and it's part of the cycle that the industry often experiences.

The state government is playing its part to support and develop the sector. For example, the Regional Development Fund has contributed \$2.5 million to Thomas Foods International at Murray Bridge to upgrade their beef boning facility, resulting in the creation of 200 jobs; \$165,000 has gone to Samex at Peterborough to replace a boiler, creating 15 jobs; and the state government provided \$120,000 to the Migrant Resource Centre to support migrant workers and their families at Bordertown, where JBS is located. The government has also contributed \$140,000 towards the development of the South Australian Sheep Industry Blueprint, which aims to increase production by 20 per cent and is due to be launched soon.

I must also acknowledge there are sectors of the meat industry which currently have room for large growth. Chicken meat production and processing is the fastest growing livestock industry in South Australia. During the past decade, it's grown faster here than in any other state in Australia, and with global demand for chicken meat also rising, South Australia is primed to help meet this demand. South Australia has emerged, too, as a leading processor of pork in Australia. We anticipate new jobs being created in both pork and poultry in the very near future.

Can I congratulate the member for Florey for her wonderful production called *Australian Products*—a shopping guide. She has put it out to her constituents just in time for Easter, and it's got a list of local supermarkets in her electorate and all the Australian produce that's available there, and the South Australian produce is in bold print. It's a very handy guide for those of us who are out there trying to ensure that we keep jobs right here in South Australia and help support farmers and food manufacturers in South Australia. So, I commend the member for Florey for her wonderful work.

#### LIVESTOCK AND MEAT SECTOR

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:21):** Supplementary, sir: how will the increase in the government's NRM levy affect the beef industry?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:22):** I haven't been approached by the beef industry about NRM costs. I've been talking to them—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I've been talking to them a lot—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart is on two warnings.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** So, I have no answer on that.

#### MEDICAL RECORDS

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Who is the government's preferred patient records storage company for the new RAH? Is it Kennards, U-Store-It, or whoever?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:22):** I think that was a joke, sir, but no-one is laughing.

#### FIJI MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:22):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister update the house about South Australia's contribution to the Australian medical assistance team deployment to Fiji following the impact of tropical cyclone Winston?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:23):** It's good to have a member of parliament who does take question time seriously and asks serious questions. On 20 February, tropical cyclone Winston swept through parts of Fiji, causing devastation to large areas of the country and 44 deaths. The Australian government responded to a request from the Fijian government to provide an Australian medical assistance team. An advance team of six from the National Critical Care and Trauma Response Centre deployed from Darwin and arrived in Fiji on 23 February. Following that, on 28 February a 13-person Australian medical assistance team was tasked and deployed in support of the mission.

Two SA Health staff were included in that second team: Mr Dan Martin, an operations lead nurse with MedSTAR and a qualified AUSMAT clinical team leader, working as one of the mission clinical team leaders; and Mr Mark Cannadine, the Director of the Emergency Management Unit, a qualified AUSMAT team member with a speciality in health planning, working in an emergency operation centre as the AUSMAT adviser.

The team had a primary focus on emergency, acute trauma care and public health initiatives through outreach programs in the worst affected areas. Overall, the team treated more than 1,500 casualties, with many residents forced to move into temporary relief camps. The main team arrived back in Australia on 12 March. The final team members arrived back on 15 March, following a visit by the foreign minister to the region. No further deployment is planned at this stage.

SA Health has an excellent database of trained and immunised volunteers ready to deploy at any time. South Australia has a strong history of sending staff to major disasters in the Asia-Pacific over the last 10 years. I commend the outstanding efforts of our volunteers and the extraordinary

contribution they make to support people in our region when these terrible disasters strike. On behalf of the government and the house, I wish to thank the volunteers for a job well done.

#### HEALTH REVIEW

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:25):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the minister stand by his claim that 95 per cent of clinicians support Transforming Health, given today's development? With your leave and that of the house I will explain. Today, in an open letter, the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons states, 'There is no evidence to support the claim of the [Transforming Health] Team, who say 95 per cent of clinicians are in support of these controversial plans.'

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:25):** Yes, I do stand by them. I do believe that Transforming Health has overwhelming support from clinicians. Of course, from time to time, there are going to be individual aspects of the reform that we need to work through and individual clinicians are going to have issues with. A good example of that is with regard to the transfer of emergency surgery from the Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Surgeons there said it was important to have a team ready to come in to deal with a patient who suddenly deteriorates overnight (after hours) at the Modbury Hospital, and that is something we agreed to, because it made sense and it made sure that people were kept safe if they were having a procedure. So, of course, there are occasionally going to be issues, but in terms of the thrust of the reforms, yes, I do believe 95 per cent of clinicians who work in the health system support it.

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** In time, given certain phone calls I have received from clinicians who have been disgusted by the behaviour of some of their colleagues, I think we are going to hear from more clinicians coming out and providing public support for these proposals. I know of one particular extraordinarily prominent clinician who will be very shortly making announcements in support of—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —Transforming Health, and I can say, when that happens, the opposition are going to look very silly indeed.

#### MONEYSMART ROOKIE PROGRAM

**Mr GEE (Napier) (14:27):** My question is to the Minister for Youth. How is the government assisting young South Australians to learn about budgeting and money matters?

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:27):** Can I thank the member for his question. I am pleased to inform the house that the state government is providing new funding to help young people learn about budgeting and money matters. We know that, for young people, being able to manage money effectively is an essential skill to not just find safe housing but to keep their home. Young people on low incomes are at high risk of unstable housing and homelessness.

The government is providing \$100,000 to community organisations to deliver the MoneySmart Rookie program as part of the 2016 Connected to YOUTH strategy. I am pleased to announce that, from today, organisations can apply for one-off grant amounts of \$500 per young person registered to complete the MoneySmart Rookie program. Applications will now close on 20 April 2016. I particularly encourage organisations in regional and remote areas to apply. As part of this program, young people will learn about credit cards, managing debt, the financial pitfalls of mobile phones and what to consider when buying their first car or when living out of home.

The MoneySmart Rookie is one of a number of programs being delivered by this government to help young people navigate the transition from school to the workforce. I am also excited to see Connected to YOUth's young entrepreneur Be a Job Maker approach take shape. This year, the government is looking into what start-up opportunities are available in South Australia, enabling young South Australians to develop their entrepreneurial spirit. I look forward to updating members in this place at a later date about this program, and other programs that this government delivers to ensure that all young South Australians get the best opportunities in our changing economy.

The government will continue to engage with young people in our community through youth forums, both at metro and during the country cabinet, the Your Say website and social media, as young South Australians must be engaged with—they are the future of our economy and the future of our state. As the Minister for Youth, I have been really delighted at the attendance at the youth forums I have held—I think I have held almost a dozen, both in regional and metro areas—and an opportunity to talk to people about what is of interest to them, what is happening well, and what they are interested in in the future.

I look forward to all members encouraging their electorates to have people participate in this MoneySmart Rookie program. It is really important that people understand, if there is easy access to credit, what that means for them, can they pay, and the capacity to pay.

#### **MONEYSMART ROOKIE PROGRAM**

**Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (14:30):** I ask the minister, given her comments about the MoneySmart program and its use of credit cards and managing debt, has she supplied a copy of it to the state's Treasurer?

*Mr Speirs interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:31):** Budget surpluses, debt is at a low level to gross state product, better than members opposite were ever able to deliver. In fact, who was the last Liberal treasurer to ever deliver a budget surplus? Who was it? That's right. There never was.

*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

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

*The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is called to order.

#### **KEOGH CASE**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:31):** Thank you, sir, for your protection. My question is to him. Has the Attorney spoken to the Solicitor-General, Martin Hinton, on the question of why the report, dated 22 November 2004, of Professor Vernon-Roberts was not disclosed to Henry Keogh's legal representatives for nearly 10 years and, if so, will he now inform the house of what that explanation is?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:32):** That question reminds me of two other questions: one I frequently hear coming from the lips of Mr Archer, I think his name is; and another was a question of almost exactly the same tone which was asked of me a little while ago. I have nothing further to add.

**Ms Chapman:** You were going to take it on notice and you were going to find out.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I have taken it on notice—

**Ms Chapman:** And you've found out nothing.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I have found out something that might be of help, and that is, the current Solicitor-General was not the solicitor-general at the relevant time.

### **BETTER SCHOOLS FUNDING**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house how Better Schools funding is being used by the Elizabeth Park Primary School to support vulnerable students?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:33):** I would be delighted and will be delighted to give some detail about the ways in which Better Schools funding is being used in Elizabeth Park Primary School. I would like to add initially that I recently visited Elizabeth Park Primary School (the principal is Patrick Moran), and the kids there were amongst the most engaged and confident I have seen, particularly for a low SES school.

They have a magnificent kitchen garden, and the capacity of those kids to show me around that garden, to explain why they have it, and to show me their understanding of the curriculum about composting, about science, about the life cycle of plants and animals, was quite remarkable and has really stayed with me. It was one of the many highlights of visiting schools.

But, yes, indeed, these schools can only succeed if we fund them appropriately and if we fund them in a way which enables them to redress some of the social disadvantage and educational disadvantage that some children, regrettably, start school with. At Elizabeth Park, it is a category 2 school, which means that it is amongst the most socioeconomically disadvantaged schools in our state.

In 2012, the Australian Early Development Census assessed that half of reception students at the school were developmentally vulnerable in two or more of the five—I believe it is five—areas that they measure. Worryingly, 80 per cent of these children were vulnerable or at risk in communication skills or general knowledge.

Not only is it important that kids start school with reasonable literacy, reasonable numeracy and a capacity to build on those, but also those social self-management skills that enable them to then learn more: to be able to sit still, to listen, to be able to communicate their needs well, to understand other communication, and to have a reasonable general knowledge. All of these background skills are crucial in children's success.

It was a particular concern to the school, as research has shown that children who are vulnerable in two or more domains are predicted to perform about 35 per cent below NAPLAN minimum standard by the time that they reach year 7. Having some evidence to respond to, the principal, Patrick Moran, and his staff and his community knew that they needed to make some inroads. They also recognised that that needed to happen in the earliest possible years.

Elizabeth Park Primary School has used their Better Schools funding of \$100,000 in 2014, \$140,000 in 2015 and \$180,000 this year to help employ two additional staff in leadership banded positions who are able to identify and deliver programs that specifically aim to improve literacy and social skills for the younger students. These additional staff members work with teachers, SSOs and community groups to identify the kind of support individual children need and to coordinate and deliver those programs. It is one of the examples of a school that truly understands that it comes from the community and needs to engage deeply with its community if it is going to give those children the chance that they deserve.

Some of those programs include family playgroups that focus on literacy and speech pathology sessions for children to improve their phonological skills, as well as support for mothers with mental health issues, which is identified as a particular concern, and giving out free books to children.

The program is starting to show results. The number of children assessed as vulnerable in two or more categories has fallen from 50 per cent in 2012 to 37 per cent in 2015, and those vulnerable in communication skills and general knowledge has nearly halved from 80 per cent to 42 per cent from 2012 to 2015. Principal Patrick Moran has said, 'The Better Schools funding has

allowed us to identify, coordinate and target programs that are delivering substantial improvements in our children's confidence and capabilities.'

#### RATE CAPPING

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Can the minister confirm his position on rate capping for council rates and, if opposed, can he outline his solution to the cost of living impact that increases above the local government cost inflation rate has on property owners?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is right on the edge.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:37):** This was a—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Morialta for the second and final time, as he invites it.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** This was a topic of discussion in that happy period in the lead-up to the last 2014 election campaign—happy for some—and I can remember the debate vividly, because it involved the opposition proposing that there should be rate capping. Of course, there was an outcry by local government in relation to this question, because they naturally made the point that they are a sovereign sphere of government and they should be allowed to determine their own futures in relation to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I know that those opposite like to treat local government as the errant siblings of state government, but they make that point—they make that point strongly. They also made the other point that if there is rate capping applied, the effect of the rate capping would be to shift the demand for service delivery into the area of user pays.

What you see in the Eastern States where you cap rates is that the councils still have to provide services, so what they do is they charge for those services. Instead of using the relatively progressive means of raising revenue through the rating system, which we all know is, by any study, regarded as one of the most efficient ways of raising taxation, they instead have to move to a user-pays system which tends to disproportionately affect those constituents who rely on those services. In other words, those constituents, those members of our community who have lower incomes and who tend to disproportionately rely upon council services so—

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The Premier is not answering the substance of the question, which was: does he agree with the policy or not and if not—

**The SPEAKER:** No, I don't uphold the point of order. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am addressing the substance of the question, sir, in explaining that those are the arguments that were advanced by the local government sector, that they strongly opposed rate capping and, of course, we joined them in that opposition in the lead-up to the last election, and our position has not changed. There's been no information that's been advanced by anybody since that time which has changed the position of our government. It certainly hasn't been debated inside our cabinet. We have not had cause to consider that. I do understand, though, that there was some species of an inquiry that was being undertaken, if I do remember, by—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** It's still on foot. We would be very interested to see the results of the inquiry. We will obviously give that earnest consideration, but we have seen no material that's come before us at the moment which would cause us to change our position.



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mitchell is warned and the member for Hammond is warned for interjecting out of his seat. The member for Kaurna.

#### **KAURNA ELECTORATE AMBULANCE STATIONS**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:41):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, can you update the house on the work to provide for new ambulance stations in Seaford and Noarlunga?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:41):** Thank you very much to the member for Kaurna for this question. I think we could land on the aircraft carrier with a big sign up saying 'Victory!' Can I put on the record my thanks for the strong support on behalf of the community in Seaford to the member for Kaurna for fighting for the construction of a much-needed ambulance station.

The government committed in the last election to build three new ambulance stations at Oakden, Noarlunga and Seaford. I am pleased to report both Oakden and Noarlunga are now under construction. So far, it has been difficult to locate a site for the Seaford community ambulance station. In September last year, the government put forward a proposal to the City of Onkaparinga to build the station on vacant land next to the Seaford CFS. Alas, the proposal was rejected by those working officials from the Onkaparinga council who stated that the ambulance station didn't fit within their 20-year vision for the site.

At the time, I called upon the elected members of the council to intervene and to reverse the decision, but sadly they did not. After evaluating and ultimately dismissing several alternative locations put forward by the council, SA Health and the SA Ambulance Service investigated the possibility of co-locating on the Seaford CFS site. This option needed extensive consultation with the local CFS brigade to ensure they were satisfied it wouldn't impact upon their critical work. The consultation did take time, but I believe it was well worth it, as I have been told that last week the CFS brigade met and approved to proceed with a joint site sharing proposal.

As part of the project, SA Health will deliver some added benefits for the shared site by way of renewed car parking areas and increased lighting and security, including CCTV, for crew and brigade safety. This is an excellent result for the community. It means we can now get on with the job of building the station, with SA Health proceeding to formal design and approval stages.

I would like to put on the record my thanks to the CFS Seaford volunteers for their time and their patience over the past few months. SA Health, SA Ambulance Service and the CFS have worked very hard to deliver this outcome. I thank the member for Kaurna for his tireless campaigning to get to this point.

I would like to update the house on the new Noarlunga ambulance station. Construction is underway on the new station located on Alexander Kelly Drive. The site's topsoil has been stripped and prepared for the ground floor slab to be poured later this month. The station will have the capacity for more support staff and paramedics, and it delivers on the government's pre-election commitment, with extra funding being provided through Transforming Health.

Construction of this station is expected to create around 20 jobs and is expected to be due for completion by later this year. The southern metropolitan area is growing both in population and in size. The government's investment in new stations at Noarlunga and Seaford will ensure that the community has a well resourced ambulance service for many years to come.

#### **PORT PIRIE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE**

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:44):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister explain why the unemployment rate in the Port Pirie region has increased by 3 per cent since he became minister and currently has the highest unemployment rate of all South Australian regions at 12.9 per cent?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The members for Stuart, Hartley and Mount Gambier are on their last chance.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:45):** Sir, the unemployment rate in South Australia is unacceptable, and there is no-one in this parliament who thinks—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kavel is warned for the second and final time. The member for Davenport is warned and the member for Mitchell is warned for the second and final time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I see the puppet master recognised for pulling the strings.

**The Hon. J.J. Snelling:** The evil genius.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The evil genius behind the scenes, yes. Unemployment in this state is unacceptably high, and the government has a series of strategies in place. Now, what we have done through prudent management of the government's and the state's finances is that we have been able to bring the budget back into balance, into surplus, paying down debt, and what we have done with that windfall is to institute some of the most comprehensive tax cuts in Australian history.

The tax cuts that we have implemented are the ones that the Prime Minister himself on the *Insiders* program recently was hailing as being very, very important. Now, we are undergoing a structural readjustment in this state. We are losing an industry that has been the bedrock of employment in this state, and that is our automotive industry.

Members opposite yell abuse and ill-timed interjections about unemployment without in fact considering that one of the reasons we are grappling with higher unemployment is the fact that the commonwealth government refused to invest in General Motors Holden. That is a bedrock employer in this state, not just in the assembly plant at Elizabeth but through our components manufacturers as well. So, what we have done is build up—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order. The question was specifically about unemployment in Port Pirie, not in Elizabeth and not to do with Holden. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to bring the minister back to the substance of the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Best when making points of order to have clean hands. The Treasurer has faced a torrent of interjections. Treasurer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** And they haven't been very clever, either. If they are at least funny it makes the job a bit more enjoyable.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer will return to the topic of unemployment in Port Pirie.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir. What the government has done specifically through its tax package is to target—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The real question we have to pose to members opposite and, indeed, to the people of Port Pirie is: what would the situation be in Port Pirie had we not invested in Nyrstar, had we not done the arrangement—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Members opposite say, 'We've committed to it also.' Well, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** The questions may not be hypothetical: answers can.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. So, given the interjections from the member for Hartley, I travelled to Geneva to meet with Nyrstar well in advance of any investment we made with it. The Premier met with Nyrstar in London well before the state election, and we had

begun the process of talking about its investments not only in South Australia but, of course, in Hobart, and of course both those operations are very important.

We have come up with a process of allowing Nyrstar to reinvest capital into Port Pirie, and, quite frankly, without that investment I shudder to think what the scenario would be in Port Pirie. You would have serious social dislocation, you would have property values plummeting. And, if it was not for the leadership shown by the member for Frome in standing up for that city, that community and that town, insisting that we invest in Port Pirie and Nyrstar, I think you would find that it would have been a very, very different outcome in Port Pirie. Members opposite, for all their bleating, have never really offered any policies for Port Pirie.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is warned for the second and final time for interjecting out of his seat. The member for Schubert, who has returned to our midst, is called to order for the second time in question time. He commences with a clean slate. The members for Hartley and Stuart are right on the edge of being removed for persistent disorder. The member for Goyder.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT LEVY

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:50):** My question is again to the Minister for Local Government.

**An honourable member:** Here we go.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Hopefully. Can the minister confirm the number of discussions he has held with the Local Government Association on their concerns for continually collecting the natural resources management levy, which may increase by 150 per cent in 2017; and, from these discussions, what action has the Minister for Local Government taken to control these government required NRM increases?

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:51):** I have regular discussions with the President and the CE of the Local Government Association and we have various discussions, as I have with the member for Goyder, about local council issues and so forth. We have a wide range of discussions. I cannot particularly tell him exactly how many times—I think it is once or twice—about concerns about collecting the NRM levy. However, my concern is that the opposition appears to be not putting up any solutions about anything whatsoever. We may be—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order, sir. Under standing order 98, the minister is prevented from debating and must just respond to the substance of the question.

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

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I have finished, Mr Speaker.

#### VACSWIM

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. How has the VACSWIM program performed this year?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:52):** I congratulate the member for Reynell and, indeed, the member for Kaurna for achieving their surf lifesaving bronze medallions last weekend after months of training. It is great to see the two of you, who are such great supporters of surf lifesaving in your electorates, getting the bronze medallions. It was a terrific moment. It was all over Facebook and received a lot of—

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —accolades. VACSWIM has been going in South Australia since the 1950s. It is a real part of the South Australian summer. I am sure there are plenty of people in this chamber who grew up doing VACSWIM. I remember jumping into the icy waters at Carpenters Rocks in the South-East and getting one of those instant cold headaches. It was pretty arctic sort of water down there.

*The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes: the Minister for Health did his at Woodville Primary School. It is a terrific, iconic event that has been happening every summer since the 1950s. Across 130 different locations around South Australia this year we saw more than 12,000 children participate, which was up on the year before, which was up on the year before that. It is good to see something that has been around—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —for so many years still growing in its popularity. At the end of the VACSWIM the children get a certificate to say what they have achieved over their week or so of VACSWIM activities. It is not about learning to swim as much as it is about learning to survive in the water. Of course, we have thousands of kilometres of coastline here in South Australia and a lot of people have backyard swimming pools. It is really important that our children grow up with confidence.

**Mr Whetstone:** And the river.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** And the river, of course, the mighty Murray River, which is very important. It can often be treacherous and things can turn bad very quickly in the Murray. It is really important that children are taught safety tips and skills, as well as being able to be confident around water, because it is one of the great recreational activities you can get to be out in the sunshine. I was really pleased that from this year the Department for Education and Child Development are changing the focus of their swimming, too, to not being so much about learning to swim but learning to survive and getting all those survival skills. I think that marries very well with the VACSWIM project.

Some of the organisations that have delivered the VACSWIM project across South Australia this January were Royal Life Saving SA at 75 locations, Surf Life Saving SA at 47 locations, YMCA South Australia at eight locations, the Tatiara council, the Marion council, the Coober Pedy council, Salisbury council and the city of Gawler. For the 2015-16 program, the VACSWIM participation fee remained fixed at \$30 per child or \$100 per family. Something that we really want to do is make sure that it is affordable for people with primary school aged kids who can be out there learning how to be safe.

The good news was that there were no reported incidents at any of the locations around the state, and that is really handy, particularly with 12,000 children involved. There were no shark sightings at all during any of the VACSWIM, so we are happy. With the cooperation of SAFECOM, the emergency services, they increased the aerial patrols along the metropolitan coastline during the VACSWIM program to doubly ensure that the children who were down there taking part were indeed really safe and being well looked after.

I am pleased to announce that the dates for VACSWIM 2017 have already been set. They are going to run from Tuesday 3 January to Wednesday 11 January. If it does not suit some organisations or some areas to have it on those dates we are open to some negotiations, but they are the dates, and later on this year registrations will open. I encourage everyone, wherever you are in this great state, to put your kids down for VACSWIM. It is a great way of learning safety but also the camaraderie that you get. As a parent, it gets the kids off your hands for a few hours during the school holidays, which is always a great thing.

#### FREE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Does the minister support the government's policy of free public transport for Seniors

Card holders in metropolitan Adelaide but not in regional South Australia, including his electorate of Port Pirie?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:57):** I thank the member for Mount Gambier for raising this important initiative that the government has taken in recent years to make free public transport available for pensioners and certain concession card holders outside of peak times. I am particularly pleased that it has been raised in this forum, because of course late last year we saw the University of Adelaide release an economic report into the benefits of free public transport for this cohort of our population. I am pleased to say that it is having a tremendous benefit for this section of the population. This has provided a huge impetus—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** This is a huge benefit for those people who otherwise might not feel able or that confident to drive themselves around, whether it is to visit family or friends, whether it is to participate in community activities or events, or even engage in volunteering. I have to say, from a personal perspective, I can remember attending a seniors' forum with the member for Port Adelaide, the federal member for Port Adelaide and also my ministerial colleague, where a range of issues relevant to seniors and pensioners were canvassed. We had great attendance from various state and federal agencies, as well as non-government organisations.

One gentleman approached me and said to me that his life quite literally had been changed by this initiative of being able to access free public transport services. This was a gentleman who has suffered from severe depression in recent times. Being able to get out of the house and jump on a train (in this instance, the Outer Harbor line) and perhaps travel into the Adelaide Railway Station and take advantage of public transport out to different parts of the city meant that he was able to provide a much richer and much more enjoyable quality of life than arguably what he would have been able to without this initiative.

The member for Mount Gambier raises an important issue about transport services that are available in regional areas. I do agree that in communities, whether it is in Mount Gambier, whether it is in Port Lincoln, whether it is in Murray Bridge, or whether it is in other parts of the Riverland or other regional parts of South Australia, sometimes there are gaps in the provision of public transport services.

Certainly, there are transport services which are available in those communities, but it has been a source of concern, whether it has been to local members or whether it has been to the government, about how effectively those services are joined up. For example, there might be school bus services, or there might be community bus services either run by non-government organisations or by local governments. Of course, perhaps a relevant consideration would be the future of those sorts of services under a policy of rate capping, but that is perhaps a matter for the regional MPs on that side of the chamber to contemplate in the future.

Of course, there are also the country taxi services which are available. I am certainly interested in making myself available and use the resources of the department to work out how we can better join up those services, and I am happy to engage with the member for Mount Gambier about that matter.

*Grievance Debate*

## UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:01):** It hurts me to hear it and it hurts me to say it, but the facts are out there for all to see: South Australia has the highest unemployment rate in the nation, the highest youth unemployment rate in the country, and the highest underemployment rate in Australia as well. South Australia's position is so dire and the state has been let down so badly by the Weatherill Labor government that federal opposition leader Bill Shorten has stepped in to offer our struggling Premier, the Treasurer and other ministers help to do their job.

After 14 years of a state Labor government in South Australia, we have hit rock bottom, and Mr Shorten has realised that our Premier has no idea and no plan to get South Australia's economy

moving again. So concerned is Mr Shorten that he has stepped in to assist his Labor colleagues in South Australia and he has called for 'a taskforce for ideas' to build the South Australian economy. A taskforce for ideas? You must be kidding me! What has the Premier been doing for 14 years? What have the ministers been doing?

This is the biggest slap to the face for a Premier that I have seen, and it comes from his own side of politics. Mr Shorten clearly believes the Premier, Treasurer and all other state ministers have lost their way. They have no plan for South Australia and, as such, Mr Shorten has called in federal Labor MP Nick Champion (member for Wakefield) to do the work of the Premier. Mr Shorten said:

We are so committed to economic growth I have asked Nick Champion to finalise our policies specially aimed at improving the circumstances of South Australians.

He goes on to say:

The task of revitalising SA's economy, facilitating a transition to new and growing industries and, importantly, lifting the education and skills of South Australians is now urgent.

Wow. Mr Shorten has lost faith in the Premier and believes Mr Champion would do a better job than Jay. Mr Shorten has conceded that the Premier cannot turn South Australia's horrid unemployment situation around. Mr Shorten has also realised that the Premier has no plan and no idea how to grow jobs in South Australia. This is an amazing revelation.

Let us just recap on where the state Labor government has landed us after 14 years. Last week, the latest unemployment figures came out in the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and South Australia has slipped further behind. The unemployment rate blew out to 7.7 per cent, seasonally adjusted, from 6.85 per cent. What has to be noted is that, at the same time, the national unemployment rate came down from 6 per cent to 5.8 per cent. While South Australia's unemployment rate goes up, on the national scene the figure is coming down. South Australia also has the highest youth unemployment rate in the nation, and the highest underemployment rate as well. People are wanting to work more, but there just aren't the opportunities.

The people of South Australia want a job, and they want a job now. What has the Premier been doing for the last 14 years that has led us to this point? My fear, and South Australia's fear, is that he has done nothing to create jobs in our great state. There was the promise of 100,000 jobs for SA back in 2010—how did that work out? The answer: just 5,850—94,150 jobs short of the mark. That is just not good enough.

The Premier has to understand that we need to create an environment that can create jobs now. Fourteen years of state Labor has brought us to this point, and we cannot hide from the fact anymore. Blaming the federal government and looking for handouts is the Premier's only tactic to grow our state, and that is an embarrassment. By contrast, our leader has put forward a plan in the recently released 2036 document. It outlines the need for our state government to:

- support small businesses as the backbone of our economy;
- create the right environment to allow businesses to grow jobs;
- reduce the tax burden on SA households and businesses by putting more money back in the pockets of South Australians;
- cutting the red tape and unnecessary regulation that inhibits the growth to create more jobs; and
- foster entrepreneurialism.

This is the foundation document—the bedrock for returning South Australia to greatness by growing our economy and generating jobs. I invite everyone to read the 2036 manifesto by going to the website: [marshall2036.com.au](http://marshall2036.com.au). This is a plan for South Australia. This is a plan to turn our state toward prosperity. This is a plan for a journey South Australians can all take together.

#### **FLINDERS UNIVERSITY DRAMA GRADUATES**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:06):** Flinders University recently celebrated a golden milestone for its School of Drama. I attended an event on behalf of the Premier and the Minister for Arts called

'Flinders 50s Creatives', which was MC'd by Douglas Gautier, with the Vice Chancellor, Professor Colin Stirling, in attendance. It is an exhibition at the Festival Theatre highlighting some of the people who have left Flinders and have gone on to make their mark in theatre, film, TV, communications, digital media, and other creative industries.

Household names like Noni Hazlehurst; Kim Dalton, OAM, of *Muriel's Wedding* and *Priscilla, Queen of the Desert* fame; Helen Leake of *Black and White* fame, Closer Productions; Annie Fox, screenwriter; Alex Reid, arts administrator; Mario Andreacchio, who made *Napoleon* and *The Dragon Pearl*; Melanie Vallejo, who is now starring in *Winners & Losers*; film composer Martin Armiger; and, of course, John Schumann of Redgum—just to name a few.

Another less well known graduate is Joanne Hartstone, a South Australian theatre producer, professional actor, theatre director and teacher, who is involved with the wonderful Modbury High School. In her 10 years since graduating with Honours from Flinders University Drama Centre, she has made her mark on the international theatre scene by producing over 60 plays in New York, London, Edinburgh, and here in Adelaide, and performing in even more films, TV shows, and stage productions.

The 2016 Adelaide Fringe marked Joanne's 10<sup>th</sup> consecutive year of being a participating artist. She ran two venues: The Queen's Theatre (the oldest theatre on mainland Australia), and the Noel Lothian Hall in the Adelaide Botanic Gardens. The Queen's Theatre was awarded Best New Venue by *The Advertiser*, and the Noel Lothian Hall was home to the award-winning: *The Bunker Trilogy*, which Joanne also co-produced and presented. It was named Best Return Season by *The Advertiser*, and won the Adelaide Critic's Circle Weekly Choice Award. The magnificent set was brought to life by starring artists Bebe Saunder, Hayden Wood, Jonathan Mathews, and Sam Donnelly.

Joanne produced Dylan Thomas's *Under Milk Wood* at the Norwood Concert Hall with Guy Masterson, and the Pulitzer Prize-nominated monologue *Thom Pain (based on nothing)*, at The German Club, with David Calvitto. At The Queen's, she presented *What Would Spock Do?*, with Sam Donnelly, and *The Flanagan Collective*, which also featured Alexander Wright, Wilfred John Nash Petherbridge, Holly Beasley-Carrigan, and Dominic Allen. They were named the Best Collective of the Fringe by *The Advertiser*, remarking that it felt like the Fringe of old. Joanne also produced South Australian performer Delia Olam in '*Just let the wind untie my perfumed hair...*' or *Who is Tahirih?*, which Joanne is now hoping to export to the Edinburgh Fringe Festival in August.

Joanne supervised and presented an ensemble of over 20 South Australian teenagers to create the play *A Minute in the Schoolyard*. The show was entirely devised, directed, written, operated and performed by students at Actors Ink aged between 13 and 18 years of age. The young performers celebrated their first Fringe with a sold-out season and very positive reviews. As well as hosting six other productions at the Queen's Theatre, Joanne also took to the stage this Fringe to perform with South Australian company Waxing Lyrical in a new play by Adelaide playwright Liam Ormsby called *The Storm*, also to excellent reviews which were well earned by her knock-out performance.

Joanne's work in the Adelaide Fringe over 10 years has been impressive and prolific. She has brought many international companies to Adelaide to show us their productions and, as a South Australian practitioner appearing on international platforms, Joanne has proudly promoted the quality of theatre coming from our state. But her career path is not clearly defined: there is no corporate ladder she can climb and the risk involved in her work means Joanne's longevity in the industry is precarious.

There was much talk in the media this year about the difficulties of producing and performing in the Adelaide Fringe, with many artists decrying audiences and the Fringe organisation for a lack of ticket sales. Joanne tells me this issue has been building for years, with the theatre genre in particular suffering dwindling ticket numbers, even with the highest-quality five-star shows. Whilst this might indicate a natural development of audience tastes over time, lack of audience growth in proportion to the size of the Fringe Festival does not help the arts industry. It has a huge financial impact on South Australian creatives, as our best practitioners nearly always leave the state, and often the country at times, in order to work in the performing arts and earn a basic wage.

Joanne is passionate in her belief that we need to help grow audiences by carefully planning tourism campaigns and look at spreading out festivals so there is not as much competition for the finite audiences we do have. It makes business sense for our state, our economy and our citizens to review and to maximise the buzz and make sure the scheduling sees that we do the best we can to assist artists. We also need to properly support young entrepreneurs in the arts like Joanne so government funds are not the only way they are able to create viable works here in South Australia. South Australia is rightly a proud festival state, and we have fostered and continue to inspire incredibly vibrant, talented practitioners. Let's keep supporting independent producers so our arts ecosystem can continue to thrive.

### SEAFORD RAIL LINE

**Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:11):** Adelaide is criss-crossed by railway and tram corridors which cut through our city into our northern, southern, southeastern and western suburbs. Many people will consider themselves fortunate to live along a transport corridor, as it ensures relatively easy access to public transport and direct routes into the city centre. I am one of thousands of South Australians who have chosen to live alongside a railway line—in my case, the Seaford line—because of the easy access it gives me to a train station and the speed with which I can get into the city—29 minutes from Marino station, to be exact.

I am a huge advocate of public transport and a regular user. However, as members of this house would be aware, living close to the Seaford line is not always a benefit. Members would recall the many months I spent campaigning for the noise of the horns and the electric trains to be reduced and for better operational policies to be implemented with drivers using these horns. The efforts we went to to fix this problem were extreme, with public protests and the infamous but ultimately successful hijacking of the transport department's GOVchat circus.

I have since been told by a senior executive of the transport department that, had it not been for this public pressure exerted on the department, bureaucrats and the minister would have made no changes. Isn't it sad that it takes this level of exhaustive campaigning before the unfeeling bureaucracy and an out-of-touch government will listen. Today, the problem of the train horns is significantly improved, with the government recently relenting to my campaign to have train horns moved to the bottom of trains so that the noise travels along the train track rather than on top of the trains where the noise is projected out into our community. There remain operational issues with regard to the way a few rogue train drivers operate the horns, but I would estimate that the problem is improved by some 80 per cent.

However, today I wish to raise yet another significant problem within the Seaford train corridor, one which I know is repeated in public transport corridors across Adelaide, and that is the problem of graffiti vandalism. Those familiar with the electrified railway corridor would know it has become a Mecca for graffiti vandals who know that their work will last longer than ever before now that the railway corridor is electrified and the transport department's ability to remove graffiti is further hindered.

Graffiti is rarely art. It is a selfish, filthy, offensive scourge which is used by criminals, low-lives, jerks, dropkicks, ferals, idiots, losers—pick a term—to deface our community. Throughout my electorate, from Hove to Hallett Cove, the railway corridor has become an endless mural of back fences and concrete poles which are covered in graffiti. This turns the railway corridor into an artery of despair; trashed and degraded, it has become a blight on the landscape which pulls the whole of the community down, and is seen by thousands of train users as they pass through it every day.

I write to the Minister for Transport on a regular basis to raise concerns about this matter and to request the repainting of railway infrastructure and private fencing backing onto the corridor. We all know that rapid removal of graffiti is the best way to combat this sort of vandalism and unfortunately the transport department's response is not rapid enough. These graffiti tags—badges of honour for the criminals who inflict them on our community—remain in place for months, as train after train filled with passengers view them.

I note the government has made efforts to paint murals at key points along the line to discourage graffiti but these are also now being destroyed with the mural at Hove Railway Station being trashed and the department being unable to get it fixed, despite multiple pleas from my office.



The Seacliff Recreation Centre on Yacca Road backs onto the Seaford line. The centre's dedicated board of management led by Beverly Manns, commissioned a fantastic piece of artwork by well-known local street artists, Ricky Spier and Mark Dopheide, to adorn the entire back wall of the centre and to deter graffiti vandalism which has been an enduring problem at the centre for decades. Tragically, the mural was left intact only for a few weeks before being completely obliterated by horrible black graffiti splattering itself across the mural.

I note that a recent email sent by transport department, chief executive, Michael Deegan, to a constituent of mine that he travelled down the train line earlier in March and observed the graffiti, but noted that it is starting to be dealt with in a different manner, including the planting of more shrubs along the corridor. I hope that Mr Deegan is serious about this as the corridor is an absolute disgrace, a terrible reflection on the transport department and a blight across our transport system. I thank the many residents who have contacted me about this matter for taking pride in their community and I implore the state government to establish a rapid response unit to deal with the graffiti vandalism within the railway corridor. This is a matter of civic pride which must be resourced.

Time expired.

### FUKUSHIMA NUCLEAR DISASTER

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:16):** In noting the five year anniversary of the Fukushima Daiichi earth quake resulting in a tsunami disaster, I asked the parliamentary library to brief me on what action has been taken. There are a number of reports; they very generously supplied me with quite a few reports, half of which I am still to read, but one of them that I wanted to refer to today is the World Health Organisation's report entitled Fukushima Five Years On. In that report they tell us that:

On 11 March 2011, a magnitude 9 earthquake occurred off the east coast of Japan, generating a tsunami that severely damaged coastal areas and resulted in 15,891 deaths and 2,579 missing people. As a consequence of the tsunami, the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station (FDNPS), located along the shoreline, lost its core cooling capacity which caused severe damage to the reactor's core and led to a nuclear accident rated as Level 7 on the International Nuclear Event Scale (INES). Substantial amounts of radioactive materials (radionuclides) were released into the environment following explosions at the FDNPS on March 12, 14 and 15.

They say that:

People living in the vicinity of the [power plant] were exposed externally to irradiation from the radioactive cloud and ground deposits and internally from inhalation and ingestion of radio nuclides. There were public health consequences [strangely] related to the result of this disaster such as the evacuation and relocation of people. These measures were taken based on radiation safety considerations and the massive damage to the infrastructure and facilities following the earthquake and tsunami. These measures resulted in a wide range of social, economic, and public health consequences. A sharp increase in mortality among elderly people who were put in temporary housings has been reported, along with increased risk of non-communicable diseases, such as diabetes and mental health problems.

Also, the issue is raised about the lack of access to healthcare having further contributed to people's health. I guess the only good news in this particular WHO report is that they say that, similar to what was observed and reported in the Chernobyl population, the displaced Fukushima population is suffering less from psychosocial and mental health impacts following relocation, ruptured social links of people who lost homes and employment, disconnected family ties and stigmatisation. There has also been a further occurrence of post-traumatic stress disorder amongst evacuees, as assessed and compared to the rest of the population.

Psychological problems such as hyperactivity, emotional symptoms and conduct disorders have also been reported amongst the evacuated Fukushima children. At this stage there are no adverse outcomes that have been observed in pregnancy and birth after the disaster but a high prevalence of postpartum depression was noted amongst the mothers in the affected region.

When I say that this is a slightly better outcome than that of Chernobyl, I am also advised in this report that the level of estimated doses, the lifetime radiation-induced cancer risks other than thyroid are small and much smaller than the lifetime baseline cancer risks. Regarding the risk of thyroid cancer in exposed infants and children, the level of risk is uncertain since it is difficult to verify thyroid dose estimates by direct measurements of radiation exposure.

For the 12 workers who were estimated to have received the highest absorbed radiation doses to the thyroid, an increased risk of developing thyroid cancer and other thyroid disorders was estimated. About 160 workers, we are told, received whole body effective doses estimated at over 100 mSv, an increased risk of cancer could be expected in the future although it would not be detectable by epidemiological studies because of the difficulty of confirming a small incidence against the normal statistical fluctuations in cancer incidence.

Time expired.

### **BELAIR NATIONAL PARK**

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:22):** Today I rise to celebrate 2016 being the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Belair National Park and give thanks to all those who care for our beautiful park. I especially thank the Friends of the Belair National Park, Friends of the Old Government House and the local CFS brigades who keep the national park safe from fire each and every season.

Belair National Park was the first national park to be proclaimed in South Australia and, indeed, this was only the second park to be proclaimed in Australia after the Royal National Park in New South Wales and was the sixth national park to be proclaimed in the world. With over 250,000 visitors each year for 125 years, Belair National Park has been a central part of South Australia, but it is the park that almost wasn't.

The land was originally used as a government farm to grow hay for police horses and other government livestock. It was also a summer home for South Australia's governors in the early part of settlement. By 1881 with the province of South Australia running out of money, something we are seeing again today, there was a proposal to sell off parts of the land to help keep South Australia solvent. Thankfully, strong opposition led to an act of parliament in 1883 prohibiting its sale.

Efforts to protect the area continued, including representations by the Royal Society of South Australia, and it was decided that the government farm be established as a public park. Created in 1891 as a national park, the settlement of South Australia at the time was only 55 years old and not even at that time was there a place in Europe or Asia that was home to a national park.

Since this time, the park has been a place for people to come together to celebrate special occasions and enjoy its beauty. In the early days, settlers would travel from Adelaide up the hill on the Belair steam train. Today visitors are spoiled for choice—able to travel by bus, car or train—although the train trip will not be any quicker than it was in the 1950s.

The 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebrations provide for an even greater opportunity for us to enjoy the Belair National Park. The official launch of the park was held on Sunday 13 March. It was a fantastic day and I encourage anyone who has not toured the park to do so. In May this year, you can take part in Grey Box Day or join an SA History Festival walk. You can also help build the state's biggest cubby town with the help of Nature Play South Australia. Free guided walks are available from April to October, with free entry on 11 September for the Belair open day and 3 December for Belair National Park's birthday party. I urge everyone to put a visit to the park on their must do list for 2016.

We are all indebted to the dedicated volunteers who work to preserve the buildings and natural surrounds of the park. As the member for Davenport, in which Belair National Park falls, I am very grateful for their efforts. Equally, I am concerned, as are a number of my constituents, that in 2015 the government failed to complete the prescribed burn-offs in the park prior to the bushfire season, and they are also concerned that deadwood and blackberries in the park pose a danger if a fire should threaten.

There are other concerns, too, that this government is not committed to maintaining the buildings in the park and preserving the park's history. The Belair National Park needs regular funding to preserve its building, control weeds and non-indigenous plants, and enable the fauna and flora to flourish. Last year's budget only made a small provision for the park, and I beg to ask the question: have we returned to the 1880s when the park was just seen as a drain on the public purse?

I certainly hope that this year's budget makes sufficient allowances to ensure the park can be maintained for future generations on this its 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary. The Belair National Park is an icon of Adelaide and indeed the Mitcham Hills. How many other cities in the world can boast that you can

catch a train from the CBD and disembark 42 minutes later in a national park? The Belair National Park is a place of recreation and tranquillity for so many South Australians. I hope this government gives it a worthy birthday present in this year's budget, which is additional funding. Happy 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary to the Belair National Park.

#### **HAPPY VALLEY BMX CLUB**

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:26):** I rise today to speak about the Happy Valley BMX Club. It sits in the heart of Fisher. The sport of BMX racing is growing rapidly, with the age of participants ranging from three to well over 60. The Happy Valley BMX Club has 175 members, with their mix comprising of 144 males and 31 females. There are 47 riders under the age of eight years old, and they are adorable, there are 60 riders aged between eight and 15, and there are 68 senior riders.

BMXing is a worldwide sport and it is also an Olympic sport, having featured in both the 2008 and 2012 games. It is very family friendly and it attracts riders in these wide age groups, supporting them at different ability levels. The broad range of ages participating provides a natural leadership opportunity as well as mentoring opportunities for young people in the local area, as well as supporting access to healthy outdoor activities.

The Happy Valley BMX Club was formed in the 1980s and is still operating at the same location. The club is in a picturesque setting amongst gum trees which, while adding to the charm of the track, causes enormous challenges, with one tree known as the 'mattress tree'. I have a battle scar courtesy of this tree but also courtesy of my lack of skill on a BMX during my teenage years.

The club was privately owned and run before affiliating with the South Australian BMX Association in 1981. In the early 1990s, it obtained a grant which saw the track demolished and rebuilt to a standard of high regard. It has held one national championship but many state championships. It also hosted events at the 7<sup>th</sup> Australian Masters Games.

The track is an open facility. It has been upgraded and maintained by the BMX club to benefit all club riders and the wider community. In 2014, a pro straight was built, and track changes were implemented to increase its technical training. Continuing with development and to assist riders compete at national and world level, in October 2015 they received some funding from the state government and they were able to bitumise their berms. The berms are the angled or banked curves seen around the track. This upgrade will improve speed, safety and also capacity while reducing the ongoing expenses and man-hours required to maintain and repair the berms in order to maintain them at a standard required for high-calibre training and racing.

The awarded grant was \$20,000, but there has been fundraising and in-kind support, which I have seen more than half a dozen times in the last few weeks as I have gone past the track or visited the club. In rain and shine the volunteers have been out there doing the physical labour, which has been incredible. The project has been well featured in the local print media as well this week and I congratulate them on that.

The club has produced many state and national champions as well as world champions over the years, with the current world champion and Olympic silver medallist Sam Willoughby home grown at the club. The young members get an enormous buzz out of seeing Sam Willoughby, their club hero, come back. He returns for a ride. He manages to keep them at bay with ease with his speed around the track.

The local riders need this track to practice on. They have to travel interstate to practice on appropriate tracks to keep their skills up. We also need a fenced local track which, unfortunately, is not really available in our local area because of limited space and close proximity to residential properties. With my support and also the support of the members for Mitchell and Bright, the Happy Valley club and The Cove BMX Club have joined forces and, with the support of the Office for Recreation and Sport, have won a grant for \$60,000 to contribute towards a feasibility study into a new world-class facility.

The hope, at the end of this feasibility study, is that they will be in a position to apply for further funding, as well as support from their own fundraising and that of their peak body, to build a world-class event facility that will attract riders from all over the globe to come and compete in South Australia. It is interesting to note that at a world event in Shepparton, Victoria, \$12 million was

brought into the economy, and with South Australia being central we would also see the western state participate so it could be even more. Well done Happy Valley and well done BMX SA.

Time expired.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Could the member just enlighten the house. Is BMX now a permanent Olympic sport or is it only a demonstration one?

**Ms COOK:** I will come back to you with an answer on that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I just thought I would throw that in. We are not sure but it would be good if the house could be informed.

### *Bills*

#### **DOG AND CAT MANAGEMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

##### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:33):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Approximately two-thirds of South Australians are pet owners. The way we manage dogs and cats as part of our community is a matter of concern for many organisations and community members and the issues involved can be complex and sometimes very emotive.

Since the Dog and Cat Management Act came into operation in 1995, best practice in dog and cat management has evolved and it is important that the act is changed to reflect this. We are no longer willing to accept euthanasia rates of dogs and cats being in the thousands each year and the unacceptable practices of puppy and kitten farms. We also recognise that the way dog and cats are managed can have an impact on the community, causing nuisance, financial costs and, in some cases, injury.

This needs to be balanced with the benefits and the unique place that dogs and cats have as companion animals in the community. Community attitudes and our understanding of the role of dogs and cats in society has changed. We now acknowledge that dogs and cats are important family members and their welfare and protection is a concern for many South Australians.

I acknowledge the work of the late Bob Such in calling for the select committee on dogs and cats as companion animals that was convened in 2012. This was the first step in identifying the amendments that I bring forward today.

The government has conducted significant levels of consultation on the proposed amendments with the community and stakeholders, including the RSPCA, the Animal Welfare League, the Local Government Association, the Australian Veterinary Association and dog and cat breeder associations. This consultation will continue as the proposed regulations and procedures are developed.

The Dog and Cat Management Board is the government's key partner in developing the proposed amendments and has been crucial in bringing the bill to parliament. I thank them for their commitment and conviction in bringing these amendments forward.

The bill aims to contemporise the Dog and Cat Management Act and implement solutions to dog and cat management challenges that reflect the community's views. Local councils will continue to have the task of administering and enforcing the act in the community. The bill provides for additional powers to authorised council employees that are consistent with powers afforded under the Local Government Act. These additional powers strengthen councils' ability to investigate breaches of the act, such as dog attacks and the keeping and sale of restricted dog breeds, and also includes the ability to sight, collect and test evidence.

Introducing consistency between the local government and dog and cat management legislation reduces red tape for councils. Previously, council employees were required to be authorised as dog management officers to respond to a dog complaint and as cat management officers to respond to a cat complaint, carrying an identification card for each role. This will now be a single form of identification. A council employee who administers the Local Government Act and Dog and Cat Management Act will now be referred to as an authorised person and have powers that are reasonably consistent.

The bill provides councils with additional powers to manage cats that are broadly consistent with the existing powers to manage dogs. These powers have been provided, but not prescribed, and councils will continue to be the authority that determines the extent of cat management in their jurisdiction. To protect the state's biodiversity and reduce predation of native animals, the bill continues to permit an authorised person to destroy a cat if found in a national park or vulnerable environment.

The bill introduces the first increase in expiations and penalties in 10 years. This reform is necessary to maintain an adequate deterrence that seeks to reduce the number of irresponsible pet owners who allow their animals to affect public safety, with appropriate penalties should they do so.

Local government supports the increases so that compliance with the act is strongly incentivised, which is not currently the case. For example, councils are permitted to set a dog registration fee at \$85 but the current expiation for failing to register is \$80 and, therefore, wholly ineffective.

During public consultation, it was identified that the increases proposed in the draft bill were considered excessive, particularly for wandering-at-large and administrative offences. The government has listened to this feedback and, with the assistance of the Dog and Cat Management Board, has reviewed the expiation and penalty amounts to a level more reflective of community expectation. This review reduces the likelihood that owners would abandon animals to avoid payment.

The bill further supports the reduction of red tape through simplification of the disability dog accreditation process. Previously, the Dog and Cat Management Board was required to approve all accreditations. Powers will be extended to 'prescribed accreditation bodies' that fulfil the requirements of the board. This means that organisations that train disability dogs will now be provided with the power to accredit dogs graduating from their own courses. The Dog and Cat Management Board, as the body administering assistance dog accreditation, will retain the ability to revoke and place conditions on delegation of this power.

The terms 'disability dog', 'hearing dog' and 'guide dog' will be retired in favour of the nationally consistent term 'assistance dog' and a consequential amendment made to the Equal Opportunities Act 1984 to reflect the change.

The bill meets an election commitment to introduce mandatory microchipping. South Australia is the only state not to have introduced this measure to return lost animals home and trace the ownership of dogs that threaten public safety. The bill requires mandatory microchipping of all dogs and cats by an age set by regulation. This is proposed to be three months and will commence for all dogs and cats from a specific date. The reform requires an animal's microchip number to be provided to the purchaser at point of sale, whether it be through a pet shop, shelter, or online.

Penalties will be imposed for owning an unmicrochipped dog or cat and for failing to keep details up to date with a microchip registry. To facilitate microchipping statewide, the bill provides a framework for approval of microchip implanters by the Dog and Cat Management Board, providing for animals to only be microchipped by an appropriately trained person. The bill provides a framework for the board to regulate and administer a statewide microchipping database. The government has produced a business case on a statewide database and is working with the board and the Local Government Association to explore its implementation.

The bill introduces mandatory desexing of dogs and cats. Desexing has been defined as 'to castrate or spay an animal so as to permanently render the animal incapable of reproducing'. It is proposed that the requirement to desex will apply to new animals from a prescribed date.

The issue of mandatory desexing arose during the government's public consultation, despite none of the proposed amendments containing any provision for desexing. The government received over 1,800 submissions via the yourSAy website and, of these, 155 gave support to desexing. Mandatory desexing has been recommended to the government by the citizens' jury on unwanted dogs and cats, the Dog and Cat Management Board, the RSPCA and the Animal Welfare League. The Select Committee on Dogs and Cats as Companion Animals supported mandatory desexing for cats.

The bill provides for this requirement to be administered through council dog and cat registration, and exemptions will be available. These are envisaged as certification by a veterinary surgeon, plus working, greyhounds and security dogs, and consideration will be given to appropriate arrangements for rural and remote communities, including Aboriginal communities. This reform is aimed at reducing cat overpopulation and the subsequent impact on animal welfare shelter admission rates, and may also reduce hormone-related nuisance behaviours that include aggression and wandering.

The schemes that provide for mandatory microchipping and desexing are contingent upon the making of regulations. Due to the importance of these regulations in implementing the schemes, there will be further community and stakeholder consultation during their preparation. This consultation will work through the issues of the appropriate age for desexing, details of the exemptions and the interaction of the sale of dogs and cats, and the appropriate age for desexing.

The bill also introduces changes to dog registration that supports the introduction of mandatory microchipping and desexing by providing a discount to owners of existing dogs that have voluntarily complied with the requirements. This reform further reduces red tape for council as registration categories that must be administered moves from a minimum of eight to two.

Following the introduction of the prescribed date after which the requirement to desex new animals will apply, dogs born before that date that are not desexed will be categorised as 'non-standard' and their owners will pay a higher registration fee than those who have voluntarily desexed. As the existing dog population dies and the requirement to desex comes into effect, registration categories will reduce to one: 'standard dog', which is a microchipped and desexed dog, or an exempted dog.

The bill removes the council requirement to provide a registration rebate for trained dogs. The rebate was ineffective in encouraging training and was difficult to administer for councils and the Dog and Cat Management Board. The bill introduces breeder registration to improve oversight of breeders without unnecessarily increasing red tape. Breeders will be required to register with the Dog and Cat Management Board, disclose their location and comply with requirements. This will assist to locate and eradicate operations where dog and cat management and welfare is a secondary concern to profit. These puppy or kitten farms have no place in South Australia.

Councils will be able to utilise breeder registration to enforce by-laws such as animal limits, trace the breeders of aggressive dogs in the community, understand animal density and incorporate the needs of breeders into animal management plans. The bill requires that breeders register individually and will be allocated a unique breeder registration number. This number must be included in any advertisements, including online, for the sale of a dog or cat. The streamlining of process requirements for members of breeder organisations will be considered.

It will also be a requirement that the registration number of the breeder is provided to consumers at the point of sale so they can identify where their pet originated. This provides a means for consumers to enforce their rights if sold a dog or cat that has a behavioural, medical or genetic condition.

The bill allows the board to set a fee for breeder registration. This revenue will be paid into the Dog and Cat Management Fund and used to administer the breeder register and conduct compliance activities as the board sees fit. I recognise that the broad majority of dog and cat breeders in South Australia raise their animals in appropriate conditions. These measures are aimed at locating unethical breeders and planning for the inclusion of humane breeders that produce healthy, sociable dogs in our communities.

The government is serious about clamping down on unethical practices and reducing the number of animals euthanased in animal welfare shelters. The government is also serious about preventing serious dog attacks that have caused fatalities interstate, and addressing the cat overpopulation that has an affect on state biodiversity.

I note the Animal Welfare (Companion Animals) Amendment Bill introduced by the Hon. Michelle Lensink MLC included many of the reforms I have brought forward today. However, by legislating these changes under the Dog and Cat Management Act instead of the Animal Welfare Act, we are utilising the existing statewide compliance framework that exists through the Dog and Cat Management Board and the 69 metropolitan and rural councils. It is the government's view that this approach is more effective as it utilises the current established system of local government councils and provides a focus on safe communities, in addition to protecting dogs and cats. The Dog and Cat Management Board will also work with all stakeholders on a community awareness campaign and support for implementation of the reforms. I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*

###### 4—Amendment of section 3—Objects

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 3 of the principal Act.

###### 5—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends section 4 of the principal Act, inserting definitions of key terms used in the measure, making consequential amendments and correcting obsolete references.

###### 6—Amendment of section 5—Owner of dog or cat

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act to extend the operation of the relevant parts of that section to include cats as well as dogs.

###### 7—Amendment of section 6—Person responsible for control of dog or cat

This clause amends section 6 of the principal Act to extend the operation of the relevant parts of that section to include cats as well as dogs.

###### 8—Amendment of section 21—Functions of Board

This clause amends section 21(1)(b) of the principal Act to extend the operation of that paragraph to include cats as well as dogs, as well as making consequential amendments to the remainder of the section.

###### 9—Amendment of section 21A—Accreditation of assistance dogs

This clause amends section 21A of the principal Act to allow certain prescribed bodies to accredit assistance dogs, previously referred to as guide dogs, hearing dogs or disability dogs.

###### 10—Insertion of section 21B

This clause inserts new section 21B into the principal Act. The new section empowers the Board to keep a register in respect of dogs and cats microchipped and/or desexed under the Act.

###### 11—Insertion of section 23A

This clause inserts new section 23A into the principal Act, conferring on the Board a standard power of delegation.

###### 12—Amendment of heading to Part 3

This clause amends the heading to Part 3 of the principal Act.

## 13—Insertion of Part 3 Division 1

This clause inserts new Part 3 Division 1 into the principal Act, with that Division allowing for the appointment of authorised persons under the Act, and related provisions setting their powers as well as requirements relating to their identification and limitations on their powers. The clause also inserts a heading to the remaining provisions of Part 3, which now becomes Division 2.

## 14—Amendment of section 26—Council responsibility for management of dogs and cats

This clause amends section 26 of the principal Act to extend the operation of the relevant parts of that section to include cats as well as dogs. The clause also sets out additional responsibilities of councils in respect of registers, and simplifies the arrangements relating to rebates of dogs or cats that are desexed etc, providing that a standard dog or cat (ie one eligible for the rebate) is one that is both desexed and microchipped.

## 15—Amendment of section 26A—Plans of management relating to dogs and cats

This clause makes a technical amendment to section 26A(3) of the principal Act.

## 16—Repeal of sections 27 to 30

This clause repeals sections 27 to 30 of the principal Act, consequent upon the amendments made by this measure.

## 17—Amendment of section 31—Offence to hinder etc authorised person

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 31 of the principal Act.

## 18—Amendment of section 32—Offences by authorised persons

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 32 of the principal Act.

## 19—Amendment of heading to Part 4

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the heading to Part 4 of the principal Act.

## 20—Amendment of section 33—Dogs must be registered

This clause amends the penalties under section 33(2) and (3) of the principal Act as stated, and makes consequential amendments.

## 21—Amendment of section 37—Notifications to ensure accuracy of registers

This clause amends the penalties under section 37(1) and (2) of the principal Act as stated.

## 22—Amendment of section 38—Transfer of ownership of dog

This clause amends the penalties under section 38 of the principal Act as stated.

## 23—Repeal of section 40

This clause repeals section 40 of the principal Act.

## 24—Amendment of section 41—Applications and fees

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 41 of the principal Act.

## 25—Repeal of section 42

This clause repeals section 42 of the principal Act.

## 26—Insertion of Part 4A

This clause inserts new Part 4A into the principal Act as follows:

## Part 4A—Microchipping and other identification

## 42A—Dogs and cats to be microchipped

This section requires dogs and cats to be microchipped in accordance with the regulations. The penalty for contravening the section is a fine of up to \$5,000. The clause also makes provision for exceptions to the requirement.

## 42B—Further offence if certain dogs and cats not microchipped following offence against section 42A

This section creates a cognate offence where a person who has been found guilty of an offence of not microchipping their dog or cat under new section 42A continues to fail to do so after being found guilty.

## 42C—Further requirements relating to identification of certain dogs and cats

This section requires certain dogs and cats (being animals that are not, or are not yet, required to be microchipped under the Act) to wear specified forms of identification in public.



## Part 4B—Desexing

## 42D—Certain dogs and cats to be desexed

This section requires dogs and cats to be desexed in accordance with the regulations. The penalty for contravening the section is a fine of up to \$5,000. The clause also makes provision for exceptions to the requirement.

## 42E—Further offence if certain dogs and cats not desexed following offence against section 42D

This section creates a cognate offence where a person who has been found guilty of an offence of not desexing their dog or cat under new section 42D continues to fail to do so after being found guilty.

## 27—Amendment of section 43—Dogs not to be allowed to wander at large

This clause amends the penalties under section 43 of the principal Act as stated.

## 28—Amendment of section 44—Dogs not to be allowed to attack etc

This clause amends the penalties under section 44 of the principal Act as stated.

## 29—Amendment of section 45—Transporting unrestrained dogs in vehicles

This clause amends the penalties under section 45(1) of the principal Act as stated, and makes other consequential amendments.

## 30—Amendment of section 45A—Miscellaneous duties relating to dogs

This clause amends the penalties under section 45A of the principal Act as stated, and makes consequential amendments.

## 31—Substitution of heading to Part 5 Division 1A

This clause amends the heading to Part 5 Division 1A of the principal Act.

## 32—Amendment of section 45B—Dogs of prescribed breed

This clause amends section 45B of the principal Act to standardise the offence in subsection (1) by clarifying that dogs of prescribed breeds must be both muzzled and restrained in public. The clause also increases offence penalties, and makes consequential amendments in relation to desexing.

## 33—Amendment of section 45C—Greyhounds

This clause amends section 45C of the principal Act to standardise the offence in subsection (1) by clarifying that greyhounds (unless exempted from the muzzling requirement) must be both muzzled and restrained in public. The clause also increases offence penalties, and clarifies that the exceptions in current subsection (2) do not include council dog parks.

## 34—Amendment of section 45D—Attack trained dogs, guard dogs and patrol dogs

This clause amends the penalties under section 45D of the principal Act, and makes a consequential amendment.

## 35—Repeal of section 45E

This clause repeals section 45E of the principal Act.

## 36—Amendment of section 47—Court's power to make orders in criminal proceedings

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 47 of the principal Act.

## 37—Repeal of Part 5 Division 2

This clause repeals Part 5 Division 2 of the principal Act.

## 38—Amendment of heading to Part 5 Division 3

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the heading to Part 5 Division 3 of the principal Act.

## 39—Amendment of section 50—Destruction and control orders

This clause amends section 50 of the principal Act. Some of the amendments are consequential, while the requirement that dogs or their owners or both undertake specified training is extended to the remaining control order categories. Most notably, the clause amends section 50 to enable the Board, as well as councils, to make the relevant orders.

## 40—Substitution of section 51

This clause substitutes section 51 of the principal Act, standardising the grounds on which orders may be made under section 50, and in particular including the grounds that the dog is subject to a similar order under the law of another jurisdiction.

## 41—Amendment of section 52—Procedure for making and revoking orders

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 52 of the principal Act, in particular recognising that the Board may now make orders.

## 42—Amendment of section 55—Contravention of order

This clause amends the penalties under section 55 of the principal Act as stated.

## 43—Amendment of section 56—Notification to council

This clause amends the penalties under section 56 of the principal Act as stated.

## 44—Amendment of section 57—Notification of order to proposed new owner of dog

This clause amends the penalties under section 57 of the principal Act as stated.

## 45—Repeal of section 58

This clause repeals section 58 of the principal Act.

## 46—Amendment of section 59A—Prohibition orders

Consistent with clause 39, this clause amends section 59A of the principal Act to enable the Board to make prohibition orders.

## 47—Amendment of section 59B—Contravention of Prohibition Order

This clause amends the penalties under section 59B of the principal Act as stated.

## 48—Repeal of section 59C

This clause repeals section 59C of the principal Act.

## 49—Substitution of Part 5 Division 4

This clause inserts new Part 5A into the principal Act as follows:

Part 5A—Destruction, seizure and detention etc of dogs and cats

Division 1—Destruction, seizure and detention etc of dogs

59D—Power to destroy dogs

This section sets out the circumstances in which a person may lawfully destroy or injure a dog. This provision (along with new section 60) is essentially a rationalisation of various existing provisions in the principal Act.

60—Power to seize and detain dogs

This section sets out the circumstances in which a person may seize and detain a dog. Again, this provision (along with new section 59D) is essentially a rationalisation of various existing provisions in the principal Act.

61—Procedure following seizure of dog

This section sets out what is to happen to a dog once it is seized and detained under the Act.

62—Destruction or disposal of seized dog

This section sets out that a person detaining a dog may destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of the dog if it is not claimed within 72 hours, or its owner will not take possession or pay moneys owing.

Division 2—Destruction and seizure etc of cats

63—Power to destroy cats

This section sets out the circumstances in which a person may lawfully destroy or injure a cat. This provision (along with new section 64) is essentially a rationalisation of various existing provisions in the principal Act.

#### 64—Power to seize and detain cats

This section sets out the circumstances in which a person may seize and detain a cat. Again, this provision (along with new section 63) is essentially a rationalisation of various existing provisions in the principal Act.

#### 64A—Destruction or disposal of seized cat

This section sets out that a person detaining a cat may destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of the cat.

#### Division 3—Miscellaneous

#### 64B—Certain bodies may microchip and desex detained dogs and cats

This section provides that an animal welfare organisation or council detaining a seized dog or cat (whether the animal was seized under the principal Act or any other Act) may microchip or desex (or both) the dog or cat. However, such an action must be done in accordance with guidelines developed by the Board.

#### 64C—Limits on entitlement to return of dog or cat

This section sets out prerequisites to return of a dog or cat seized under this proposed Part.

#### 64D—Notification to owner of dog or cat destroyed etc under Division

This section requires certain persons who destroy, injure, seize or detain a dog or an identified cat under this proposed Part to notify the animal's owner and the local council (or, if it is outside of council areas, a police officer).

#### 64E—Recovery of costs

This section enables the operator of a facility at which a dog or cat has been detained under this proposed Part to recover (as a debt) charges payable under the regulations in relation to the seizure, detention or destruction of the dog or cat.

#### 64F—Ownership of certain dogs and cats to vest in operator of facility

This section vests ownership of certain dogs or cats destroyed or otherwise disposed of under this proposed Part in the operator of the facility taking the action. The section also provides that no compensation is payable to a previous owner of the dog or cat in respect of its destruction or disposal.

#### 50—Amendment of section 66—Liability for dogs<sup>1</sup>

This clause corrects an obsolete reference in section 66 of the principal Act.

#### 51—Substitution of Part 7

This clause inserts new Parts 7 and 7A into the principal Act, in substitution for current Part 7, as follows:

#### Part 7—Breeding and sale of dogs and cats

#### 68—Registration of breeders

This section provides for the registration by the Board of persons as a breeder of dogs or cats (as the case requires). The section also sets out procedural requirements in respect of registration.

#### 69—Offence for breeder to sell dogs or cats unless registered

This section creates an offence for a person to sell a dog or cat that he or she has bred unless he or she is appropriately registered as a breeder under this Part, or registered with an approved representative body or under the law of another jurisdiction. The maximum penalty for an offence is a fine of \$5,000.

#### 70—Offences relating to sale of certain dogs and cats

This section creates offences for a person to sell a dog or cat that has not been micro-chipped (in subsection (1)) or desexed (in subsection (2)) in accordance with the requirements to be set out in the regulations. The maximum penalty for an offence is a fine of \$5,000. The section also confers a regulation making power to disapply the section in respect of sales occurring in certain circumstances.

#### 71—Certain information to be given to buyers

This section creates offences for a person who sells a dog or cat to fail to provide the information required by subsection (1). A similar offence is created by subsection (2) in respect of a person publishing an advertisement for the sale of a dog or cat. The maximum penalty for an offence is a fine of \$5,000. The section also confers a regulation making power to disapply the section in certain circumstances.

#### Part 7A—Review of decisions by SACAT

## 72—Review of certain decisions by South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

This section confers jurisdiction on the SACAT to review certain decisions under the principal Act.

## 52—Insertion of section 80A

This clause inserts new section 80A into the principal Act. The new section allows the Board to exempt a person or body from the operation of a specified provision or provisions of the principal Act.

## 53—Amendment of section 81—Assistance dogs

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 81 of the principal Act, as well as aligning terms used in subsection (2) with those used in the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* of the Commonwealth.

## 54—Amendment of section 81A—Interference with dog or cat in lawful custody

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 81A of the principal Act, as well as increasing the maximum penalty for an offence under the section to a \$5,000 fine.

## 55—Insertion of section 81B

This clause inserts new section 81B into the principal Act. The new section creates an offence where a person, without lawful excuse, interferes with the identification carried by a dog or cat.

## 56—Amendment of section 83—No liability for action taken under Act

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 83 of the principal Act.

## 57—Amendment of section 85—Continuing offences

This clause amends section 85 of the principal Act to include the provisions of new Parts 4A and 4B in the exceptions to the scope of the continuing offence provision.

## 58—Amendment of section 88—Evidence

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 88 of the principal Act.

## 59—Amendment of section 88A—Liability of vehicle owners in relation to transporting unrestrained dogs

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 89 of the principal Act.

## 60—Amendment of section 90—By-laws

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 90 of the principal Act.

## 61—Insertion of section 90A

This clause inserts new section 90A into the principal Act, requiring the Minister to review and report to Parliament on the operation of the Act as amended by this measure.

## 62—Amendment of section 91—Regulations

This clause, in addition to inserting standard provisions relating to codes etc and expiation fees, amends section 91 of the principal Act so that regulations under the Act no longer need the recommendation of the Board before they can be made, rather the Board must now be given notice of proposed regulations, and consideration must be given to submissions made by the Board within the specified period.

## Schedule 1—Related amendments and transitional provisions

Part 1—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

## 1—Amendment of section 83H—Interpretation

## 2—Amendment of section 83L—Evidentiary

These clauses make consequential amendments to the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*.

Part 2—Amendment of *Equal Opportunity Act 1984*

## 3—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the *Equal Opportunity Act 1984*.

Part 3—Amendment of *Major Events Act 2013*

## 4—Amendment of section 26—Powers of authorised persons at major event venues

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the *Major Events Act 2013*.

## Part 4—Transitional provisions

- 5—Accreditation of assistance dogs to continue
- 6—Certain exemptions under section 45E to continue
- 7—Dog management officers taken to be authorised persons
- 8—Cat management officers taken to be authorised persons
- 9—Designated areas

These transitional provisions continue appointments and other administrative acts made or done under the principal Act prior to the commencement of this measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

### *Motions*

#### **PARA WIRRA RECREATION PARK**

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:46):** I move:

That this house requests His Excellency the Governor to make a proclamation under section 33(3) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 to abolish the Para Wirra Recreation Park.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:46):** I rise to indicate my support for this motion. Para Wirra is a wonderful park that combines natural bushland with great recreational facilities, including a sports oval and many bushwalking trails to suit all levels. It is one of the 50 national parks and reserves within 50 kilometres of the Adelaide CBD, covering a total combined area of over 13,000 hectares of land. The proposed reclassification of Para Wirra Recreation Park to a conservation park will give better recognition to the park's significant natural and historic importance.

The South Australian government is committed to the ongoing provision and development of recreational opportunities in parks. This is reflected in our nature-based tourism action plan, which recognises the importance of tourist and regional growth investment opportunities. But, in order to grow this important industry that already accounts for \$1.1 billion in expenditure in South Australia each year, we must ensure that our open spaces are protected and remain attractive to visitors.

The state government has an outstanding record on increasing our network of parks and reserves. In total, South Australia has over 300 parks showcasing a diverse range of natural attractions, including Seal Bay, Flinders Ranges, Cleland, the Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail, and Naracoorte Caves. And, we have systematically added to this network of parks and reserves.

Over the past 13 years, this government has proclaimed 69 new parks and added land to 76 existing parks. In addition, when Labor came into government in South Australia in 2002, just 70,000 hectares of South Australia had wilderness protection status. We have increased this to 1,843,448 hectares. South Australia now has the largest percentage of both public and private protected land of any Australian mainland jurisdiction—approximately 27,675,000 hectares; that is equivalent to the size of the state of Victoria.

We have also worked hard to ensure that our parks and reserves offer visitors a great experience. This has been at the heart of the state government's \$10.4 million investment to improve metropolitan Adelaide's parks and reserves, including the Para Wirra Recreation Park. The proposed upgrades to Para Wirra have been designed to be sustainable and sensitive to the natural surroundings, and include:

- a nature play space to engage children in the natural beauty of the park;
- improved picnic and shelter facilities;
- and education and information hub;
- new camp sites to provide opportunities for northern metropolitan residents to enjoy bush camping in an easily accessible location;
- improvements to the parks' entrance, car parking and information;
- walking and cycling trail upgrades;

- toilet upgrades and drinking water facilities;
- a scenic lookout; and
- an additional ranger to assist with delivering improved park information, park events, educational activities and seasonal programs on park.

I understand that the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources has engaged a private company to develop concept plans, if the park operates. Early drafts of the concept designs are due in September, and we expect works to be scheduled after the detailed design stage is finalised towards the end of 2016.

Tourism in South Australia is already worth \$5.3 billion a year and employs 32,000 people, approximately. These measures will help achieve our target of boosting the industry to \$8 billion a year and increase employment to 41,000 jobs by 2020. If we are serious about attracting visitors from interstate and around the world to explore our fantastic network of parks and reserves, then we have an obligation to protect our parks for today's and future generations. I therefore strongly recommend the motion to members.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:50):** I rise to support this motion:

That this house requests His Excellency the Governor to make a proclamation under section 33(3) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 to abolish the Para Wirra Recreation Park.

The proposed reclassification will allow the park to receive better recognition for the significant natural and historic values it protects. The intention is that the park be reclassified from 'recreation' to 'conservation' to allow for the change in category. The National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 requires that a recreation park be first abolished, and that the subject land then be proclaimed as a conservation park. The abolition of the recreation park may only occur by resolution passed by both houses of parliament, and I note that this went through the other place yesterday.

The Para Wirra Recreation Park/Conservation Park consists of some 1,500 hectares, or slightly more, about 40 kilometres north-east of Adelaide. It is in the foothills of the Mount Lofty Ranges at what now really is the northern end of metropolitan Adelaide. When it was first established in 1962, of course it was nowhere near suburban Adelaide, but with encroachment, it has become quite a unique parcel of beautiful bushland setting.

The park has within its boundaries a sports oval and many walking trails, which I understand are particularly popular on weekends such as the upcoming Easter weekend, when the weather is going to be good. I do hope that with the change in category that the oval and these walking trails will still be available to the general public and even, perhaps, become more enhanced.

The predominance of flora within the park is, of course, eucalyptus. There is longleaf box, pink gums, South Australian blue gums and a scattering of native pines, yaccas, and heaths. I also understand that there are over 100 species of native birds contained within these 1,500 hectares—quite a valuable piece of bushland. There are emus—which, of course, are highly visible—parrots, galahs and lorikeets. With regard to animals, there are western grey kangaroos, echidnas, skinks, bearded dragons and sleepy lizards—the ubiquitous sleepy lizard, I am sure.

Special mention must go to the Friends of Para Wirra. They were out in numbers yesterday in the other place for the debate there, and they have put in a lot of work over a very long time. My understanding is that they are particularly pleased to see this progress being made in this much-loved part of South Australia. They have worked tirelessly, amongst other things, attempting to eradicate many of the pest plants and animal species that, of course, have been introduced since European settlement. We do support the motion and look forward to its progress through the house.

**Mr GEE (Napier) (15:54):** I rise to indicate my support for this motion and, given the high level of bipartisan support for the making of this proclamation, I will be very brief. South Australia's parks and reserves are, for all South Australians, a fantastic opportunity to engage with the environment. For my constituency, residents of South Australia and visitors to the state, Para Wirra is characteristically a wonder in nature. Para Wirra lies on the north-eastern boundary of the electorate of Napier and can be accessed via Humbug Scrub Road at One Tree Hill.

This motion proposes that the proclamation of the Para Wirra Recreation Park be revoked as a first step in having it classified as a conservation park. This change will better reflect its conservation significance and the sustainable manner in which recreation opportunities are provided. It is important that protected areas are about the balance between conservation and public use and enjoyment, and this balance is best achieved when we engage meaningfully with the local community and park users. This is something that the Friends of Para Wirra have long understood.

This group has a strong and longstanding affiliation with the park that covers over 1,500 hectares and is located around 40 kilometres northeast of Adelaide. They have long spoken in favour of conservation status for Para Wirra at the instigation of founding president, the late Ted Hughes OAM. The Friends of Para Wirra have repeatedly expressed a desire that any redevelopment in the park must promote sustainable use and not impact native vegetation or disturb wildlife in the park.

Decisions about recreational use are assessed against conservation and other park values, irrespective of park categories. These decisions are made in accordance with the park management plan. Its success, however, hinges on community involvement, and this is why the state government has recently undertaken one of the most extensive public engagement processes to upgrade metropolitan parks.

When the state government committed \$10.4 million to upgrading metropolitan parks and reserves at the last election, it was decided that the local communities and the people who use the parks should decide what facilities were needed. This resulted in a strong co-design process to ensure the whole community, not just our historic stakeholders, are consulted and involved in the project. Over 11,000 people participated in the project and were involved in southern and northern co-design teams, ministerial roundtables, free park open days, submissions to the YourSAy website and a Minecraft design-a-park competition with nearly 40 entries from primary schools.

This motion will help ensure that the natural beauty and significance of Para Wirra Recreation Park is protected so that many generations of South Australians can enjoy it in the future. I congratulate the Friends of Para Wirra for their advocacy as well as the numerous volunteers across the state who give time and resources to our many parks and reserves. I strongly commend this motion to members.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:57):** I rise to indicate my support for this motion, too. I live, as most people know, in Elizabeth. I grew up in Elizabeth Downs, just down the hill from Para Wirra Recreation Park, and spent many childhood weekends there, as I am sure the member for Napier has. Para Wirra Recreation Park covers over 1,500 hectares of bushland at One Tree Hill, making it one of the largest blocks of remnant native vegetation in the Mount Lofty Ranges. First protected in 1962 as a national park, when the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 was introduced, the park was reconstituted as a recreation park.

This was done to reflect its intended role as a natural area catering for a wide range of recreational activities for the growing population in the northern suburbs of Adelaide. However, the conservation value of the park has never been underestimated. We know that, when managed well, and with the cooperation of the local community and park users, conservation and recreation need not be mutually exclusive. The state government wants the community to continue to care about our parks and reserves and encourage people to get out and enjoy them.

The proposed reclassification of Para Wirra Recreation Park to a conservation park will allow the park to receive better recognition for the significant natural and historical values it protects. Para Wirra, as the member for Flinders has indicated, holds important native vegetation such as the pink gum and the river red gum woodland. It is home to a wealth of wildlife, including western grey kangaroos, echidnas, bearded dragons and, if we are to believe the member for Flinders, more than 100 species of birds.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Name them.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Name them?

**Mr Treloar:** Just half of them.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Just most of them.

**Ms Cook:** One's fine.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I couldn't name one, but they are all lovely. The park also protects species of conservation significance, including the yellow-footed antechinus, which is a tiny mammal listed as vulnerable in South Australia.

Prior to its dedication as a park, the land comprising Para Wirra Recreation Park was subject to varying land uses. Most notably, during the 1860s, the 1890s and during the Depression-era years, the land was mined for gold. Historically significant remnants of the area's gold mining history are scattered throughout the park, including mine shafts, tunnels and stone ruins that date back as far as the 1860s.

Para Wirra Recreation Park offers a range of sustainable recreation activities within the conservation framework of the park. For example, bushwalking along one of the many walking trails in the park, cycling on sealed roads, horseriding and dog walking on leads. The park offers picnic facilities with gas barbecues and toilets, a sports oval, lookouts and a picturesque lake. For so many reasons, Para Wirra Recreation Park is an important asset for the northern suburbs specifically, but also for our state as a whole, and it deserves our recognition. For this reason, I strongly commend this motion to members.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (16:00):** I would briefly like to speak to this motion in commending it to the house although I gather it has the support of both sides. The Para Wirra Recreation Park covers 1,500 hectares and is located, as members have mentioned, approximately 40 kilometres northeast of Adelaide. The proposed reclassification will allow the park to receive better recognition for the significant natural and historic values it protects, and will be consistent with the government's intention to reflect how sustainable recreation opportunities are provided within the conservation framework.

The government is committed to the ongoing provision and development of recreational opportunities in parks. This is clearly demonstrated by the release for consultation of South Australia's nature-based tourism plan. To allow for the change in category, the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 requires that a recreation park be abolished and that the subject land be then proclaimed as a conservation park. The abolition of the recreation park must only occur in pursuance of a resolution passed by both houses of parliament. Notice of motion for this resolution must be given at least 14 sitting days before the motion is passed.

The Para Wirra Conservation Park will not be used for mining purposes. The government will proclaim the park under section 30(1) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, and not with a section 43 proclamation permitting mining access. I thank members who have spoken in favour of this motion and commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **DOG FENCE (PAYMENTS AND RATES) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 February 2016.)

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:02):** I rise to indicate my support for this bill. The Dog Fence stretches through remote isolated country of the Australian outback; indeed, a lot of it stretches through my electorate of Giles. Its purpose is to keep wild dogs from killing grazing animals, mainly sheep. 'Wild dogs' is a term that includes dingoes, hybrids or unmanaged domestic dogs. Historically, wild dogs had a major impact on the livestock industry, and we are continually striving to find new ways to humanely and sustainably control them.

The first merino flocks were brought to Australia in the 1800s. At first, wild dogs did not seem to affect livestock when grazing first began in the northern plains of South Australia around 1860.



However, dingo populations soon multiplied and evidence suggests that they began to thrive on the newly-imported European rabbit.

By the early 1900s, dingo attacks made it virtually impossible to successfully establish a sheep industry. Sheep graziers began building fences around their properties in an effort to protect their flocks. Over time, neighbouring properties grouped together to become enclosed within vermin-proof fences.

The single line Dog Fence we know today was established in South Australia in 1946 to align with the most northern boundaries of the properties contained within the vermin-proof districts. At 5,400 kilometres long, it is the longest continuous fence in the world, 2½ half times the length of the Great Wall of China. Since 1947, the 2,178 kilometre stretch of fence within South Australia has been continuously maintained, realigned and upgraded.

The Dog Fence Board is the governing body set up to administer and manage the Dog Fence and ensure that it is regularly patrolled and maintained. The entire fence is inspected at least every second week by patrolmen (and hopefully some patrolwomen) employed by the local boards or by station owners themselves.

New fencing technology has seen the introduction of dog proof grids at road crossings and solar powered electrified sections. However, it is important to note that the Dog Fence also provides a boundary outside of which the dingo is recognised as a legitimate wildlife species. This is significant given the important role the dingo has always played in the lives of Aboriginal people becoming an integral part of camp life, oral literature, beliefs and practices. Therefore, it is imperative that we balance this cultural and ecological significance with the needs of the livestock industry, and this is also why it is important that the Dog Fence is properly maintained.

This amendment bill is about ensuring the Dog Fence can continue to be maintained into the future. It will allow the board to make annual increments to payments in line with inflation for some time into the future or until the act is next amended. For this reason, I strongly commend this bill to members.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:05):** I rise to support this bill and would like to make a brief contribution. This bill aims to ensure that there are sufficient funds and resources to maintain the Dog Fence now and into the future.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will just establish, member for Flinders, if you are going to be the lead speaker?

**Mr TRELOAR:** I will be the lead speaker. There are six local boards which sit under the Dog Fence Board; ownership of the fence is vested in those local boards, apart from the fact that there are two private owners who manage sections of the fence on their own properties. The boards administer the funds and are responsible for the employment of contractors who inspect and maintain sections of the fence. The Dog Fence Act was last reviewed in 2005.

Three main amendments have been proposed. The first is to do with the set cap of \$250 per kilometre which goes to the local boards for maintenance. It is proposed that this be lifted to \$400 per kilometre. The second proposed amendment relates to the rate charged to pastoralists, currently capped at \$1.20 per square kilometre of rateable land—that is, land contained within pastoral leases. It is proposed that this be lifted to \$2 per square kilometre. There is a minor technical amendment which refers to the name of the referencing body. I understand that was the South Australian Farmers Federation and now will be Livestock SA.

There is also the matter of funding sourced from the sheep transaction levy. I note in referring to the annual report of the Dog Fence Board that approximately half of the funds raised (\$515,000 in 2015) are as a result of the sheep transaction levy. Every time sheep are traded anywhere across the state—whether it be in the pastoral zone, the wheat-sheep belt or in the high rainfall zone in the South-East—this transaction levy is paid. Part of it at least goes towards the maintenance of the fence.

I understand also that the government matches the rates and levies raised almost dollar for dollar, and I certainly hope that will continue. The Dog Fence is an iconic structure; it has been

referred to by the member for Giles who touched on its importance. It stretches not just across the north of South Australia but also through New South Wales, around the border of New South Wales and across Queensland. It stretches from the Great Australian Bight, just south of Nundroo which is in my electorate, it winds its way through the pastoral zone—

**The Hon. P. Caica:** Good fishing spot.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Beautiful fishing spot. Right, member for Colton.

**Mr Pederick:** Fowlers Bay.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Fowlers Bay. It goes through the pastoral zone, through the Flinders Ranges, out through the north-east pastoral, around the border of New South Wales and winds its way through Queensland, ultimately finishing up somewhere near the coast, east of the Darling Downs. The total length right across Australia is 5,600 kilometres and, in fact, it is the longest fence in the world. Often, we just have the largest of something in the southern hemisphere but in this case it is the largest in the world. The South Australian segment is about 2,200 kilometres and, as I said, it stretches from the Great Australian Bight to the border just north of Broken Hill.

The fence essentially protects sheep flocks in the southern half of the state, and it really defines the pastoral zone between the areas to the south of the fence, where sheep flocks predominate—there are some cattle, but sheep flock predominate—and to the north of the fence where, because of the dingo population, it is impossible to run a sheep flock. Having said that, I do know that dingoes do have some impact on newborn calves within the cattle flocks in the Far North of the state.

The dingo is kept out of the southern pastoral areas by the Dog Fence. It has had several incarnations. On the Eyre Peninsula we have a number of roads stretching east to west across the peninsula that are known as Dog Fence Road. My only assumption is that as settlement moved north so did the Dog Fence and so did the attempts by the settlers to eradicate the dingo from within the areas that they were settling and looking to run sheep.

I remember going to the Warramboo footy club at one time a few years ago and noticing that there were two things of interest on the wall. The first was the Norwood league side from I think 1909, which beat Carlton to win the Champions of Australia award that year, and the other thing was a stuffed dingo. It was the last dingo shot in the Warramboo district. They took such pride in achieving the result that they stuffed it and put it up in the footy club. In my wife's family legend has it that her grandfather shot the last dingo in the Cockaleechee district; so long, long has there been an effort to control and even eradicate dingoes.

Dingoes are a declared pest in South Australia on the south side of the fence. In fact, it is often referred to as a native dog, but my understanding is that it is not naturally occurring in Australia but rather it was introduced anywhere between 4½ thousand and 18,000 years ago, so best guess is putting it around 10,000 years ago. It is not naturally occurring but it certainly has been here long enough to become native, and no doubt it has had an impact on the native environment and landscape as a result of being here for many thousands of years.

Often, that area of land inside the Dog Fence is referred to as just that, 'the inside country'. Amongst pastoral people in the state, when you talk about inside and outside country they are very clear on what that means. It is a physical barrier to stop wild dogs entering the state.

Interestingly, I was reading an article in the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune* just a week or so ago about a wild dog that had been shot in the Port Neill district—my guess is 80 kilometres north of Port Lincoln. You can see that breaches do occur from time to time. This particular landowner lost six sheep on one night. He recognised immediately what the problem was, and he staked the dog out, I think even camping out overnight to ensure that he shot the dog; so, breaches do occur.

I remember a couple of years ago that, when it was dry out west in my electorate, there was particular pressure on the fence from camels. Camels are another introduced species that have become feral. Current estimates have camel numbers in Australia at about two million head. During the dry period towards the end of the millennium drought there was much pressure on the fence, and the camels were knocking it down. Not only were the camels coming in but, of course, it was also allowing the wild dogs to come in. So constant vigilance is required.

At the moment, rates are collected from the owners of rateable land, which are holdings of more than 10 square kilometres inside the fence. The current act caps the maximum rate at \$1.20, and that is looking to be raised. Some consultation did occur in the lead up to this with Livestock SA, Primary Producers SA, the local boards and the South Australian Sheep Advisory Group. They raised no real issues or real concerns apart from the recognition that the fence needed to be maintained and even enhanced now and into the future.

If I could just go back to camels briefly. One of the recent improvements in the fence is that there has been an electrification of some areas, particularly around the Lake Frome stretch, and the federal government provided some \$400,000 to electrify the top wire of the fence in that area. My understanding is that that has been very effective and there have been no breaches in that part of the fence in the past two years where that electric wire has been implemented.

The efforts continue. I know that there is an effort outside of the fence as well by landowners and also the department to control dogs. Baiting occurs within a 100 kilometre distance of the fence to really minimise the numbers on the north side of the fence and so minimise the pressure on the fence from dogs themselves. Baiting occurs inside and baiting occurs outside, and for a time even there was a bounty on dingoes.

An interesting development in all of this is, of course, the increasing numbers of hybrid dogs, and it is not surprising, I guess, that when dingoes do come into the inside country there are many domestic and working dogs and they manage to find each other often times and particularly as you come further south where dingoes are sighted. Often they are not purebred dingoes but rather hybrids. I stand to be corrected on this but the Australian blue heeler has been bred in fact with some wild dog. We will check on that; I can get back to the house on that.

With those few words, we do support the bill. I know that we have another couple of speakers on this side who would like to put a perspective from their electorates, but I do think that these moneys raised will be well spent, and I cannot overemphasise the importance of this fence in protecting the pastoral interests in this state.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (16:16):** I rise to indicate my support for this bill. While dogs and dingoes are not only a major threat to the sheep industry they can also present a potential threat to public safety and public nuisance if they were to spread into the populated areas, and we heard the comments made previously by the member for Stuart about some domesticated dogs which have gone wild and which are creating some havoc south of the Dog Fence.

Since the mid 1800s vermin-proof fences have been commonly used to protect the sheep industry from stock losses caused by wild dogs. By 1931 there were 56 proclaimed fence districts and about 54,600 kilometres of vermin-proof fences throughout the state. However, over time many of the internal fences fell into disrepair and industry called for a single continuous fence based on the existing barrier fences of the outer districts in the north of the state.

It is a shame that the former member for Stuart is not here because he might have been around at that time. In response, the parliament passed the Dog Fence Act 1946, which established a Dog Fence Board to administer the Dog Fence Fund and to maintain the Dog Fence. A full review of the Dog Fence Act 1946 was conducted in 1999, in consultation with industry, and the former Speaker the Hon. Graham Gunn was certainly here at that time.

The review resulted in minor amendments, including the recognition of dog-proof fences in other parts of the state. The revised act was assented on 29 September 2005 and commenced on 10 November 2005. Today the Dog Fence in South Australia is 2,178 kilometres long, extending from west of Fowlers Bay, as mentioned by the—

**Mr Pederick:** The member for Flinders.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —member for Flinders; thank you, member Hammond—on the cliffs of the Great Australian Bight, north to above Coober Pedy and east to the New South Wales above Broken Hill. It then joins with the New South Wales and Queensland dog fences for a total length of 5,400 kilometres.

Inside (that is south of) the Dog Fence, wild dogs are a declared pest under the South Australian Natural Resources Management Act 2004. Since 2009 the SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board—and I commend the Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board for the work that it does—has coordinated the Biteback program to assist regional land managers inside the fence with best practice control for wild dogs.

Land managers with similar geography and land systems are encouraged to work together in cooperative groups via the development of what are called local area plans (LAPs). Biteback provides land managers with a range of services, including:

- a biennial 1080 bait mixing service;
- year-round access to manufactured baits;
- access to a trap loan service; and
- offering its LAP groups advice on future management, upcoming technologies and interstate developments.

In addition to the Biteback program, Biosecurity SA conducts an aerial baiting program to augment Biteback's ground baiting program.

It is clear that the Dog Fence is vital in the protection of the sheep industry from stock losses by preventing the entry of wild dogs into southern pastoral areas. These amendments will allow the board to make annual increments to payments in line with inflation that will, in turn, ensure that the Dog Fence is adequately resourced and continues to be maintained in a dog-proof condition into the future. I strongly commend this bill to members.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:20):** I, too, rise to support the Dog Fence (Payments and Rates) Amendment Bill 2016. The object of this bill is to make sure that there are sufficient funds and resources available to maintain the Dog Fence into the future. There are six local boards which sit under the Dog Fence Board and ownership of the fence is vested in those local boards, apart from two private owners who manage sections of the fence on their properties. These boards administer the funds and are responsible for the employment of contractors who inspect and maintain sections of the fence.

Three amendments are proposed in this bill today. The act sets a cap of \$250 per kilometre which goes to the local boards for maintenance and it is proposed that this be lifted to \$400 per kilometre. The rate charged to pastoralists is currently capped at \$1.20 per square kilometre of rateable land and it is proposed that this is lifted to \$2 per square kilometre. The third amendment, obviously, is the minor technical amendment to remove a reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation, which, it has been indicated before in this house, is now defunct, and replace it with Livestock SA Inc.

The rate involved has historically been increased by the consumer price index and is collected through the sheep transaction levy. The minimum payment, which is based on a property basis, is \$100. The total of rates raised last year was \$508,000 and that was matched, I believe, dollar for dollar by the state government. I hope the state government, even with this extra funding raised, will also match it dollar for dollar.

The Dog Fence Board was one of those boards which was very fortunate to survive the recent legislative consolidation of government boards and committees. The member for Flinders talked about pressure on the fence from camels, and the federal government provided \$400,000 to electrify the top wire along the Lake Frome stretch of the fence. On our information, there have been no breaches of the fence by camels in the past two years. With continual maintenance and upgrades with electric wires, the condition of the fence is continually improving.

In regard to some of the history of the fence, it is obviously there to keep the dingo, Australia's wild native dog, from killing grazing animals, mainly sheep. The history of Merinos in South Australia, and Australia, goes way back to the 1800s when Merino flocks were brought out here. They were introduced to the northern plains of South Australia around 1860. It is interesting that, when you go through the Flinders Ranges, you can find historical monuments talking about the station owners and graziers and their management of their sheep flocks around that time.

The first three decades of this period was relatively free of dingoes. However, dingo populations multiplied, and evidence suggests that they began to thrive on the newly imported European rabbits—they could have eaten a few more of them—which were running in feral plagues at the same time.

By the early 1900s, this made it impossible to establish a sheep industry. What happened was that in 1946 a single-line dog fence was established to align with the most northern boundaries of the properties contained within the vermin-proof districts that had been established earlier, with people putting in about 30,000 miles of their own fences to protect their flocks from these wild dogs.

As has been indicated in the house, the fence now extends from the Great Australian Bight in South Australia near Fowlers Bay, eastward across South Australia, through New South Wales to finish at the Bunya Mountains of Queensland near the Pacific coast. It is the longest continuous fence in the world at 5,400 kilometres long, with 2,178 kilometres being in South Australia. As has been indicated earlier, it is 2½ times the length of the Great Wall of China.

Under the Dog Fence Act of 1946 there was a rate levied on grazing properties based inside the fence to fund the wages for maintenance and patrol workers. Since 1947, the fence within South Australia has been continuously maintained, realigned and upgraded. New fencing technology has been incorporated so that dog-proof grids at road crossings and solar-powered electric sections have been introduced.

A few years ago I travelled around with the member for Stuart. While we were in Coober Pedy we were taken out to the Dog Fence and had a viewing of the grids and the well-maintained fence just outside of Coober Pedy. I note that there has been extra work done with electrifying the fence to keep camels out. There is nothing like seeing a mob of camels running alongside you on the other side of a fence, wondering what they are going to do next. We witnessed that as a family up at Innamincka and it is pretty ferocious. Evidently, there are millions of camels racing around in the outback that can cause this damage.

Certainly, in the main, the Dog Fence does its job. Cattle owners north of the line have had significant damage in the past, especially in times of drought. I have been at Cowarie Station, Sharon Oldfield's property on the Birdsville track, during the drought, where the property was virtually reduced to beach sand. Even though they had agisted over three-quarters of the stock off the property, the wild dogs were causing havoc for newborn calves. Because they are an organic property they were not baiting, so they were shooting hundreds of dogs, trying to keep ahead of the situation.

As has been indicated by the member for Flinders, there is baiting done by vehicle or by plane both inside and outside the fence. I think the restriction on how much aerial baiting you can do should be lifted so that a bigger attack can be made on these dogs so we can get a better result not just for the pastoralists who are doing this work, because essentially they are doing this work for the good of the state. Baiting is far more efficient than trying to bounce a Toyota around a lot of inhospitable country in a lot of areas to put baits out by hand. I certainly think that should be opened up more to get more control of these wild dogs.

I know there has been a lot of consultation in regard to this with Livestock South Australia, Primary Producers South Australia, the local boards and the South Australian Sheep Advisory Group. My office put a call in to Geoff Power, and he is a very good operator. He is president of the Livestock South Australia board and he runs a self-replacing Merino flock near Orroroo. He is a past president of WoolProducers Australia and has been an executive member of the organisation since 2005.

Geoff has also been a member of the South Australian Sheep Advisory Group, and that group advises the South Australian Minister for Agriculture on sheep and wool matters. Geoff is also a member of the South Australian Wild Dog Action Group and is working with wool producers on a national approach to tackle increasing numbers of wild dogs in pastoral regions.

So, I thought, who better to contact than Geoff Power? He made a few quick phone calls today just to make sure everything was on the right track for us, and contacted us earlier today and said, 'No, it is all fine; we can support the increases and the increased funding going into keeping these pests out of the inside country.'

I do want it to be recorded—and it will obviously be recorded here today—that people in the outside country do suffer from dogs. Because a lot of these properties have organic status, there are issues around being able to use 1080 bait. Obviously, they cannot, so hundreds of dogs have to be shot. They can cause a lot of damage to cattle, tearing them down very cruelly and causing a very slow death for a lot of cattle, mainly calves.

It should be noted that if this fence was not there, the multimillion-dollar sheep industry that we have in this state would not exist. With those few remarks, I commend the bill.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:30):** I just want to make a few comments with regard to this that are more generic than just talking about the Dog Fence. In question time today, the Minister for Agriculture talked about how important the livestock industry was to South Australia. It is heartening to see that members of the Labor government do at last recognise the importance of agriculture to this state and to the economy of this state.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That was my question. I have always been interested—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** It was a good question, and I am praising you for it. Deputy Speaker, it has taken a long time for the Labor government to recognise the importance of agriculture to this state. I recently gave evidence to the Natural Resources Committee of this parliament concerning the savage increases in natural resources management board levies in several parts of this state.

In the evidence I gave, there was evidence from a federal government report which suggested that the increase in the level of disposable incomes of regional South Australians over the 10-year period of 2001-11 was a mere fraction of the increase in the level of disposable incomes of those people in metropolitan Adelaide.

I do not have the figures in front of me, but, off the top of my head, I think in metropolitan Adelaide over that 10-year period, real household incomes increased by something like \$175 per week, whereas real household incomes in my part of the world—the high rainfall part of South Australia—increased by I think it was something less than \$40—I am not sure whether it was \$29 or \$39.

The reality is that the farming communities in this state are doing it tough, and have been doing it tough for a long time. It is essential that we have a dog fence in South Australia. The lead speaker for the opposition will be asking at least one question of the minister regarding the ongoing commitment of the state to pay for its share of the maintenance of the Dog Fence. That is a very important question, and I will be very interested in the minister's answer on the commitment of the government.

I raise this matter because the farming community are doing it tough, yet they form the backbone of the economy of this state. They keep being asked to pay at every opportunity where it can be identified that the cost can be sheeted home to that community. Other speakers from this side of the house have pointed out that around half the money that is current expended—and I think that that will be the ongoing concept—comes from the sheep transaction levy.

Every sheep that is bought and sold—remembering many sheep get bought and sold on more than one occasion during their life—every time there is a transaction, there is a levy paid by the vendor which is collected by the state government. Those moneys, in part, fund the maintenance of the Dog Fence.

The highest rate per acre of sheep in South Australia, I suspect, would be in my electorate in the South-East—a long, long way from the Dog Fence. In my electorate, the seat of MacKillop, and next door, the seat of Mount Gambier, I suspect the average contribution by the average farmer would be higher than that of any other part of the state, yet we are the furthest away from the Dog Fence. We could argue, I think quite legitimately, that we should be paying a lower rate. We do not argue that, and I have no intention of arguing that on behalf of my constituents.

However, I make the point to this government that we are asked to pay what I believe is much more than our fair share for a number of services. I would like the government, and those people responsible in this government, to take this on board, and with particular emphasis on the imposts now being put on my constituents through the natural resources management boards,

particularly with the water planning and management costs that are being demanded by this government.

I have been doing considerable research on this particular matter, and the minister has been running around saying that these costs were identified in the 2011 budget. I have just gone back to the budget improvement measures document, the second report of the Sustainable Budget Commission of August 2010, and I have been reading that the actual concept was to only recover water planning and management costs from SA Water, not from the average water licence holder across the state.

In the meantime, my constituents—sheep farmers in my electorate—are being asked to pay substantially towards the maintenance of the Dog Fence. They are also being asked to pay substantially towards the costs of water planning and management and they are asked to pay substantially towards any costs that can be identified. We would not mind that if the same principle was applied across the board: that wherever you can identify the people who created the cost, then sheet the full cost back to those particular people.

If that was the principle adopted right across government, I would not have an argument at all. I remember suggesting to minister Hunter in another place, when discussing the proposal to impose a drainage levy on the constituents in my electorate, that when this government sought full cost recovery for the provision of public transport services in Adelaide then I would be willing to discuss a drainage levy with my constituents.

I say the same thing with regard to full cost recovery of water planning and management services. If those people who are actually creating those costs were paying for it, I would have no argument, no problem with my constituents paying for the cost of managing the water licensing system in the South-East. What irks me is that we are paying for costs which are created in other parts of the state, and I do not believe that should be fairly put on my constituents.

I will continue to argue that whilst the minister continues to refuse to be accountable, and he does that by not doing what he is obliged to do under the National Water Initiative; that is, to publish a lot of data and information about those costs and the way he has determined those costs. He is refusing to do that, notwithstanding that his government has signed an agreement which obliges him to do that, and I will continue to work in that space to try to get that information so I can go back to my constituents and say, 'Well, in fact, this is the real cost,' or indeed, 'Yes, you are being fleeced by this government.'

I make those comments with regard to this particular bill because I think there is a connection. I am not arguing that the people in the South-East should not be contributing towards the Dog Fence—although I think we are paying fairly dearly for it—but I think my constituents fully accept that this is a very important industry for the state. I just wish that this government would actually believe in their hearts what they say when they acknowledge the importance of the agricultural industry to this state.

I wish that they would fully accept that the agricultural industry in this state is much more important than the motor industry, yet we hear them talk about the motor industry and the demise of that industry almost on a daily basis. Notwithstanding that it is obviously a big issue for those people directly involved, we have lost many more jobs in agriculture in the last 20 years—probably even in the last 10 years—than have been lost and will be lost in the motor industry in South Australia. I have not heard a squeak from the Labor Government. That is why I made the comment a few moments ago that it is heartening to see the government at least talking about and giving a voice to the importance of agriculture in this state.

I wish that they would implement some positive policies to support and indeed enhance agriculture. It is the one industry we have in this state that could derive much more economic benefit for every South Australian, but because this government sees agriculture as a milch cow, which it can continue to tax, rather than an opportunity, the farming community of this state continues to do it tough and will continue to do it tough under this government, and the rest of the economy will not benefit in the way that it could if our agricultural sector was supported by a government that understood it. I will close my comments there and commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (16:41):** It is an interesting position to follow what I thought was the agrarian socialist member for MacKillop, but obviously from that contribution that cannot be attributed to him anymore. I support the Dog Fence (Payments and Rates) Amendment Bill 2016. Wild dogs, including dingoes, have increased significantly in the areas south of the Dog Fence in recent years, threatening particularly, as we have heard, the state's sheep industry. The Dog Fence, along with other associated measures, plays an important role in protecting this industry and controlling other adverse effects increased by the number of wild dogs.

One of the opportunities afforded to me as the Presiding Member of the parliament's Natural Resources Committee is that over the years I have visited different sections of the Dog Fence with the committee and Natural Resources management staff and board members, and I have for a long time heard from a number of members in this house. I particularly remember being on the Natural Resources Committee with the previous member for Stuart and former Speaker, the Hon. Graeme Gunn, and also the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, former member of the Legislative Council, who helped educate me on the importance of the Dog Fence.

They were followed by the current member for Stuart, who raised this issue very early in his time on the Natural Resources Committee, and that has continued as a concern with the Hon. John Dawkins in the other place and the member for Flinders, who was our lead speaker for the opposition in this particular debate today. So, I have had the opportunity to see the fence and also hear firsthand from people who both work along that fence and benefit from the fence. I also remember very clearly one of the times that I went there seeing the damage that wild cats were perpetrating in the area, particularly to birds and native animals and reptiles.

One of the programs that has been successful in this area is the Biteback program, which focuses on wild dogs inside the Dog Fence. This program has been boosted through an additional \$300,000 of state and Australian government drought assistance funding and a further \$100,000 from the South Australian Arid Lands board's regional NRM levy funding—the funding that the member for MacKillop was speaking about earlier, so there are some direct connections, as he was trying to make, between the regional NRM levy funding.

Some of the new measures that have been implemented to benefit the livestock industry include a second Biteback officer working one-on-one with landholders; additional bait supply services inside and outside the Dog Fence; support for travel costs for specialist shooters to drought affected properties; engaging a professional regional dog trapper; and training land managers in trapping techniques.

As members would appreciate, we are talking about a very large area of land involving many stakeholders, so good and effective collaboration is essential for an effective strategy. Many of these initiatives have arisen as a result of improved communication and coordination. For example, SAAL wild dog staff work very closely with 22 local wild dog planning groups south of the Dog Fence to tackle wild dogs at a local scale, and the sense of collaboration has increased since the South Australian Wild Dog Advisory Group (SAWDAG) was established in 2013.

SAWDAG's role is to provide recommendations and oversee the implementation of priority actions for South Australia under the state and national wild dog plans. Representatives from the industry, natural resources management, the Dog Fence Board, biodiversity conservation, Aboriginal communities and governments sit on the advisory group chaired by Mr Geoff Power, a highly respected figure in the Australian wool industry and President of Livestock SA.

The group released a draft State Wild Dog Strategic Plan which was discussed during the forum held in Port Augusta in 2015 and attended by around 60 people representing pastoral, conservation, Aboriginal and government perspectives. The draft document was circulated for consideration to 18 stakeholders, including several NRM boards, the Dog Fence Board and Livestock SA in September 2015. I understand that a final draft will be presented following endorsement by the South Australian Wild Dog Advisory Group.

This plan will help South Australia deliver its contributions to achieving outcomes under the National Wild Dog Action Plan released in 2014 and endorsed by this government. Controlling wild dog populations and protecting our livestock industries is an important national challenge, and we must ensure that we are using all of the tools available to us to succeed. This amendment bill is



about ensuring that there are sufficient resources available to maintain the Dog Fence into the future, and on that basis, I commend the bill to members.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:47):** Let me say very clearly that I support this bill, as I gather do all members of this house. Wild dogs are a terribly big and I believe still underestimated problem for South Australia. I am heartened to have just listened to the speech by the member for Ashford, who I know has done tremendous work with the Natural Resources Committee that she chairs, and I thank her for that. I have to say, though, that I do believe from a government and industry perspective there is still much more to do.

Wild dogs are a very emotive issue. They are a beautiful, wonderful, natural, native Australian animal, and they have a very important place in our nation—outside the Dog Fence. Inside the Dog Fence they are a declared pest and it is every landholder's responsibility to eradicate wild dogs inside the fence, and they need the government's help to do that, and they need industry help to do that as well.

Those two things can cause a bit of conflict because, as I said, they are beautiful, wonderful native animals. Some people do not like the idea that they should be killed anywhere in the nation. That is not my view; my view is that it is important to differentiate and we have chosen historically to make the Dog Fence the demarcation border, if you like. They cause extraordinary, vicious damage to stock. It is quite a natural thing for a dog to do; do not blame the dogs. It is their natural thing to come, when they have the opportunity, particularly when times are tougher, particularly when there has been less rain and we are in drought and native food sources start to get thinner and thinner on the ground, then stock become much more attractive.

It is primarily sheep but it is also cattle. It is important that this house understands that there is a significant percentage of deaths to cattle on cattle properties from wild dogs, and it has been proven all over Australia. It is not only sheep, but sheep are far more vulnerable. They kill and maim ferociously. It is the natural thing to do for them, it is not their fault, it is just what they do.

The big problem we have in South Australia is that over the last 15 to 20 years they have been breeding up inside the Dog Fence. The fence cannot be a perfect barrier. We need to always make it as good as it can possibly be but it cannot be a perfect barrier. There will be times when camels will knock it over or when flooding rains will knock it over and, when that happens, it is typically not possible for somebody to get in to do maintenance and upgrading work sometimes for many weeks after the damage has occurred.

Dogs come through, they typically head south. It is a natural thing to do, it is not a random thing. They do not just come through the fence and head back to where they were. In South Australia, in general, the further south you go the more rain there is, the more vegetation there is, the more flora and fauna there is and, of course, for the dogs, there is more food. So, they come south and they stay south and they have no reason to go back north.

The fence gets fixed and stops the next lot of dogs from coming through until there is more damage, but the dogs that are below the fence breed up. For many years now they have been breeding up relatively unchecked. I thank the government and the sheep industry, very importantly, for the money that has been put into the Biteback program over the last few years. It has started to make a big difference.

Of course, this is an ongoing job. It is not as if you go out and trap or shoot or poison a particular number of wild dogs and say, 'That is good. We had 20, we have just got rid of 15, so we only have five left,' because as soon as you take your eye off the ball that five becomes 10, 20, then 15 and 20 again very quickly. It is a forever job. It is very important that the government and the industry provide graziers with ongoing support. It has been good but the reality is that the funding that exists at the moment is about to run out at the end of June this year. I am hopeful that funding will be extended but I am not aware of any commitment that has been made yet towards that.

I think it is very important that that comes so that people know what they are doing, very importantly so that the people who have been trained as dog trackers and dog trappers can stay doing the work they are doing because, if that is what you need for your livelihood and you do not have any assurance that that is going to continue, and you get another opportunity to go and earn

your money some other way, you will go and do that. Not only will we have lost the people doing the work but we will have lost those skills as well. I know people in exactly that situation who say, 'What do I do? I need to feed my family. I have to take another job if I do not know that this one is going to continue.'

I say again, I appreciate the resources that have gone into this but it is very important that they continue. It should be just like funding for roads, schools or hospitals—it should be something that goes on forever—because the problem, unfortunately, is not going to go away until the fence is a perfect, impenetrable barrier, and of course it can never be that.

I do not know whether one of the previous speakers might have mentioned this but I read yesterday that a dog was shot near Port Neill on Eyre Peninsula, by my estimate 300 kilometres away from the closest part of the Dog Fence. I read this report yesterday, so it has only happened very recently. That is just one example in the electorate of the member for Flinders. In my electorate that sort of thing is happening all the time around Wilmington, where I live, and around Orroroo, which is south of Wilmington. People are seeing wild dogs and shooting them when they have the opportunity. It is a very serious issue.

That brings me to the substance of this bill which is about increasing the capacity for the Dog Fence Board to charge more from graziers for the maintenance of the Dog Fence, and it is very important that the house understands the connection but the difference between the funding that the member for Ashford was talking about and that I have been talking about until now which is about wild dog eradication below the Dog Fence. It includes baiting, trapping and shooting on the margins just outside the Dog Fence and in some cases much further away. That is funding for eradicating dogs from places that they should not be, as distinct from what this bill seeks to do, which is to provide the capacity to charge more for the maintenance of the fence itself.

They are two different things, and both of them are important. And, please, nobody in this place think that by raising rates the Dog Fence Board can charge for the maintenance of the fence, but then the other money does not have to be spent, because they are two different things. They are connected, they try to do similar work for the same purpose, but they are different buckets of money for different purposes within the same broader job of trying to keep livestock safe inside the Dog Fence.

I certainly do support giving the board the capacity to increase the fees that it charges, both the per kilometre fee for the maintenance of the fence itself but also the per square kilometre charge for landholders below the fence. I know that there is always some consternation for people who are well south of the fence who think, 'Well, why should we pay this money? The fence is several hundred kilometres away from us.' I can understand that, particularly in light of what the member for MacKillop said about charges forever growing.

The government, for many years now over many industries, has gone to this user pays system, which makes some sense when you look at it. Why should people who do not benefit pay? However, it is getting to the stage where the government is asking industries to pay for just about everything to do with their industry but they have not reduced the tax take in any other way. They have not reduced the overall burden on those people, so the people or companies, whoever they happen to be, in industries pay more now for industry-specific levies, but they also still pay the same tax as they have always paid in every other way.

It is important to understand, as the member for MacKillop tried to say and others may have said as well, that the burden just cannot keep growing and growing. The government cannot just keep saying to everybody, 'You're just paying a bit more for this, and you're connected to that, so you pay another levy here and another levy there.' It is important to understand that it is not a bottomless pit. It cannot just keep going, given that we know there is no reduction in the pre-existing taxes; it is only ever an addition in levies, taxes and charges.

Having said that, in the Port Neill example that I just mentioned there are many examples of dogs being shot in the Riverland, well below the Dog Fence particularly around the Waikerie area, which has been a real hot spot in the last few years for people with wild dogs, and also around Port Augusta, the area that I am familiar with. The reality is that we need this buffer, we need this barrier, we need all the things that we are doing—trapping, shooting, baiting, fencing—otherwise we

would have dogs everywhere. We have got way too many as it is at the moment, but otherwise it would just continue and continue.

While I can understand that if a person was a grazier near Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier or Port Vincent it might seem a little bit tough to have to pay for the maintenance of the Dog Fence, but I think the reality is that those people and those grazing companies—whether it be a small family operation or a large organisation—do benefit enormously by virtue of the fact that the Dog Fence is there.

Those levies across the entire state at the moment raise, I believe, \$508,000 per year. The government matches that, and I think that is a good system too. The industry has said through Livestock SA and many other organisations that they support this bill and they are prepared to say on behalf of the graziers they represent that the industry should pay more; but what is good about that is that when it is dollar for dollar the government will pay more as well.

What I would ask the minister to confirm in her opportunity to speak after this is that the government will continue to match dollar for dollar, so that when the rates that the Dog Fence Board can charge increase, if that is what the Dog Fence Board chooses to do and more money is raised directly from landholders, the government will continue to match that funding dollar for dollar as it always has.

I would not support the bill nearly as keenly if that was not the case. I do think it is very important so that the industry is contributing 50 per cent and it is asked to pay more but then the government contributes 50 per cent and by default it will pay more as well towards the same body of work. So, if the minister is able to confirm that will be the case I would be very grateful for that.

I think that I will leave it at that with a few final comments about the importance of agriculture in general. We are talking about grazing at the moment, but agriculture is our most important industry in South Australia. It is not our largest growth opportunity, and everybody in this place knows that I want to support all industries across the board, but while often the focus is on the growth industries it is important to understand that agriculture remains the largest wealth contributor to our state's economy, and that will continue for a very long time.

As the member for Flinders once said to me about six years ago, shortly after we came into this place together: we can talk, we can argue, we can agree, we can do anything we like in here in parliament to try to improve our state's economic prosperity, we can do anything we like in here but nothing will do it as much as whether it rains or not. If it rains and we get good rains across our entire state that dwarfs anything that the government or the opposition can do with regard to contributing to our state's economy. If it does not rain our whole state is in trouble.

So, we should still continue to do the positive and constructive work that we do here to improve our state, whether it be social things, housing things, all the way through to business and the harder core economic things. We still need to work on all of those things, but, please, let us never forget how important agriculture is to our state, and the Dog Fence is incredibly important to agriculture in our state.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (17:01):** I am very pleased to close the second reading debate. There have been so many thoughtful and useful contributions by people who have a very detailed and deep knowledge of the value of the Dog Fence and also of the communities that it supports. In closing, I would briefly draw the attention of people to section 31 of the act, in order to seek to give some assurance that has been asked for in recent contributions. Section 31 states:

The Treasurer must, out of money to be provided by parliament for the purpose...

- (b) as soon as may be after the commencement of each financial year, pay to the board a subsidy at the rate of \$1 for every dollar of the rates and contributions by councils...

That, I hope, is a sufficient assurance of the position of the government in its commitment to supporting the ongoing maintenance of the Dog Fence and to having public contributions, as well as private contributions, to that.

I thank all those who were involved in preparing this bill, the advisers and the drafters, and also those who were involved in extensive consultation that was undertaken. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (17:03):** I move:

*That this bill be now read a third time.*

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 March 2015.)

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:04):** I rise on behalf of the opposition to speak on the Local Government (Stormwater Management Agreement) Amendment Bill 2015.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** As lead speaker?

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Yes I am. The bill implements the state and local government Stormwater Management Agreement of 2013. The Local Government Association originally entered into a memorandum of agreement on stormwater management in 2006.

The agreement set out the first responsibilities for stormwater management in the state, addressing the responsibilities for stormwater management and providing the basis for a joint collaboration by both levels of government to deal with the threat of flooding and to better manage the use of stormwater as a resource. As part of the agreement, the state government provides \$4 million per annum indexed over 30 years. The Local Government Act 1999 was amended in 2007 to represent this.

In 2011, the government released the Stormwater Strategy—The Future of Stormwater Management. One of the key recommendations arising from the strategy was to establish a new operational model for the authority by giving it a more strategic outlook. This agreement required the authority to develop a 10-year strategic plan, with business plans then prepared every three years.

The Local Government (Stormwater Management Agreement) Amendment Bill represents the legislative changes of the 2013 agreement. The Stormwater Management Authority was established on 1 July 2007 under the Local Government (Stormwater Management) Amendment Act 2007 to implement the Stormwater Management Agreement and to operate as the planning, prioritising and funding body in accordance with the agreement.

The most recent agreement was signed on 30 August 2013 but it is now, once again, under review. The proposed changes that are part of this bill include an emphasis on members' skills as a primary consideration while retaining an equal number of local government-nominated and state government-nominated members.

This change also means that members nominated by local government no longer need to be representative of a particular geographic area and, according to the government, this change will ease pressure, as many areas struggle to nominate a suitable member. However, this change could potentially result in no regional representation on the authority and the opposition has already filed amendments to the bill in consultation with the LGA, and this was accepted through the Legislative Council.

We want to ensure that at least one local government representative is on the authority and that that person will be nominated by the LGA and have qualifications or experience to represent the interests of a region of local government. So I clarify that this appointment would be based on

qualifications and experience and not on the employment status. The appropriateness of those qualifications and experience would be determined by the LGA and be made publicly available.

It makes sense to have at least one person from the LGA nominated by the LGA to sit on that authority, and it just does not make any sense at all, given the local floodwater and stormwater management agreement between local government and state government, that there is potential for nobody from regional local government to be on there. As the bill stands, it is written in legislation that regional interests be represented.

I am glad to see that common sense has prevailed in the Legislative Council and the Minister for Water accepted these important amendments. In another place, the Minister for Water said of the opposition's amendments that changes around board membership was driven by the Local Government Association to ensure that the Stormwater Management Authority has skills-based membership and not be constrained by geographic representation.

This may be the case but, after the LGA supported our amendments as a way to ensure that regional interests remain on the board and as the Minister for Water pointed out, of the nine high priority catchments identified in this legislation, three are in regional South Australia, these being Clare, Renmark and Port Augusta, so I believe it is key to have regional interests in the legislation so that the views of people concerning stormwater outside of metropolitan Adelaide are continually raised. What we do not want to see is a board of metropolitan members providing advice on regional stormwater.

What this means is that we need to have eyes and ears on the ground where we are seeing, potentially, a high percentage of pressure put on those towns that are often inundated with stormwater. In a lot of cases, they are areas of flooding where the water cannot run away, and that is where I think a lot of the action needs to be implemented. Surely there is no issue in finding one regional representative from across South Australia with the skills in stormwater management. The board could even hold further meetings in regional South Australia.

The members of the board have been appointed until 30 June 2017, and they are: Stephen Hains, the presiding member; Dr Helen MacDonald, regional councils, from Mount Gambier, representing regional interests; Mayor Rosenberg from the southern metropolitan councils; Mr Wally Iasiello, northern metropolitan councils; Ms Julia Grant, executive director from DEWNR; Ms Katharine Ward, project officer from DEWNR; and Mr Andrew Grear, manager of statutory planning from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

During the briefing for this bill we were told that, through this agreement, a list of stormwater plans will be actively pursued, which will allow mechanisms for the authority to assist with stormwater activities on an ongoing basis. A number of concerns have been raised with me about the state government's stormwater approach. This amendment bill highlights that in many areas this state is well behind when it comes to stormwater initiatives. The bill does put the importance of stormwater as a resource for harvesting and reuse at the forefront, where it should be. As has been pointed out, a contemporary and integrated approach is warranted if we are to both manage the risks and harness the benefits of stormwater.

Most water that we deal with is stormwater, because in one way or another it runs off. Yes, the desal plant cleans, treats, desalinates and puts water back into a catchment or into a system. Seawater really is a reticulated catchment of the majority of stormwater, but it is a huge resource. As I have said many times in this house, all potable water was initially stormwater at some stage. Whether that water is in a rainwater tank, a dam, a river, a reservoir—wherever it may be, it is stormwater that in one way, shape or another has been captured. Whether stormwater is reused or let run into adjacent waterways—rivers, dams, reservoirs or out to sea—that is something that is just a natural phenomenon.

I would like to think that South Australia would adopt a much stronger policy for stormwater capture and reuse. We know that much stormwater that finds its way into metropolitan Adelaide hits the roads, the gutters, the stormwater system and, in the majority of cases, flows out to sea. In many of the recreational fishing meetings that we are dealing with at the moment, there is no mention in that review of urban run-off, which is having a huge impact on our gulf, our breeding grounds and our seagrasses. That is a real concern to me as well.

The state government's Water for Good policy highlights the importance of stormwater recycling and diversifying the state's water supplies. It has targets such as: a harvest of 35 gigalitres of water per annum by 2025, and by 2050 the capacity to provide up to 60 gigalitres of recycled stormwater per annum in Greater Adelaide.

If we had a proactive minister—and his department, and a government for that matter—we would be harvesting a lot more stormwater. We notice that the minister is doing a cost-benefit analysis on the desal plant as we speak. Why have we got the desal plant? We are now doing a cost-benefit analysis as to whether they are going to help out irrigators or not.

I think it is outrageous that the state government has invested almost \$2.3 billion in a desalination plant and a pipe interconnection network from the south to the north, and yet we are now doing a cost-benefit analysis as to whether we should be starting that desal plant up, whether we should continue to support jobs and food production, underpinning an economy in South Australia. We are going around and around in circles.

I just find it outrageous that the minister will use turning on the desal plant as a mechanism to raise the cost of water in South Australia. It is outrageous to think that that desal plant has been ramped up and down since its initiation, through a warranty process. We saw the price of water go up, but we have not seen the price of water go down now that that desal plant has been reduced back down to three gigalitres to keep the membranes in operational mode.

I think it is just outrageous that the minister continues to play his little game of threatening the people of South Australia that he will have to raise the price of water if he turns on the desal plant. Every time there is a little bit of pressure put on the minister about why he is increasing the NRM levy—apparently we are going to have to raise the price of water if we are going to pay compensation for broken pipes.

It is outrageous that we once again get sucked in by this government's spin when it comes to dealing with the real issues and not dealing with the solution. The price of water has gone up 243 per cent over the life of this government, and yet we are continually threatened by the minister that he is going to raise the price of water if we start the desal, or if we pay compensation for stormwater breaks, or if there is any form of backlash over cost shifting when it comes to NRM.

I think it is time that the minister got serious about underpinning the state's economy with water. We are going to see a water shortage coming into the state's entitlement this year, as reported by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority. It is time that the government, led by the Minister for Water, got real and stopped playing games, and actually supported an economy that is vital to South Australia's bottom line.

If we talk about targets for stormwater, we talk about capturing stormwater and we talk about the Water for Good stormwater strategy. Even the then minister said, 'We must do more if we are to achieve our goal.' I really do think that the government of today has hit a brick wall when it comes to the reuse of our stormwater and treated wastewater. They are just happy to let that water spill out into the gulf, threaten our environment, threaten seagrass, and threaten fish stock breeding grounds. It is something that is not being dealt with, and yet this state is held to ransom by the threat of having our water prices increased. That concerns me, because we continually hear the threat from the minister.

As I said, we must do more to achieve our goals for capturing stormwater, storing that stormwater and then being able to reuse it. We must be adept in capturing the stormwater and storing it for later use. Importantly, we must design our urban centres to provide water security for future generations.

If we are going to have resistance to turn on desal plants—there does not even appear to be trigger points on what activates this desal plant. Do we let the river run dry? Do we let the catchments dry before we turn it on? What actually is the mechanism for that green button to be pushed so that we can have the desal plant in operation and actually use that \$2.3 billion investment that every taxpayer in South Australia has been burdened with? It really does beg the question.

Of course, I think it is important to design our urban centres to provide water security for future generations with stormwater. I commend Colin Pitman, who is now a water consultant. He is

a world-renowned expert in stormwater capture and storage. I think Colin Pitman has probably been one of the unsung heroes, particularly with this government, because they continue to ignore how important stormwater capture and storage is in South Australia.

There are great examples of world-leading technology out at Salisbury, Green Fields and Parafield Airport. These are examples of how stormwater could be used, and yet we adapt a small part of it and are just happy to let the stormwater run out to sea.

As I understand it, a number of councils do not actually have a solid stormwater plan. In an age of lower water storages and availability, I think every council needs to have a strong, concise strategy as to how it will tackle stormwater management and re-use of the water. Under this bill, a stormwater management authority will keep a 10-year strategic plan, and three-yearly business plans on stormwater.

Under this bill, the authority will also continue to outline a more proactive approach in looking at different funding streams for stormwater projects. At the moment, the work has not been undertaken on what expenditure is required for specific projects and long-term strategies. The argument is that not enough money is available for stormwater infrastructure and this is a view shared by many councils.

Many of the current council plans are aimed primarily at flooding rather than being proactive with stormwater capture, diversion and, potentially, storage. I note that one area which will be interesting to watch is that if council fails to prepare the stormwater management plans as per the bill, the Stormwater Management Authority can prepare the plan through ministerial approval, and then act on it. Overall, we support the establishment of the Stormwater Management Agreement, and I am pleased our amendments have been supported in the Legislative Council, and regional interests will remain on the board in this legislation.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

*Adjournment Debate*

### **PINERY BUSHFIRES**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (17:21):** In speaking in support of the motion to adjourn, I would just like to bring to the attention of the house a survey I have recently undertaken in my electorate of the people who were affected by the Pinery fires. On 25 November, 119 days ago, the people in my electorate in the communities of Wasleys, Woolsheds, Templers, Magdala, Pinkerton Plains and Hamley Bridge, were affected by the fires which started at Pinery. Sadly, in that fire two people lost their lives, and a number of people were injured.

The purpose of the survey was to find out what people on the ground were thinking—those people who were affected by the fires—and how, as a local member and, perhaps, government in general, could respond to the various issues. We had around 10 per cent return rate on the survey, which is quite usual for a survey. In terms of the results, we had 20 responses from Wasleys, three from Hamley Bridge, six from Templers, one from Magdala, one from Woolsheds, and one from Pinkerton Plains.

Of those residents who responded to the survey, six stated that they had incurred a personal injury in the fires; 19 said that their home was destroyed, or affected in some way; five lost animals or stock; six indicated they lost a motor vehicle; 11 had outbuildings affected by the fires; seven lost crops; and eight had their machinery of some type affected by the fires. In addition to that, there were also some people who lost their gardens or pasture, and eight people lost fences, extensively.

Six people who responded to the survey indicated that they were forced to relocate because of the fire. Of the 32 people who responded, 26 have registered with the Recovery Office. Those who did not register with the Recovery Office indicated they did not believe they needed help—there was no major damage—and some were not sure whether they had registered or not.

In terms of challenges facing the residents, we asked what challenges the residents were facing after the fire. Overwhelmingly, 50 per cent of people said that cleaning up was the biggest challenge they had. Fifty per cent of people indicated that they were affected in the sense of the clean up.

The major issue also impeding the clean up are the ongoing dust storms which people in the fire-affected areas are having. That was quite a strong theme throughout the survey responses, and certainly only a week or so ago we had some major dust storms through that area as well. Not only dust storms, but we are also losing very valuable topsoil which is required for production out there. If we do not get some more rains very quickly, a lot of farmers are going to be in dire straits. The rains are required if for no other reason than to get some plants growing in the area and some growth to actually stabilise the topsoils.

Of the 32 respondents, eight people said that mental health recovery was a major issue for themselves, and that is, if you like, a sleeper issue, that people were finding it tough to rebuild. By rebuild, I do not mean physically rebuilding, but rebuilding their lives in the sense of what they are going to do next. A number of people are still trying to decide what their next step is and what they are going to do: are they going to rebuild a home or go somewhere else? You have to remember a number of the farmers are in their 70s and it is a very difficult decision for them to make. I have an enormous amount of empathy for them. Of those people, a number said that they were not actually sure whether they should rebuild or relocate.

People indicated they were generally happy with the insurance process. In the main, the insurance companies have been quite responsive. There are some isolated cases, but in the main they have been quite responsive. One of the issues which has come up is the cost associated with rebuilding fences. Rebuilding fences is a major problem there. Farmers did not insure some fences because of the cost involved in insurance, and we are working with a number of farmers trying to assist them in that process.

Another issue which came up is the lack of a postal service in the town. Members would remember that the actual Wasleys post office was significantly burnt during the fire. The couple who run the post office there are working really hard to rebuild it. I would have to say I am not sure that Australia Post have done all they can with that recovery process. From what I have been seeing, they really have not gone out of their way to do much in terms of rebuilding that post office or the postal service and other interim measures. What they did is redirect all the post to Roseworthy. That is fine as a short-term thing, but in terms of actually understanding how important that post office is to that town in terms of the recovery process, I think for Australia Post it is just business as usual. I am disappointed with the response of Australia Post, as are a number of other people.

The other issue which has come up time and time again is lack of mobile coverage. I raised that issue only a couple of weeks ago in this place when I indicated that we need to do more, as part of the Black Spot program, to make sure that we have better coverage in these communities. Of course, some families who were affected by severe injury are still struggling in terms of their personal recovery. Our heart goes out to those families who are still dealing with some major issues relating to burns to their bodies, etc. For a lot of farmers, it is going to be a real challenge in terms of income. If the rains do not come and there is no income this year, it will be a major issue for that community involved in terms of rebuilding that community.

In terms of the services, we asked people what services they have accessed. Eight of the 32 people who responded said they have accessed the state recovery centre. Six said they have been in touch with Red Cross. In terms of Red Cross, I would just like to congratulate them on sponsoring a psychologist who came out there and spoke with people, and that is Dr Rob Gordon. I would say that, at the outset, when I thought they were bringing in a psychologist, I was a bit sceptical about how effective that would be. Dr Rob Gordon is actually an outstanding psychologist; he did a wonderful job.

I went to one of the sessions with the community out there and I was extremely impressed with the way he approached it: no lecturing, not telling people what to do, but through a whole range of storytelling he actually helped to relate people's experiences. You could hear after the session that they were engaged with him. I understand that, as a result of that very positive response, Red Cross has invited him back and he is doing some more sessions and I look forward to those.

In terms of services that residents have accessed, BlazeAid came in for a big tick from the community. BlazeAid has well supported the communities out there. Generally speaking, people are also happy with the response by government agencies. That has been quite supportive. They also



had support from Samaritan's Purse, and I also understand the Mormons were up there helping people clear up and rebuild.

In terms of how people have rated overall the dissemination of the information about the recovery process, 10 of the 32 said that it was good, eight said that it was satisfactory, and the remainder said that it was poor. So, there is obviously some work to be done there in terms of communicating with the community and making sure that people get access to information.

It was interesting that the strongest response we received in the survey was that people felt that a door-to-door approach would be much more effective, rather than in other ways. People said they just wanted the personal touch and also for people to tell their story. That is a lesson to be learnt. I understand that some door-to-door work has been done but the information suggests that it should have been done earlier.

Also, there was concern about the lack of, perhaps, a Facebook page where people could load information up or other people could interact. A general Facebook page has also come up in the survey. In terms of how people rated overall the recovery process to date, eight of the 32 said that the process was good, 11 said that it was satisfactory, and the remainder said that it was poor. In terms of the comments about the response by Australia Post, it was seen as poor and that some of the information has been confusing, and also that the focus was on the townships and not enough on outlying areas.

What I can say is that there was a lot of strong support for the volunteers who have worked with communities, and also a concern about access to funding, which is something I will talk about at a later date.

#### WINE TAX

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (17:32):** I rise today to talk about an issue that is very pertinent to my electorate and to one of the biggest industries in South Australia and one of the most celebrated industries in South Australia. As the member for Schubert, I am, by definition, a supporter of the wine industry. It is one of our great success stories and it melds the strengths that South Australia traditionally has in agricultural production with advanced manufacturing.

My electorate is named after Max Schubert, whose stewardship and invention of Grange has spurred Penfolds to recently be named as the world's most admired wine brand. Indeed, Ray Beckwith, in my electorate, was a great pioneer in the stabilisation of pH, which is one of the reasons we are able to have such a successful wine industry and which exports wine products globally.

So, when I see information in the media and groups who put forward proposals that would do undue harm to my electorate, that would, in essence, shut down my electorate, I feel compelled to speak out. A couple of weeks ago in the media changes were reported that would see wine taxed at instead of the current wine equalisation tax but would change to a situation where the cost of a \$15 to \$20 bottle of wine would increase by \$3.80. We would be looking at 20 per cent to 30 per cent increase in the cost of wine.

This proposal comes from a group called the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education (FARE), which has said that reforming the alcohol tax system should be a no brainer, which I dispute and I dispute heavily. I would like to quote the executive director of FARE, a guy called Michael Thorn, who was on FIVEaa recently, and I would like to read some of what he said. He said:

Medical research is becoming clearer about alcohol's impact on brain development.

Penberthy in response said:

That's if you drink heaps of it.

And his response was:

All alcohol causes harm.

Penberthy said:

One glass?

He said:

All alcohol causes some harm. It increases your risk of disease.

Penberthy said:

That's highly contested in the medical community.

And he said:

No, it's not. It's not contested at all.

Penberthy then said:

Why is it that every couple of weeks we seem to see a report coming out saying that a glass of red three or four times a week won't actually hurt you? It indeed could help you.

He says:

I think you're making that up, I don't know where you're seeing those reports. They don't come out every two weeks. We often see the alcohol industry promoting those sorts of lines and these are the sorts of issues we need to deal with in our community. There are a lot of myths about this and a sense that our drinking is not a problem and yet you go to hospital emergency departments, you go to our drug and alcohol services, you see the consequences.

What I would also like to point out is that a part of the submission that this group FARE has made to the liquor licensing review, point 15, wants to amend the Liquor Licensing Act to disallow persons under the age of 18 from entering premises licensed to sell takeaway liquor. When I look at the proposal to basically stop any family coming in to any cellar door in my electorate or indeed any electorate across South Australia, I get worried.

When I see reports in the media that all alcohol causes some harm, I think we are talking about a group that is not looking in a balanced way at the issues before us. To refute the idea that all alcohol causes harm and that indeed Penberthy was just making it up when it came to reports that moderate consumption of wine could actually be a good thing, I would like to point FARE to the Harvard Medical School's T.H. Chan School of Public Health which recently put out a report that says:

Moderate drinking seems to be good for the heart and circulatory system, and probably protects against type 2 diabetes and gallstones.

I would call Harvard Medical School a fairly reputable source. FARE would have you believe that alcohol problems are getting worse in this country, but I would like to point FARE to the National Drug Strategy Household Survey detailed report from 2013 that said that 12 to 15-year-old drinking has halved and, indeed, teenage drinking overall has dropped quite considerably; again, something that is part of the Australian government and what I would consider a credible source.

We then go on to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which shows that in pure alcohol terms the per capita consumption of alcohol has dropped by about 15 per cent in only the past five years, from 5.68 litres of pure alcohol per year down to 4.01; and of wine, from 3.78 down to 3.64. What these reports say is that there is a reducing issue when it comes to dangerous alcohol consumption in our community but also that moderate consumption of wine is indeed part of a healthy and balanced lifestyle. Indeed, this from DrinkWise Australia, which I would consider would be a fairly good authority when it comes to these issues. It says on their website:

When enjoyed in moderation, alcohol can form part of a healthy lifestyle that includes good diet and exercise. On the other hand, excessive drinking can have harmful effects to your health.

That is a fairly balanced statement and something I think we can take heart from, but the idea that all alcohol causes harm is extremely scary. I am not somebody who wants to see harm caused by excessive alcohol in our community but this idea that we need a blanket approach to stop any family from going into a cellar door and that to stop anyone from drinking alcohol at any time ever is a decent way to deal with this issue; instead, we need to be targeting problem drinkers.

We are already seeing reductions in drinking across the board and we have evidence here that I presented today that shows that underage drinking is also reducing. This type of proposal, the proposal to increase tax on wine, would have a disproportionate devastating effect on

South Australia. We are over 50 per cent of the nation's wine industry and this type of proposal, the increase of 20 to 30 per cent taxation rate on alcohol, would be nothing short of devastating.

This is an industry that in 2013-14 contributed \$1.77 billion, most of which is reinvested in regional South Australia. IBISWorld also says that in 2014-15, their estimate of \$1.6 billion should be used. This is an industry that is supporting our regional communities; this is an industry that is supporting our export economy and deserves better than glib statements like, 'All alcohol causes harm.'

This is an issue for my electorate, but this is a big issue for electorates all across South Australia. This is an issue in the electorate of Chaffey; it is an issue in the electorates of Hammond, MacKillop, Mawson, Kavel, Stuart and, indeed, in the electorate of Frome with the Clare Valley. This is an issue across most of regional South Australia and when I see groups like FARE being unchallenged in the media, I feel compelled to speak out.

Reasonable drinking is part of South Australian culture. It has been part of Australian culture since the arrival of the first settlers; it has been part of western culture for hundreds and hundreds of years. Indeed, the first settlers of the Barossa Valley, who came out from Prussia, brought with them a responsible, moderate drinking culture and they brought it here to South Australia.

What worries me is that we now have a group, the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education (FARE), which is the equivalent of the modern prohibitionist movement. They are a modern temperance movement. Their stated aim, as you can see by Michael Thorn's comments in the media, is to shut down the alcohol industry. Over 50 per cent of the value that my electorate contributes to the South Australian economy comes from the wine industry. A concept such as FARE is pushing would close down my electorate in a way that losing Arrium would be to Whyalla or losing Nyrstar would be to Port Pirie.

This type of proposal would do nothing short of shut down my entire electorate and I will not stand here and let it go idly by. This is a modern prohibitionist movement that left unchecked works against common sense, it works against the ability of the vast majority—99 point something per cent of the population—who have the ability to sit down and enjoy a drink in moderation. This type of proposal works to threaten the jobs of many who work in this great industry, many who live in the great electorate of Schubert.

I appreciate the opportunity to bring this issue to the house. I will certainly be making sure that the opposite views are heard and that the sensible common-sense voice is heard and that in this debate we can have some clarity, some common sense and some rationalism to counterbalance the views of some extreme elements who are seeking to shut down one of the greatest assets that the South Australian economy has.

At 17:42 the house adjourned until Thursday 24 March 2016 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***GAWLER MODERNISATION PROJECT**

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (29 October 2015).

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development):** I have been advised:

1. The \$0.002 million interest relates to a timing issue only and the department liaises with the Commonwealth to determine the best application of any unspent funds and interest generated.
2. Shared Services SA process accounts payable invoices on behalf of DPTI. In 2014-15, five invoices were double paid to the total value of \$2,118.04.

All duplicate payments have been pursued and the total amounts have been recovered.

The department, in collaboration with Shared Services, are continually reviewing internal controls to identify opportunities for improvements.

*Estimates Replies***PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES**

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (23 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development):** I have been advised:

Between 30 June 2014 and 30 June 2015, job titles and total employment costs of executive positions that resulted in terminations within the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure with a total estimated cost of \$141,500 or more are listed below:

(a) Abolished:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost*
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Government Architect/Executive Director, Office for Design and Architecture SA	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Accommodation and Property Services	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Contracting and Procurement	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Communications and Community Relations	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Project Director	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Strategic and Business Services	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Facilities Services	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Strategic Projects	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Manager, Contracts & Standards	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Statewide Operations and Programs	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Marine and Logistics Policy	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Executive Director, Corporate Services Division	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Asset Management	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Customer Systems Development	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Manager, Field Services	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Local Government Policy	\$152,974

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost*
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Executive Director, Public Transport Services	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Divisional Finance and Investment Strategy	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director, Projects	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Deputy Chief Executive, Transport Services/ Executive Director, Transport Services	\$211,810
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Executive Director, Business Services	\$211,810

\*Total Employment Cost (TEC) is calculated using the minimum Total Remuneration Package Value (TRPV) of the position, the total includes salary and superannuation.

The department has undergone a departmental rejuvenation resulting in the following position creations between 30 June 2014 and 30 June 2015 with a total estimated cost of \$141,500 or more:

(b) Created:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost*
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager People and Performance	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Investment Management	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Customer Experience	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Investment Services	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Planning and Transport Policy	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Safety and Policy Programs	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Director Construction Contracting	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Information Services	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Operational Services	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Asset Management	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Architecture and Building Environment	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Project and Asset Maintenance	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Commissioner for Kangaroo Island	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Manager Safety Strategy	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Manager Vehicle Operations	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Manager Field Services	\$152,974
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Property	\$211,810
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	General Manager Information and Strategy	\$211,810
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Chief Development Officer	\$211,810

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost*
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Chief Corporate Officer	\$211,810
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Chief Operating Officer	\$211,810

\*Total Employment Cost (TEC) is calculated using the minimum Total Remuneration Package Value (TRPV) of the position, the total includes salary and superannuation.

#### WORKFORCE SUMMARY

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development):** I have been advised:

1. No, there has been no provision of bonuses for staff separate to their salary and usual entitlements approved for the payment of staff in the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.
2. There will be no provision of bonuses for staff in the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure for 2015-16.

#### GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (23 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development):**

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
South Australian Police (SAPOL)	38,317,400.00	Intra-Government Transfer: Contribution from the Community Road Safety Fund for SA police programs.	Yes
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC)—Service SA (SSA)	31,382,000.00	Funds provided to the Government Services group (DPC) for services provided on behalf of the Registrar of motor vehicles.	Yes
Various councils	10,505,509.00	Grants from the Open Space and Places For People grant programs to implement open space and public realm programs across South Australia.	Yes
Taxi Service providers	10,164,002.39	Taxi subsidies payable to individuals with limited mobility SA Transport Subsidy Scheme (SATSS).	No
Various Sporting groups	7,085,500.00	Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program (CRSFP)—For the planning, establishment and improvement of sport and recreation facilities.	Yes
Provincial City and Regional Bus Operators	4,354,743.12	For passengers eligible to travel at Concessional Rates.	Yes
Various Sporting groups	3,396,400.00	Sport and Recreation Development and Inclusion Program (SRDIP).	Yes
Various Sporting groups	2,948,500.00	Sport and Recreation Sustainability Program (SRSP).	Yes
Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF)	2,358,437.00	Flinders Ports Land Tax equivalent	Yes
Various Sporting groups	2,350,000.00	Active Club Program—For programs, equipment and minor facilities.	Yes
Renewal SA	2,060,000.00	Torrens Riverbank improvement works	Yes
Various Councils	2,049,244.48	Upgrade of Boat ramps and boat launching facilities	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
YMCA of SA	1,598,970.47	Operator subsidy to YMCA for the operation and management of the Parks Community Centre.	Yes
YMCA Aquatic and event services	1,558,725.00	Operator subsidy to YMCA for the operation and management of the South Australian Aquatics and Leisure centre.	Yes
Various Councils	1,545,889.79	Funding provided for road safety works on both Council and SA Government owned roads	Yes
South Australian Primary School children	1,061,465.00	The South Australian government has committed to paying \$50 vouchers to all primary school children as a contribution to school fees.	Yes
Department of Planning Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI)- Development	1,056,511.74	Vibrant City Funding	Yes
DPTI- Development	1,000,000.00	30 Year Plan contribution	Yes
MAC Local Government Initiative Grants.	826,382.00	Grants providing assistance with infrastructure projects identified by local government to provide road safety benefits on Council Roads in accordance with applicable standards published by Austroads and Standards Australia Limited.	Yes
Adelaide Shores	796,809.70	Tax Equivalent Payment	Yes
Centre for Automotive Safety Research (CASR) within the University of Adelaide	700,666.00	CASR funding provided by DPTI and Motor Accident Commission (MAC) for the continuing operation of the Centre for Automotive Safety Research within the University of Adelaide.	Yes
Various Councils	662,594.57	Road section improvements in regional council area	Yes
Kangaroo Island Council	550,000.00	To assist the council with marketing of Kangaroo Island region.	Yes
Various Sporting groups	500,000.00	To construct a state level facility	Yes
National Transport Commission	467,000.00	To contribute to the national road, rail and intermodal transport reform agenda	Yes
Various Community Programs	406,604.00	Community Programs Grants are available to a wide range of stakeholders within the community to deliver travel behaviour change initiatives.	Yes
Various Swimming Facilities	400,368.00	Vacswim program to improve the capacity of each organization to deliver water safety programs.	Yes
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC)—Service SA (SSA)	373,000.00	Road safety enforcement Services Provision	Yes
Renew Adelaide	300,000.00	Contribution to bring together the property sector, creative industries and entrepreneurs to create a vibrant city.	Yes
Great Southern Rail	300,000.00	To assist with the refurbishment and operation of the Overland rail service between Adelaide and Melbourne.	Yes
Department of Environment Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR)	275,000.00	Highbury Aqueduct land management	Yes
Department of Environment Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR)	250,000.00	Land Management—open space reserves at Maslins Beach, Port Willunga and Gawler Buffer	Yes
Naracoorte Lucindale Council	225,001.00	Upgrade of Naracoorte regional livestock exchange	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC)—Service SA (SSA)	224,000.00	Funding Transfer for Workers Compensation	Yes
Netball SA	220,000.00	Netball SA Loan Subsidy	Yes
Kangaroo Island Council	210,000.00	To assist the council with the Kangaroo Island Airport Upgrade business case.	Yes
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC)—Service SA (SSA)	205,000.00	Intra-Government Transfer: Provision of Service by Business Delivery to Marine Operations.	Yes
SA Police	169,100.00	Intra-Government Transfer: Rural Highways saturation policing initiative funding.	Yes
Australasia Railway Corporation (ARRC)—Northern Territory Government	150,000.00	Annual Grant to assist with Australasia Railway Corporation to provide services to the community.	Yes
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC)—Service SA (SSA)	139,000.00	Payment to Service SA for the provision of processing higher volumes of Driver Disqualifications due to the speed bracket offence being revised.	Yes
Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF)	125,736.93	Lincoln Cove Marina	Yes
Regional Anangu Services Aboriginal Corporation	121,206.82	APY Lands Aerodrome Project	Yes
Regional Anangu Services Aboriginal Corporation	114,375.00	Replace solar lighting at Armata, Murputja and Mimilli	Yes
Various Councils	104,380.00	Bus Shelter Program	Yes
SA Sports Federation Inc	100,000.00	Sports Museum Fit out	Yes
Regional Anangu Services Aboriginal Corporation	100,000.00	Umuwa Aerodrome Upgrade Works 2014-15—Project 1	Yes
Keep South Australia Beautiful (KESAB)	81,000.00	Contribution to Litter management across South Australia	Yes
Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board	75,000.00	Annual Payment to the Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board to provide Rail Safety Standards to the community.	No
Regional Anangu Services Aboriginal Corporation	65,000.00	Umuwa Aerodrome Upgrade Works 2014-15—Project 2	Yes
District Council of the Copper Coast	62,826.00	Upgrading of Road Accessing Ferry Terminal	Yes
Hub Adelaide	60,000.00	Spark young entrepreneur program	Yes
Attorney-General's Department (AGD)	58,225.69	Contribution to Administration Support in Minister Rau's Office.	Yes
The Department of the premier and Cabinet (DPC)	48,140.00	Intra-Government Transfer: Contribution for the Jobs for youth program	Yes
Various Sporting Groups	45,000.00	For the delivery of Targeted services for regional clubs and associations	Yes
The University of Adelaide	40,000.00	Student project sponsorship.	Yes



Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Department of Environment Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR)	38,870.00	Land management—open space reserves at Mt Osmond, Harford and St Michaels	Yes
Local Government Association Mutual Liability Scheme	38,562.34	Contribution to the Aerodrome risk management program	No
South Australian National Football League (SANFL)	35,000.00	To support the SANFL to develop a regulatory framework to protect the integrity of football at all levels in South Australia	Yes
Conservation Council of SA	34,755.00	For the development of the environmental sustainability program.	Yes
SA Police	32,625.00	Funding Contribution to the National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council	Yes
Kangaroo Island Council	30,000.00	Installation of tie up points	Yes
Oak Valley (Maralinga) Inc	30,000.00	Oak Valley Aerodrome fencing upgrade	Yes
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC)—Service SA (SSA)	27,000.00	Funding Transfer for Revenue Management Services for south eastern freeway safety cameras	Yes
City of Playford Council	25,000.00	For the implementation of Playford Football Leadership Alliance program.	Yes
Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR)	25,000.00	Intra-Government Transfer: Contribution to Co-operative research centre for low carbon living.	Yes
Williams Burton	20,000.00	Contribution to City Makers—fire safety upgrade	Yes
Conservation Council SA	20,000.00	Contribution to City Makers—fire safety upgrade	Yes
Life without barriers	20,000.00	Contribution to City Makers—accessible toilet facilities	Yes
Basement	20,000.00	Contribution to City Makers—accessible toilet facilities	Yes
Surrender	20,000.00	Contribution to City Makers—Arts event for Fringe 2015	Yes
Fork on the Road	20,000.00	Contribution to City Makers—Food Truck events	Yes
Migrant resource centre	20,000.00	Contribution to City Makers—Arts space for migrant community	Yes
Windmill Theatre	20,000.00	Contribution to City Makers—Public mural on city wall	Yes
World Food Connection	20,000.00	Contribution to City Makers—Activate Central Market entrance	Yes
Format Collective	19,974.00	Contribution to City Makers—accessible toilet facilities	Yes
Austrroads	18,564.00	Funding of National Guidelines for Transport System Management (NGTSM) Review Stage 2	No
Adelaide City Council	17,334.00	Adelaide Parklands Management Strategy	No
Act Now Theatre	17,113.00	Contribution to City Makers—Zombie Apocalypse survival plan	Yes
Contemporary Arts Centre of SA	17,113.00	Contribution to City Makers -Visual Art project	Yes
Regional Anangu Services Aboriginal Corporation	15,496.00	Umuwa Aerodrome Upgrade works 2014-15—Project 1	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Various Horse Racing Groups	15,000.00	For the provision of integrity and animal welfare services within the thoroughbred racing industry in SA	Yes
Digital Market Square	15,000.00	For the Community Connect ME application	Yes
SA Tourism Commission	15,000.00	Intra-Government Transfer: Contribution to the Sweet Streets event as part of Tasting Australia	Yes
Conservation Council SA	15,000.00	Contribution to Conservation Council Planning, transport and infrastructure initiatives.	Yes
Australian Railway Historical Society (SA Div) Inc	13,795.10	Tourism and Heritage Fees—Community Service obligation	Yes
Recreation SA	12,000.00	To support Recreation SA's involvement in a national project to re-establish the national standards for Adventure Activity Standards.	Yes
University of South Australia	11,500.00	Yearly instalment for PHD research study.	Yes
Outback Communities Authority	10,952.00	Regional Aviation Access Program—Remote Airstrip Upgrade—Kingoonya	Yes
Australian Baseball League	10,000.00	To assist with the Australian Baseball League championship series.	Yes

Note that these figures for the department have been audited for the 2014-15 financial year by the Auditor-General's Department.

#### Local Government Grants Commission

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Various councils and community authorities	233,744,673.00	Grants to assist councils to provide important services and critical infrastructure.	No

Note that these figures for the Local Government Grants Commission have not yet been audited for 2014-15 financial year by the Auditor-General's Department.

#### Outback Communities Authority

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Various indigenous and outback communities	287,000.00	To support regional development initiatives, community maintenance and activities.	Yes
Various indigenous and outback communities	72,000.00	To support regional sports projects, youth programs and other small community projects.	No

Note that these figures for the Outback Communities Authority have not yet been audited for 2014-15 financial year by the Auditor-General's Department.

#### Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, for each year of the forward estimates

	BUDGET
Name of Grant Program	2015-16 \$000
Local Government Grants Commission—Finance Assistance Grants	150,160
SAPOL Road Safety Program	39,276
Service SA—Revenue management services	32,723
Open Space and Places for People Grants	17,951

Name of Grant Program	BUDGET
	2015-16 \$000
Subsidies made under the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme (SATTS)	10,883
SA Water—South Road Planning Torrens to Torrens	10,000
Other Intra-government Transfers	8,490
Country Bus and Provincial Concessions	6,218
Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program	4,107
Heavy Vehicle Safety and Productivity Program	3,886
Sport and Recreation Development and Inclusion Program	3,879
Local Government Road Safety Projects—Motor Accidents Commission (MAC)	3,000
Sport and Recreation Sustainability Program	2,609
Active Club Program	2,350
Black Spot Programs Road Safety	2,060
Sports Vouchers	1,977
Local Government—Marine Facilities improvements	1,234
Recreation & Sport grants	1,062
Parks Community Centre Subsidy	899
SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre Subsidy	786
Centre for Automotive Research	721
Local Government and Community Grants—Road safety	509
Residents to Win Program	500
State Facilities Fund	500
Outback Communities Authority	484
National Transport Commission—national road, rail and intermodal transport reform	480
VACSWIM	430
Equal Remuneration Order—Social and Community Sector	262
Tall Ships (One and All & Falie)	229
Other Grants	191
Australasia Rail Corporation Payment	164
Great Southern Rail—Overland Rail Services	150
Local Government City Makers Program	100
KESAB Road Watch Program	76
Jobs for Youth Program	40
Rail Industry Safety Standards Board	39
Local Government Association Aviation Payment	36

Total indicative grants forecast for the forward estimates (\$'000) are:

- 2016-17      \$299,232
- 2017-18      \$303,046
- 2018-19      \$309,958
- 2019-20      \$317,634

Note that:

1. Not all grant funding is allocated to a specific grant program. Allocations are made during the financial year as a result of the finalisation of agreements between the department and relevant stakeholders.

2. Budgets for the forward estimates are not allocated to individual grant recipients as the majority of grants are provided/allocated to recipients during the financial year in which the grant is applied for. Budgets are subject to the annual budget process and final Cabinet endorsement.