

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17 May 2016

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

**The SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

### *Bills*

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

##### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 February 2016.)

**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) (11:02):** I guess I am just concluding the debate on this matter. There was a degree of hysteria at one point in the debate about the question of the way in which information which is held by the courts might be regulated.

As I made clear at the time of moving this bill, that request was made by the Director of Public Prosecutions in response to a very particular unsatisfactory circumstance that the director had encountered. Since that time, I have spoken with the director, and I have invited the director to consider whether other mechanisms might be sufficient to achieve the purpose that the director was concerned about in a different way, and I will consider that matter between the houses.

I do not in any way move away from the notion that somebody can be outraged and wringing their hands about the stupid behaviour of some employees of the health department accessing a health department computer to find personal information about somebody, and the very same people have the complete opposite opinion about busybodies going into court files to find exactly the same information about exactly the same people—I find that absolutely laughable, absurd, and typical of the sort of shallow thinking that arrives here from time to time.

That said, I am going to reflect on whether or not the quite laudable purposes the director had in mind can be achieved in another way. I will reflect on that between this place and the next, and we will see what, if anything, happens when the bill gets elsewhere.

Bill read a second time.

##### *Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [AG-1]—

Page 4, after line 9—After subclause (6) insert:

- (7) Section 32A will come into operation immediately after Schedule 1 Part 1 of the *Youth Justice Administration Act 2016* comes into operation, or on the day on which this Act is assented to by the Governor, whichever is the later.

This amendment provides for the commencement of amendment No. 2 in my name, which inserts section 32A into the portfolio bill. This amendment should not come into operation before schedule 1

of the Youth Justice Administration Act is proclaimed, so the commencement clause has the effect that, first of all, if schedule 1 of the Youth Justice Administration Act is proclaimed prior to this portfolio bill receiving royal assent, section 32A commences on assent. If schedule 1 of the Youth Justice Administration Act has not been proclaimed when this portfolio bill receives royal assent, then section 32A will not commence until the proclamation of the youth justice act, specifically schedule 1.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** In short, we will consent to this, but I do have a couple of questions of the Attorney. What is the progress of the Youth Justice Administration Bill, which is yet to be an act? I do not think it is listed in the other place; I am not sure where it is at.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** That is within the responsibility of another minister. I am not exactly sure where it is up to. I am told that it is in the upper house. That, of course, as one would be aware, is perhaps not a helpful piece of information, but nonetheless that is what I have been told.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Is the minister aware of any reason why that bill is not being progressed by the government's person in charge of business for listing it as a priority bill? I appreciate that we need to have some consistency in the commencement date, I understand that, but I want to know why it has not been progressed. Is there some problem with the advance of that bill by the government (because it is up to your government, Attorney, to do it)?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** As far as I know, there is no problem at all but, as the honourable member would be aware, the government does not have control of the Legislative Council. The council does what it will do in whatever order it wants and take such time as it considers appropriate—for example, the planning bill took six months—so it just depends.

Both of us can make inquiries, but if the question is simply whether the government has the pause button on this, the answer is no. We are not trying to stop this or slow it down or do anything else. Where it sits on our list of priorities at any given moment in time is something I would have to check because, as Attorney-General, I understand I presently have something like 15 bills up there.

Good news: I have just been advised it has just passed. That is good news, breaking news. I was reading from an earlier bulletin. The current news is that it has passed and all is well.

**Ms Chapman:** So do we need this amendment?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, because it has not been proclaimed yet. If the question is: why? I do not know the answer to that, but I can wait for another bulletin if there is one on that particular topic, off the interweb. We will see what we can find out for you, but thank goodness it passed during the course of debate. That was good.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 3 to 7 passed.

New clause 7A.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Chapman-3]—

Page 6, after line 3—After clause 7 insert:

7A—Insertion of section 62A

After section 62 insert:

62A—Attorney-General must consent to minor being charged with offence against this Division

(1) A minor may not be charged with an offence against any provision of this Division unless the Attorney-General consents to the prosecution by notice in writing.

(2) In this section—

*minor* means a person under the age of 18 years.

This is a provision which comes to the parliament essentially while the Summary Offences Act is open, and will make provision for a requirement that if a child—that is, someone defined as under the age of 18 years—is to be charged with child pornography offences, that it be with the consent of the Attorney-General.

The reason this is before the house is because of the excellent work of the Law Society of South Australia in giving consideration to another bill which the parliament is yet to consider; namely, the Summary Offences (Filming and Sexting Offences) Amendment Bill 2016 which is, I think, to follow. That bill will deal with how we manage the use of images, including bare breasts and things of that nature, which are used in a circumstance commonly known as revenge pornography.

This usually arises out of what has been a happy and intimate relationship being fractured and people acting in a silly, at best, and offensive, at worst, manner. This is, therefore, to attract a new regime of penalty—fairly, I think, and I indicate that we will be supporting that bill—to deal with this phenomenon. It should be treated very differently from the behaviour that attracts, potentially, child pornography charges, which are very severe, for good reason, at that end.

The Law Society suggested this in order to reduce the likelihood of a young person being charged with the production or dissemination of child pornography—it might be a photograph of a naked teenager who had sent an intimate photograph of themselves to their boyfriend or girlfriend and then attempted to send it to the world. Certainly, our side of the house supports this. It would place responsibility on the Attorney-General to be the gatekeeper of this, so that we ensure we do not have children caught up in this situation.

I think it is fair to say that where we have criminal offences for conduct, and they are on a graduated basis, you can hit somebody and you get a certain level of offence, but if we go across to more severe assaults on people where there is a factor which attracts reasonably a greater penalty—namely, the victim is injured (the victim might be a vulnerable person, an aged person, a child, etc.)—we have a regime where there is a much stricter level of sentencing. In fact, overlaying that is provision where, if there have been repeat offences, they should attract even greater penalties. So, we have a number of structures that give a variety of offences.

Sometimes a piece of conduct by somebody could be prosecuted as an offence at a number of levels. This will be a measure which, if accepted by the government, will ensure that there is at least a gatekeeper to deal with a child in that circumstance and, in a way, assist in the protection of them being charged with something that is far beyond what really was intended.

Whilst we thank the Law Society for bringing the matter to our attention, the reason it is particularly concerning to us is that, during the course of inquiry and investigation of this bill and the other proposed legislation, we made the inquiry as to whether any child had actually been prosecuted in respect of sending text publications of naked ex-girlfriends or boyfriends to somebody and had been in the firing line under the laws we have already. The answer came back no.

What further inquiry elicited for us was the fact that there had been a young person charged with offences, quite severe I am told but, because they had turned 18 before we had asked the question about whether a child had been prosecuted in these circumstances, we of course got the sanitised answer, namely, no, without disclosing that in fact a child had been prosecuted. Without going into the detail of the nature of the offences by this child, it appears that that was quite severe in the conduct and reasonably attracted a child pornography charge. I do not even know whether it has been finalised, a plea has been entered, or whether there has been a change of prosecution—that is actually academic.

What is important is that if a child is going to be prosecuted for publishing this sort of material, then we have to be clear to ensure that, if it is very serious, yes, they need to take the consequences like anyone else, but we need to protect against that, and one way the Law Society has suggested is for the Attorney-General to have that responsibility. I am not usually rushing in here to give the Attorney-General extra areas of responsibility. I expect that this is a reasonable request and that whoever is the Attorney-General would have that responsibility.

I can remember coming in here and asking for there to be a special provision for a former attorney-general who was in the position at the time to have a new role and right to allow the reinterment and/or cremation of the remains of a dead person (found without a death certificate, because the identification of the skeleton was unclear) without there being a death certificate. I thought that was a reasonable thing for an attorney-general to be able to do, and the then attorney-general accepted that responsibility and it was made into law. As a consequence, we were able to

deal with that to the satisfaction of the living descendants of skeletons that had been found and to have them properly laid to rest.

As I say, it is not a common thing that I would be coming in here to do, but I hope that the Attorney-General will take this on. I do not think it will be onerous, and I suspect that he is likely to say to the parliament, 'We rely on our prosecuting authorities to do the right thing and our police to investigate and report matters; that, in this case, the DPP would take responsibility for prosecution at the senior level; and that he or she should be sufficiently expert and experienced to make the right decision and we should leave it entirely for them as to whether there is a prosecution.'

It does not interfere with ultimately the DPP proceeding with the prosecution, but at least the Attorney-General would have cast their eye over it so that we avoid the situation of putting children who do stupid things potentially at risk (we all know that and that is why we have a juvenile justice system) and who ought not be caught up in the grubby world of child pornography offences, which, sadly, from time to time, a minor does get involved in. I would ask the government to consider this as a worthy amendment and support the same.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I thank the deputy leader for her remarks. First of all, by way of some clarification, as a matter of fact it is the case that occasionally people who are minors do commit really serious offences. The fact that they are minors should not shield them from being prosecuted for those very serious offences, if that is what they are committing. Here I want to make clear that I am distinguishing completely between the disenchanted ex-boyfriend or girlfriend and people who are doing something far more sinister. There is a big difference between those two propositions.

It will remain the case that unfortunately from time to time people under 18 may well—almost perhaps inevitably at some point will—commit those terrible offences, and they need to be charged accordingly. That is point No. 1. Point No. 2 is that, according to my advice, there was a person (one person) who was convicted of such an offence who was under 18 at the time of their conviction and put on the child sex offenders register as a minor. That individual is now no longer a minor. Whereas at one point in time they were a minor on the register, they are now still on the register but no longer a minor because they are older. That might perhaps assist the deputy leader in understanding the information she received.

As to the primary question here, the question as far as I am concerned is: should the Attorney-General of the day have, in effect, a prosecutorial discretion in relation to this and only this particular little piece of criminal law? I do not personally think that it is wise to go around making exceptions to the general proposition that the independent Director of Public Prosecutions makes his or her determination about these matters and that that is where it should be done. If I am not mistaken (and I am sure somebody will correct me), the Attorney already has the power, if they choose to exercise it, to direct the Director of Public Prosecutions in respect of matters anyway. But it is a general power to direct and it is, in effect, a general power to overrule, if you like.

This case actually flips the whole thing around and the director cannot do anything without the permission of the Attorney. I do not think that is good public policy. I certainly do not think it is good public policy to make an exception of that type on a piecemeal basis for different pieces of legislation. I have been here long enough to know that sooner or later, once you have found one good reason to exercise an exception, people come forward out of the woodwork with other good reasons. I remember here, a while ago, in a very progressive piece of law we sought to protect police dogs. You might recall that pretty soon it included—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It could be Koda. But then we discovered that Valiant, Valiant the horse, had been belted during the course of a ride down Hindley Street one evening, and it included other animals. Then we got into a conversation about whether it should include guide dogs and other companion animals, and so on. The point I am trying to make is that once you create one of these exceptions, or these special circumstances, the question is: if that is so special, what about this? I have discovered that everyone has a good reason why their thing is special.

My view is that if we had an instance where the Attorney of the day was of the view that the director had made a mistake in prosecuting or intending to prosecute somebody for one of these offences, the Attorney does already have the capacity, in effect, to direct the director otherwise. I

think that sort of extreme general proposition, which has certainly not been used in my time, is all that we need because I would rather trust in the prosecutorial discretion being exercised by those independent people.

Also, if you look at it from the perspective of the Attorney-General of the day, why would the Attorney-General want to get involved in a decision to prosecute or not prosecute an individual? This is politicising a prosecution.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Well, it is. It is politicising the prosecutorial determination, which I think, as a matter of principle, is a bad idea. I just do not think it is a good idea. For that reason, I do not support this proposal. But, to the extent that the member for Bragg was saying that there are obviously some people who should be prosecuted for a minor offence because of the nature of their offending, I completely agree with her on that. Obviously that is right, and that is part of the reason we are doing this sexting bill. I entirely agree with that, but I am confident that the director and his team of people are perfectly capable of making those determinations themselves.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I thank the Attorney for at least considering the matter. I just place on the record that it would be concerning to me that we progress to deal with a new level, a lower level, of offences to deal with a very contemporary and pressing problem and not act to ensure that we shield young people, particularly, against unfairly having the book thrown at them at the serious end.

The Law Society, I am sure, would have made clear to the Attorney that obviously we are dealing with a child offender. We have to accept that they are less mature. We have to accept that they do silly things and that they may frustrate and act in a manner which is rude and offensive towards law enforcement officers over a sustained period, for example, and get on the wrong side of them and be in a situation where they are charged at a serious level.

Now, that can happen, and I raise the question: how on earth would the Attorney know about it until we ended up in trials with a child who has been already charged? There would be no obligation even to tell the Attorney. Whilst he has advised the house—and I accept he is quite right—that the Attorney-General does have this power to direct a director of public prosecutions, at least by a majority decision, if my memory serves me, the former chief justice dissented on that ruling.

Nevertheless, it is law that the Attorney-General has power to direct. I think the basis of that case was to direct that there be an appeal against a sentence in a particular case. It may have been against the finding but, in any event, it was very controversial at the time. I am not aware of any circumstances since where it has been exercised. I think it has been threatened a few times and there have been calls on attorneys-general to direct the DPP to do certain things.

Whether it has actually been exercised or whether there has been some wise counsel extended, and a view of implementation by the DPP which is considered consistent with that, I am not here to debate. But I make the point that it would be too late after a 15 year old has been dragged through the prosecution process for a very serious offence to then have the Attorney-General come in at some later date to try to rescue the circumstance. I think that is unfair.

I think this is a worthy amendment. I am disappointed. We will have to trust that the law enforcement agencies will always act responsibly, which we obviously hope occurs, and it is a matter which we may need to revisit, if in fact there is a circumstance where that abuse that has been foreshadowed may occur.

New clause negatived.

Clauses 8 to 18 passed.

Clause 19.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Chapman–2]—

Page 7, page 8, lines 20 to 29 [Part 7, clause 19]—Delete Part 7

The position is, as we have canvassed in the debate, that the effect of this amendment and the two to follow is to remove the government's proposal to make it more difficult to have accessibility to court records. Each of these amendments deals with the District Court, the Supreme Court and the Magistrates Court, as outlined in the bill, in part 12 for the Magistrates Court and part 17 for the Supreme Court.

I will not traverse the reasons why it is necessary to maintain the position that we have, but I want to place on record what we already have in the Evidence Act, and I will do that in a moment. I just want to say initially that I am pleased to hear that the Attorney is prepared to review this situation. He makes the point, as we did in debate (and I think he initially made the claim in his second reading contribution) that this suite of amendments to restrict access to court records came about as a result of one case. It is very public. It has been on the front page of the paper and it related to the—

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

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Well, health department. I will just go as far as that. You have repeated that, again. We did in debate but, in any event, I do not need to make names about it, but the issue surrounded the right of the media and others to have access to superior court records and consequently a very public disclosure that a number of people had accessed health records, and they were being investigated, and the like, and there was much public discourse about this.

I am disappointed in relation to that, that the government has not actually acted to ensure that we better protect our health records. I think that there are some legislative reform opportunities there, and certainly on our side of the house we are considering that. In essence, this was a case where an application had been made to have access to records. The DPP's opposition to have access to court records had been met with a response by the court to allow access to material but not the publication of it. That is not an uncommon way of dealing with matters, particularly if there are pending procedures in a superior court of a criminal nature.

The DPP, I suggest, had the opportunity to have that matter reviewed at a higher level under the appeal process. If he had elected to do that, he may have received a remedy different from what he got or failed to get. As a consequence of this one case, the DPP has contacted the Attorney-General and said, 'I want this fixed. I want this resolved,' as a result of one case. I suggest that he had other options to have it dealt with if he had followed that properly.

It seems that when the government, through the Attorney, comes into the parliament and says, 'We need to deal with busybodies going into court records', understand this: we have a court system which is supposed to be open and transparent. The very way in which we run our courts—except in exceptional circumstances—is that they are open to scrutiny, and the best way of doing that, just like us here in the parliament, is to allow people to know what is going on.

We do not have star chambers in South Australia in respect of court prosecutions. We may have parts of evidence that is given with the public excluded, etc., and we have restrictions on publication of material, and all those things, but we start with the premise that they are open courts. They always say that sunshine is the best disinfectant, but it is very important and it is a very important principle.

Just in the last breath of the Attorney-General on the previous amendment, we had, 'I'm not going to have exceptions. I'm not going to make a law in relation to just one situation. I'm not going to breach the independence, etc., of the DPP or police prosecuting matters and have some executive interference in that,' yet here in the next breath he is acknowledging that he is introducing legislation as a result of one case, which, frankly, should have been dealt with in a different way. If the DPP is not happy with the decision of the courts, he has his remedies.

To rush down here through the Attorney-General and ask to have the law changed for everyone because he was unsuccessful in what was, in his view, inappropriate publication of material, ultimately leading to the discovery and disclosure of another scandalous situation, is a problem for him and the government, not for the legislature. That said, I still say that at least the Attorney has recognised that there may be some other ways to deal with this. He is prepared to have a look at it between the houses, and I thank him for that.

For the sake of the record, I want to record for the parliament that, under our Evidence Act of 1929, there is already provision under division 10 for sensitive material. Section 67G of that act provides that dealing with access to sensitive material can be actually viewing it, copying it, having it electronically conveyed or, indeed, transmitting it, and there is considerable authority as to a procedure for its protection.

Under 67H—Meaning of sensitive material, an image of a person is sensitive if it is of a person engaged or apparently engaged in a private act, or if it is of a victim, or alleged victim, of a sexual offence or an offence of stalking under section 19AA of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act or it is taken or made after the person's death. Section 67I then prescribes procedures for the restriction of access to sensitive material. The process there, in short, allows for applications to be made to protect it and to ensure that it is not published. It may be that we look to some amendment to that; we would certainly consider it. There are also, obviously, penalties for the improper dissemination of sensitive material.

It seems to me that, at the moment, we have a process that allows for courts to operate in an open and transparent way and for people to find out who has been prosecuted, what they have been charged with and the circumstances as to the pleadings in relation to that conduct, and we are dealing only with criminal matters here. People do have the right to know that. These people might be employed in an environment where other workers might be at risk. There may be family members who need to know if somebody has been charged with certain offences, etc.

That is why we have an open and transparent court system and we have a set of structures which give a number of powers to the DPP and the courts to protect sensitive material or material that might otherwise prejudice other proceedings and the like. Use them: we have them. We will look at some other amendments if the Attorney comes up with them, but to simply use this case to expel people from access to that material through the proper process is wrong and I look forward to seeing his alternative model.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I have said a bit about this before, so I will not labour the point. I agree absolutely that we do need to be in a society where our courts are open, and that means you can find out whether a person is charged by looking at the cause list. You can find out what is going on in the case, if you are that interested, by picking yourself up, wandering down to Victoria Square and dropping yourself in the courtroom. You can listen until the cows come home and hear any evidence that is led in the court and you can report on it as much as you like. I do not have a problem with that at all.

What I do have a problem with—and what I think is unfair—is busybodies wandering down to the court records and pulling things out and reading them in circumstances where those things are never, perhaps, a matter for an open court hearing. They are behind-the-scenes things which may never get out, and I would ask the member for Bragg this question. There is one court that I know of where proceedings are secret, basically, and for damn good reason.

**Ms Chapman:** Youth Court.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Family Court. Why is it that all of those proceedings are not there for everyone to see? The answer is obvious, and we do not seem to have a problem about that. Not being able to say anything about what goes on there does not render the Family Court or the Youth Court a Star Chamber. By the way, I support both of those things. I completely agree with that. It would be outrageous if we were to be reporting what goes on in either of those places, for very good reason.

All I am saying, and all this was attempting to deal with, was the fact that in our other courts if something is not actually in court and you are too lazy to sit in court yourself and listen to it, or get hold of the transcript or whatever it is, but leave that aside, it is not—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It's not even in court—not even in court. It is just being a busybody and in circumstances where the person about whom you are being a busybody is not even told that you are seeking to intrude into matters which might be very sensitive indeed from their point of view. It

could include, for example, medical records. It could include all sorts of information which is very personal to that person and may ultimately not be necessary to be led in court.

I think it is an entirely reasonable point but, as I indicated before, I am prepared to look at alternatives. If we can find an alternative way of providing some sort of decorum for people, albeit people who are charged with criminal offences, then I think we should try to do that, but let's see how we go between the houses.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 20 to 23 passed.

New clause 23A.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Chapman–1]—

Page 9, after line 35—After clause 23 insert:

23A—Substitution of section 11

Section 11—delete the section and substitute:

11—Duration of intervention orders

- (1) A final intervention order remains in force—
  - (a) for a period of 5 years or such lesser period as may be fixed by the Court—
    - (i) that confirms the interim intervention order as a final intervention order under section 23; or
    - (ii) that issues the final intervention order under section 23 in substitution for an interim intervention order,
 

(as the case may be); or
  - (b) until it is revoked in accordance with this Act,
 

whichever occurs first.
- (2) An interim intervention order remains in force—
  - (a) until confirmed by the Court under section 23; or
  - (b) until it is revoked in accordance with this Act,
 

whichever occurs first.
- (3) Subject to subsection (4), this section applies to an intervention order—
  - (a) that was issued before or after the commencement of subsection (1); or
  - (b) that was continued in force under clause 37 of Schedule 1; or
  - (c) that was issued pursuant to the *Bail Act 1985*, the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*, the *Youth Court Act 1993* or any other Act.
- (4) An intervention order issued more than 5 years prior to the commencement of this section will, by force of this subsection, be taken to be revoked on the day falling on the 6 month anniversary of the commencement of this section (however nothing in this subsection prevents a person from applying for another intervention order in relation to the same defendant).

I indicate that this is a replica of the legislation which was before the house as a private member's bill. As I indicated during the course of the debate on this bill, I have now sought to transfer that proposition in the same terms as the amendment while the legislation is open. This relates to the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009, which is now open for consideration.

In short, this provides for a fixed term, essentially, for intervention orders. The reform in this area when we debated the matter back in 2007, 2008 and 2009 was to allow for the intervention orders just simply to continue in force without having any automatic expiry date. I am pretty sure it was the Courts Administration Authority annual report that recommended that this situation ought not continue and there ought to be a time frame. It suggested that, for the final order, that be up to



five years. Of course, that means you can apply to revoke it in the meantime, but the consequence of us having undetermined intervention orders is that a large number of them have accumulated and are clogging up the system.

What is actually happening, and this was something that was the subject of some discussion at the time, is that although the intention was to relieve the victim, or the person seeking protection under an intervention order from having to go back to the court to continue to extend orders, the victim may move; in fact the person who is the subject of the intervention order may move address or state, or the circumstances may change and it is just simply left there and is of no actual benefit any longer. There is not any action by either the victim or the offender to go and seek relief from it, but it still sits there in the system. The recommendation comes from the Courts Administration Authority, and I would ask the government to consider supporting the same.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** The deputy leader raises a very important issue, and I actually share some of her concerns about this matter because there is no doubt that at one end of the spectrum there are completely redundant orders that are clogging up the system. I have no doubt about that whatsoever.

The question is: are they all redundant orders after five years? The answer to that question is almost certainly no. That then raises the question: how does one sort the first group from the second? Is the utilisation of an arbitrary time period, although not ridiculous, the appropriate way to do that? I am not convinced at the moment that that is the case. I do acknowledge, and agree with the deputy leader, that this is an issue. It is something we need to grapple with. I do not think it is satisfactory that what happens presently should continue indefinitely to happen, because what we are doing is building up a mountain of these orders and eventually there will be trouble caused by that.

We are in the process of preparing a discussion paper on domestic violence. The matter that has been referred to in this particular amendment is one of the topics that that paper will seek to agitate. I would like to see what a broader community exposure to this brings up. There are people in this space who view things from a perspective of ideology, and there are people who view things from a perspective of practicality, common sense and so on. I am not sure at the moment what the practical common-sense answer is to the undoubted problem that the deputy leader raises.

There would be some who would say, 'Well, so what? Just let them mount up.' I am not in that camp. I do not agree with that. That said, I am not yet sufficiently sure of my ground to be confident that this is the correct way to address that problem. I oppose it, but I do not oppose it completely and conceptually and philosophically. I oppose it simply because, at this point in time, I do not think we have sufficiently teased this one out to get the best possible answer. This may be an answer, but I am not satisfied it is the best possible answer at this point in time. Obviously, any step we take in this area will require the courts to change the way they do things. You would not just bring this in as an interim proposition for the fun of it. For that reason, I oppose it.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I note the Attorney-General's indication that this matter will be canvassed in his forthcoming discussion paper. I look forward to receiving a copy of the same. Let's hope the matter can be resolved in that orderly manner.

New clause negatived.

Clauses 24 to 32 passed.

New clause 32A.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I move:

Amendment No 2 [AG-1]—

Page 12, after line 26—After clause 32 insert:

32A—Amendment of section 79A—Rights on arrest

Section 79A(1a)(c)—delete 'a person nominated by the Chief Executive Officer within the meaning of the *Family and Community Services Act 1972*' and substitute:

a person, or a person of a class, nominated by the Chief Executive within the meaning of the *Youth Justice Administration Act 2016*

This is a consequential amendment to section 79A of the Summary Offences Act, and it was sought to be made by the Youth Justice Administration Act. However, as a result of a drafting error, the amendment as it appears in that act will be of no effect. This amendment is in exactly the same terms as the section in the Youth Justice Administration Act. This portfolio bill already amends the Summary Offences Act, and the amendment will be inserted into the right part of the portfolio bill under the right heading.

By way of background, the amendment was and is part of a series of amendments consequential to the commencement of the Youth Justice Administration Act, which broadly speaking transfers powers and responsibilities undertaken by the minister and the chief executive within the meaning of the Family and Community Services Act to the minister and chief executive within the meaning of the Youth Justice Administration Act.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** We support the amendment.

New clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (33 to 37) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**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) (11:58):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**SUMMARY OFFENCES (FILMING AND SEXTING OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 March 2016.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:58):** I rise to speak on the Summary Offences (Filming and Sexting Offences) Amendment Bill 2016 and indicate that the opposition will be supporting this bill. However, I indicate that there will be amendments which I will canvass in the course of the contribution I propose to make.

The bill before us seeks to amend the Summary Offences Act 1953 and generally is in response to an increase in young people sending sexually explicit material, normally via their mobile phone (otherwise known as sexting), and is also in response to what is commonly called 'revenge pornography'. Revenge pornography is the publication of explicit material depicting someone who has not consented to that publication and with the intent of causing them humiliation, embarrassment and the like. The government recognised that this was a matter that did need to be addressed, and I think issued a discussion paper—or it may have even been the bill at that stage—late last year for public comment and consideration.

Essentially, the bill now before us does two things: it applies the current offence of distribution of an invasive image to children offenders as well as adults, and it also provides a separate penalty if the images depict a minor. The existing penalty for distribution will remain a \$10,000 fine or up to a two-year imprisonment penalty. Where the image is of a minor, the penalty will be a \$20,000 fine or up to four years' imprisonment.

The second thing the bill does is propose a new offence of threatening to distribute an invasive image or an image obtained from indecent filming. This will apply to a person who was intending to provoke fear that the threat will be carried out and who was recklessly indifferent to whether that fear was provoked. In this area, if the image is of a minor, the penalty will be a \$10,000

fine or up to two years' imprisonment, and in any other case a \$5,000 fine or up to one year's imprisonment.

In order to avoid the criminalisation of the distribution of innocent images of minors, the definition of 'invasive image' in the bill excludes an image of a person who falls within the standards of morality, decency and propriety generally accepted by reasonable adults in the community; that is the wording that is used in the bill. The government claims that the bill will give prosecutors a better range of offences, as currently offences involving invasive images depicting children under 18 years can usually only be charged under the child exploitation material offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

The penalties for child exploitation are much higher and include a different definition of the offending material and, as we explored in a previous bill before the parliament this morning, it is important to recognise what we are dealing with as being quite distinct and not within the area of criminal sanction against conduct that relates to child exploitation. That is a serious and universally condemned conduct and it has very serious penalties attached to it.

The Law Society had considered it in its Women Lawyers Committee, Children and the Law Committee and Criminal Law Committee, together with the University of Adelaide Law School, and generally the society is supportive of the bill. As I indicated, so are we. However, the Law Society did consider that the Criminal Law Consolidation Act prosecutions should only be progressed against a minor with the consent of the Attorney-General. We have presented that opportunity in a preceding bill to the government and they have declined it.

However, I make the point that when we are introducing this legislation with the new level of offences, for the reasons which have been laid out and which we accept, it is important that we do protect people against being inappropriately prosecuted for the more serious offences, particularly if the alleged offender is a minor. There was, however, reference to two other matters that were raised with us; one is that, in reference to the definitions in respect of publication of breasts, they should be explicitly defined as 'bare breasts'.

The complication that comes with providing for the offence to relate to breasts is that they can be partially exposed and would be caught by the definition in the offence. I say this on the basis that it is a fair assessment that, in the contemporary world, seeing a partially disclosed female breast of a mature female when wearing a bikini top, a bra or some partial covering may be offensive to some people but largely is accepted by the community as being a reasonable vision, and one that is certainly permitted and frequently paraded in person, in literature, in advertising and the like.

If the covering is particularly scanty or transparent, it starts to blur the lines; nevertheless, I think it is fair to say that in 2016 it is a very different approach from 1916, when of course, unless you were covered neck to knee, it was going to cause public offence. We need to be clear that we are talking about naked, exposed breasts, displaying the nipples, etc., and that offences in this criminal sanction of the Summary Offences Act should not be attracted unless we have that category. I foreshadow that I will be moving that amendment.

The second thing that has been brought to our attention, which I think it is fair to say we had a pretty longstanding stoush with the government over in the surveillance devices legislation, is what the definition of a media organisation should be. The government has reverted to form and in this bill presented a definition which we do not consider adequate. The Attorney-General is fully aware of what we are referring to, and I foreshadow that we will propose an amendment to include a definition of 'media organisation' consistent with that which was ultimately accepted by the parliament.

It was certainly one which took the Attorney-General a little time to ultimately accept, but he did so, and that bill has now passed and I think is on its way to being proclaimed, if it has not been already. It may be that this was a matter which the Attorney thought that he could get away with by placing the other definition of 'media organisation'. It may be that the drafting of this bill had occurred at a time when we had not concluded the resolution of the definition of 'media organisation' in the other bill. I will give the Attorney the benefit of the doubt, but I will soon know if he comes back into the debate on this matter with any assertion that he objects to this amendment because it will flag to me that perhaps the former was the case.

I am ever hopeful that he has understood the importance of having media definition in a general manner which, as I say, is consistent with current commonwealth legislation and it is consistent with the Surveillance Devices Act which we have recently amended and in which a definition in exactly these terms has been approved. As I say, I will be moving that amendment as well. Otherwise, I indicate that the opposition will be supporting the bill.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:10):** I rise to make a contribution on this piece of legislation. In doing so, I want to take a step back and to look more broadly at the types of things that we are seeking to do here. Society has changed greatly over the last 30 or 40 years, and even in the last 20 years, when the advent of technology has changed the fundamental way that humans interact with each other. As a civilised society, we rely on levels of discretion and levels of privacy in order for us to remain a cohesive cohort of people living in often quite close quarters to each other, and that is an important principle that needs to be looked after. I refer to a quote by Ayn Rand who said:

Civilisation is the progress toward a society of privacy. The savage's whole existence is public, ruled by the laws of his tribe. Civilisation is the process of setting man free from men.

That is a philosopher's way of pointing out that privacy is quite a modern construct when you look at the history of the earth and the history of mankind, but privacy is one of the fundamental underpinnings of how we as a society have been able to function and are able to grow into a modern, prosperous people.

The reason it is important is that living in a civilised society requires us to suppress some of our more basic instincts, to suppress some of our more—as Ayn Rand puts it—'savage instincts'. There is a whole series of laws which again we are debating today, and a criminal code, that asks us to suppress sometimes base emotional instincts that we otherwise have. A very simple example is that violence is not an appropriate way to express your feelings in, basically, any circumstance save and except for things like self-defence and others.

Privacy, as a principle to a civilised society, adds to that. Whilst we are suppressing our base human instinct in a whole variety of ways, privacy allows us—in the privacy of our own homes, in the privacy of our own minds—to take ownership of our own thought. As we have seen society evolve and as we have seen technology evolve, we as parliaments are confronted with new challenges. If you were sunbaking naked in your backyard 50 years ago, the worst thing that could happen was that your neighbour popped his head over the fence. If he or she decided to go and get a camera to take a photograph of you doing that, it was quite a difficult, laborious process. Also, 50 or 60 years ago most people did not have cameras.

**Mr Duluk:** Yes, they did.

**Mr KNOLL:** Sorry; they did have cameras, but not in the proliferation that we see them today. Whereas now we see the ability of anybody with a smart phone to be able to take a photo over the fence, or sometimes more accidental footage is taken especially with regard to drones, for instance, flying over the top of people's houses. There is an example of a real estate agent's drone taking a photograph of somebody sunbaking in their backyard in Melbourne. There is a whole host of examples where the nature of privacy in our civilised society is changing and where our laws need to catch up.

What we are dealing with today is a very specific example of the ability of young people to communicate images of themselves to their friends, and then the potential misuse of those images. Again, this is something that would have been much more difficult in times gone by. If you think about times gone by, instead of being able to send a text to all your friends or putting up an image on a website that should not otherwise be put up, you would have had to do things like photocopy or pass a photograph around to your friends.

We now have the ability to damage others much more easily and much more freely, and our default right or our default presumption of privacy is being eroded. Again, as parliaments, we need to make sure that we stay on top of these things. Frustratingly, I think we are dealing with these things in quite a piecemeal way. Without detracting from the fact that I think this piece of legislation is reasonable and that we on this side support it, we need to look at this a little bit more holistically.

I will go back to some other examples around the Surveillance Devices Act that we passed here last year. It was a fantastic piece of legislation which I have been supportive of for quite a long time, and it was exciting to see it passed. Again, it brought back a presumption of privacy or a right to privacy that did not otherwise exist before—the idea that, when we are in a private space, we should have a reasonable presumption to having privacy within that space and, indeed, that what happens within that space cannot legally be recorded.

What we are dealing with today is slightly different, but along the same vein: the fact that modern technology gives rise to breeches of what people would otherwise have a right to consider private. When one person shares a private image of themselves with another person, they do that under the presumption that that image will remain private. Indeed, it is up to the person who takes it to determine who they disseminate that image to. Unfortunately, again with modern technology, that decision can be taken away from them, and that is why I think that what we are doing here today is an important piece of work, except that we are again dealing with this in a rather piecemeal fashion.

I know that the South Australian Law Reform Institute has looked at privacy in a much broader way. Indeed, they have made a series of recommendations that I hope at some point in the future we will be debating in a more holistic sense, because I think we in South Australia—and this is an issue that is not just confined to us but happens in jurisdictions all across the world—are playing catch-up when it comes to privacy.

That fundamental presumption of privacy that people would have had in times gone past no longer exists. As a younger MP in this place and as somebody who has lived a reasonable amount of my life on the internet, I certainly understand these things more than most. However, as a parliament, I think it would be exciting if we were to actually deal with this not only in a much more holistic fashion but also in a way that gives some completeness, that is maybe technologically agnostic, so that we are not simply playing catch-up when a new piece of technology comes into play.

I would like to see us create a set of rules that will endure as the pace of technological change increases so that we can actually provide a platform on which our civilised society can remain civilised. I think it is extremely important for the future prosperity of all civilisations around the world that we get this right. Not to get too extremist, but every civilisation that has gone before us has failed for one reason or another; and not to go through the history of the Roman Empire or—

**Mr Treloar:** Days are numbered.

**Mr KNOLL:** That's right, yes. But suffice to say that we have been extraordinarily successful, the most successful civilisation in the history of man, in being able to create and change our world and deliver better living standards for our people. We have the longest life expectancy that we have ever had, and that is again an extremely recent phenomenon. We have more leisure time and we are richer. As modern societies, especially in First World societies like Australia, this is the greatest time to be alive.

**Mr Treloar:** In Australia.

**Mr KNOLL:** It's the greatest time to be alive in Australia, certainly, but we need to be careful that we continue to protect the gains that we have made. I think in my lifetime certainly we are going to deal with challenges, and whether it be climate change, whether it be changes to energy consumption patterns, or whether it be the fact that we hit resource limits in a variety of different areas that force us to look at alternative ways of doing things, I would hate to see the breakdown of our civilisation in my lifetime. That may sound extremist, except whether it be extreme climate change, whether it be nuclear war, whether it be world war more generally, there are a number things that we need to consider.

As much as privacy may not seem like it is up there, I genuinely do believe that it is, because a breakdown of that privacy I think will lead to a less cohesive society, a more lawless society, and one in which we do not show respect for each other in the way that we should, or indeed have the opportunities to privately disrespect each other in a way that is not apparent to those we are seeking to disrespect, if that makes sense.

So whilst I applaud the intent of this bill and, again, it is something that we are supporting, I would urge us as legislators to look more broadly at this issue, because otherwise we are going to be debating piecemeal bits of legislation like this on an ongoing basis for generations to come, all the while not looking far enough ahead so that we can actually prepare our society for what is happening and what is to come, thereby not doing right by the people whom we are elected to serve.

We have an amendment that is going to be put forward by the shadow attorney in relation to the fact that any charges of pornography that are to be brought against a minor need the prior written consent of the Attorney-General. The current Attorney-General is someone, as long as he avails himself of what new technology looks like, I think will be well placed to rule on these matters. But, again, whilst we are seeking to have the law keep up with the pace of technological change, we also need to make sure that the law does not otherwise capture those who view privacy and technology slightly differently.

I look at the younger generation who have grown up with technology. I have a 3½-year-old child at home who is able to turn on an iPad, find the ABC iView app, find ABC Kids and find her latest *Bing* episode within 15 seconds, and she cannot read yet, but she is able to use a piece of technology. She is able to find photographs of herself on the iPad and scroll through them and then we have to recount the stories. My point is that they do not have a fear of technology, but they also potentially do not understand its consequences, and that is where we as legislators need to help them understand those consequences or provide a framework in which those consequences are appropriate.

So when you have two minors who send back and forth to each other images of a private nature, does that mean that they are disseminating pornography? In this instance, we are suggesting that there needs to be discretion built into the system; that the Attorney-General is potentially the right person to hold that discretion; that whilst seeking to reinforce the presumption of privacy that should exist within a civilised society, we also have enough discretion within the system to ensure that it does not capture those whom we are not seeking to capture; and, indeed, that we find the right path forward in this otherwise difficult and vexed area of public policy.

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:24):** I also rise today to speak in support of the Summary Offences (Filming and Sexting Offences) Amendment Bill 2016. Technology has obviously changed and continues to change. With that change in technology, we as legislators always need to be on the front foot to ensure that we are able to set the necessary boundaries for our community, for the conduct of those in our area.

The mischief which this bill is seeking to prevent and avoid is clear, namely, the distribution of intimate and pornographic images of another person without their consent. I believe that the bill adequately cracks down on revenge porn and the distribution of such images. The new laws target people who not only distribute or seek to distribute the explicit images, but also those who threaten to distribute an invasive image. Sometimes, the threat is more potent than actually carrying out the conduct, so I am glad that the Attorney and his department have sought that coverage in the bill.

As the member for Schubert alluded to, with technology emerging as rapidly as it is, and with so many young people having access to a phone with colour images, the sending of this type of image has become much easier to do. So, it is essential that laws are updated to keep in touch with the technology as it changes. There has been an offence set up under the bill for sending a picture depicting a person 17 years or under which would now carry a maximum penalty of \$20,000 or four years' imprisonment. I believe the bill will also give those who have authority to prosecute much greater flexibility, and many more offences will be available for prosecution to reflect the changing nature of the prospective offending.

I note that there has been public consultation sought on the bill and there has been support across the board. It is dangerous to assume that some young offenders who deal with such explicit material are simply naive or misguided, because sometimes they go far beyond that, and there are some who are out there to inflict damage through the distribution of these images.

The types of images that will be captured by this bill can all too often be used as a means of not only harassment but also bullying and revenge. Too often we see cases where young people are actually being bullied through this type of mechanism. In some instances, suicides have been caused

because young people feel so depressed by the bullying. Unfortunately, this type of behaviour has been caused by revenge porn and sexting, so it is important that we legislate against this type of behaviour.

We all know that once an image hits cyberspace and is in the internet history it is there forever, and we are certainly sending a clear message to young people that they need to understand this. I am sure that the legislation by itself will not necessarily solve this very difficult and complex issue. I think this proposed bill has a significant role to set the boundaries that society will tolerate, and to send a clear message as to the appropriate code of conduct in this regard.

I have noticed that when you look at other jurisdictions around the world, they have been quick off the mark to legislate against this type of behaviour, and so it is only fitting that South Australia now follow suit. I had a look at some statistics provided from an American study, a joint study by the National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy and CosmoGirl, which actually suggested that 20 per cent of teens aged 13 to 19, and 33 per cent of young adults aged 20 to 26, have shared nude or semi-nude pictures of themselves, either by text message or online posting.

The study has gone on to say that teen girls were slightly more likely to do this than the boys. In the study, 11 per cent of the young teen girls admitted to sending suggestive photos of themselves. This is a significant issue. Whilst we do not need to panic that it is as prevalent here in Australia, it is a significant issue. That is why we as legislators must do all we can to prevent this kind of behaviour and to set the relevant standards in place.

The bill refines, and also updates, the offences in part A of the Summary Offences Act of 1953, and those offences pertain to filming in response to sexting. Apart from that, the bill also amends section 26C of the Summary Offences Act, so that the offence in that section of distributing an invasive image will actually apply to images where the party depicted is under the age of 17. As I said, under the bill, the distribution of an invasive image of a minor will be a very serious criminal offence, and it will attract a fine of up to \$20,000 or imprisonment of four years.

I think there is wide scope there given to a court to award a penalty, if it sees fit, that is in line with the offence. We all know that these types of images can cause significant damage to one's credibility. Whilst there are other means available to a victim, often that damage is done. I think that penalty is fitting of the crimes committed. I seek to support the bill. As I said, the technology in this area has moved quite rapidly. I welcome the government's response to the change in technology, and I think this bill certainly adequately sets the appropriate boundaries for behaviour in place. I commend it to the house.

**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) (12:32):** I thank all of those who have contributed. I will just say a few very brief words. First of all, the member for Schubert went to some lengths to deal with the significance in his mind of the role of privacy in our contemporary society. I can only say that I agree with him, and I look forward to his continued interest in that topic over the months ahead because it is a matter, I think, of great importance and hopefully a matter this parliament can turn its mind to.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes. Watch this space. Anyway, on this particular proposition here, I welcome the general support from the opposition as well, obviously, and I—

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order! I just can't hear the Attorney. Thank you.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It is always hard to compete with the member for Wright. I just wanted to look at the context in which we are now pursuing this. I welcome the fact that the opposition has indicated general support for this. There has been indication of two proposed amendments. The first of them I am happy to reflect on in the course of the matter going forward. I listened with interest to

the comments made by the deputy leader about contemporary views of breasts, and I am open to being persuaded; I will think about that one between the houses.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I understand, and my present inclination is that it was quite a persuasive argument. That is my present inclination, but I need time to reflect on it. As to the second of the amendments, I would like to put this in a bit of context. Section 26A is the section of the Summary Offences Act with which we are dealing, and section 26A presently deals with humiliating and degrading images.

That is a matter we dealt with some time ago, and I will just remind people what that is. These are images of a person who is the victim of an assault or an act of violence, or an act that reasonable adult members of the community would consider to be humiliating or degrading to such a person (but does not include an act that reasonable adult members of the community would consider to cause only minor or moderate embarrassment).

Remember, this was actually harking back to the days when students at a school victimised a young person at the school purely for the purpose of filming the victimisation of that child, and then putting that onto—

**Ms Chapman:** Luckily they did, otherwise nobody would have known about it.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** True; a good point. Nevertheless, the whole purpose of that exercise was to procure that film. So just as we say that child exploitation material should neither be consumed nor produced, so we say, in respect of this sort of material, that it should neither be consumed nor produced. That is already there.

The next thing that is already there is protection of an invasive image of a person. This came from the old (in the vernacular of the time) 'upskirting' type of legislation that was floating around, and I will give the definition because it is relevant. An invasive image means an image of a person:

(a) engaged in a private act; or

(b) in a state of undress such that the person's bare genital or anal region is visible,

but does not include—

and this where our amendment starts—

an image of a person under...the age of 16 years...

That is what we are talking about. We have already covered humiliating or degrading; it is already there. It is already there to deal with an image which is regarded as invasive.

What we are doing is actually extending coverage to people who are younger, and we are adding in a new term, 'an invasive image', and an invasive image is that of a person engaged in a private act or a person in a state of such undress, as in the case of a female, that the breasts are visible, or any bare genital or anal region, etc. We have also added in here the threat to reveal such an image. So it is the sending of such an image, the transmission of such an image without a person's consent, and also the threat to do so.

The reason I have laboured that at some length is to point out the fact that the second amendment being suggested by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is both completely unsatisfactory and, with the greatest of respect, absurd. It is unsatisfactory because even if we were dealing with anything else, the fact is that we already have a definition in section 26 of a media organisation. It is one that has been there for some time; it is in 26B(9). It already defines a media organisation, and that is a definition that the government accepts.

We do not accept weakening that definition, which is already the operative definition for 'humiliating and degrading' and the operative definition for 'invasive'. The amendment that is sought to be moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would weaken the position for those two things and then lower them to the new lower standard being set in these circumstances: first objection.

The second objection is that there is no doubt that the definition of media organisation in 26B(9) refers to responsible, large, accountable media organisations. The definition which is being



sought to be moved in amendment No. 2 basically could include any self-styled commentator, blogger, or whomever you like, on the internet, not responsible people, inasmuch as they are out there in the media, who are not people captured by the definition presently in the legislation.

The third point I would like to make on this is: could somebody please explain to me why anybody in the media would think it is in the public interest to go around broadcasting images of people engaged in a private act (this is without their permission) or in a state of undress such that their bare genital or anal region is visible (without their permission), or where there is an assault or other act of violence against the person? It might be possible that a responsible media organisation might do that if the police ask for assistance in identifying an offender—I accept that. Then we get to the question of invasive image, which again is the same thing.

The whole business about pandering to Free TV and other lobbies should not take precedence in every instance over making sure that this is actually supposed to be protecting somebody from something. It is not supposed to be giving busybodies an excuse to go around publishing whatever they want to publish about people on the internet or anywhere else. There is a fundamental point of difference here: it is just not okay.

The first bit I am quite happy to talk about—the full breast or the partial breast. I am happy to have a conversation about that, and it might be that we can resolve that between the houses, but as to the second one, that is not okay, from our point of view.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Chapman–1]—

Page 3, line 22 [clause 5(7), inserted subsection (2)(b)(i)]—Before 'breasts' insert 'bare'

I thank the Attorney for indicating that he will give consideration to the addition of the word 'bare', to ensure that we are dealing with the clearly offensive publication of that part of the female anatomy, and I look forward to his consent in due course.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I repeat again that I oppose it only at this point because I have not had a chance to consider it. I will talk to the deputy leader about this between the houses. I was much moved by her speech.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 6.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I note for the first time in 14 years that there is actually an error in the numbering. I am shocked because parliamentary counsel are usually so excellent, but I note, at least on my copy, that it says 'Section 269B(9)' and it clearly should be 'Section 26B(9)'. I think it is acknowledged that there is no section 269B of the Summary Offences Act, so if we could delete the '9' where it first appears. I move the amendment in an amended form:

Amendment No 2 [Chapman–1]—

Page 3, after line 31—Insert:

- (2) Section 26B(9), definitions of *broadcasting*, *media organisation* and *publish*—delete the definitions and substitute:

*media organisation* means an organisation whose activities consist of or include the collection, preparation for dissemination or dissemination of the following material for the purpose of making it available to the public:

- (a) material having the character of news, current affairs, information or a documentary;

- (b) material consisting of commentary or opinion on, or analysis of, news, current affairs, information or a documentary;

I place on the record that I hear the Attorney's statement suggesting that this definition would somehow or other weaken what would otherwise be provided. I do not accept that. I do not accept this whole question of public interest and whether people are engaged in a private act or there is a display of material.

The fact is that we are agreeing with the government that there is a need in the community to deal with the publication of this type of material. It borders on the area of privacy. The government has the capacity to deal with the matter of privacy and the breach of it generally for the public. There is a very comprehensive proposal that has been presented by the Law Reform Commission for the introduction of a tortious remedy for breaches of privacy which we have been urging the government for some time to consider.

However, what we are dealing with here is introducing a new offence. We are dealing with not just the failure or the incapacity to be able to lodge material in evidence where material or information is captured and then could be unfairly used against somebody. We are dealing with a new regime of criminal offences purportedly for a certain circumstance to deal with an obvious ill that is out there in the community now but which we must deal with to make sure that we do not inadvertently capture people.

In the real world, media organisations are not just major television stations or major newspapers or groups who are members of the union; it is broader than that. We are in 2016 and we have had this debate in another place and the commonwealth has had this debate and realised that we have to have a more flexible definition. The fact that the Attorney is so passionately opposed to it makes me think that he knew full well that the old definition was going to be left in this bill and he just did not even want to deal with it.

We may have to go through this tortuous process again when the Legislative Council may agree with us—they did in the other legislation. I would have thought that the Attorney could take the loss on the chin the previous time around and not be so petulant in refusing to allow an amendment that will, at the very least, provide consistency with other legislation in the contemporary envelope. I am very disappointed to hear that. It seems as though we are going to have another unnecessary battle, but in the interests of consistency and bearing in mind that we are introducing another regime of offences.

The Attorney touched on the reason we are all here in the first place, that is, to deal with people who deliberately use images and the publication of them to cause humiliation or offence to others. He referred to the precipitating example in the schoolyard. I place on the record—and I have said it before in other forums—thank goodness for that young boy, not because he had a pure intent in relation to his being prepared to humiliate another boy in the schoolyard by taking those photographs, but because if he had not recorded that the Department for Education would not have acted, would not have been forced to act, and the parents would not have known anything about it. There are actually some circumstances where the publication of what would otherwise be humiliating material would be important.

I think the Attorney himself has used an example of where we may need to be able to identify someone, someone who is photographed on the ground in a riotous conduct, believed to be a suspect, who might have bitten a police officer, contaminated them with a contagious disease, and they may need to be identified, when the only photograph of them is where they are upended on the street with their legs apart and parts of their private areas exposed. That is an example. So, I think the government is being a bit petulant, at least the Attorney is on behalf of the government, in not allowing this amendment. We will see if we are here to fight it on another day.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 10) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**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) (12:51):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Sitting suspended from 12:52 to 14:01.*

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMPLAINTS (BUDGET REPORT) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

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

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**COMPULSORY THIRD PARTY INSURANCE REGULATION BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY (PROHIBITION) (PUBLIC MONEY) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Petitions*

**RETIREMENT VILLAGES**

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs):** Presented a petition signed by 189 residents of Pasadena and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to ensure that clause 21 of the Retirement Villages Bill include the provision for a maximum 12 month statutory period after the resident ceases to reside in a retirement village, within which the sums of money due to the departing resident must be paid by the administering authority.

**GLENELG POLICE STATION**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** Presented a petition signed by 1,974 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to maintain current levels of police numbers and operating hours at the Glenelg Police Station.

**REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** Presented a petition signed by 86 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to close the Repatriation General Hospital and recognise this hospital as the spiritual home and vital lifeline for veterans of South Australia and the South Australian community.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**ANSWERS TABLED**

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—  
City of Mitcham Annual Report 2014-15  
Eyre Peninsula Annual Report 2014-15

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Bail—Forms  
Criminal Law Consolidation—Prescribed occupations and employment—  
aggravated offences  
Rules made under the following Acts—  
Supreme Court—  
Civil—  
Amendment No. 31  
Supplementary—Amendment No. 5  
Criminal—  
Amendment No. 2  
Supplementary—Amendment No. 1  
Special Applications—  
Amendment No. 1  
Amendment No. 3

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Development—SA Motorsport Park

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Explosives—Fireworks

By the Treasurer (Hon. A Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Public Corporations—Interpretation

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

South Australian Commercial Lakes and Coorong Fishery Management Plan—March 2016

By the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion (Hon. Z.L. Bettison) on behalf of the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

SACE Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2015  
Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Environment Protection—SA Motorsport Park  
Native Vegetation—SA Motorsport Park  
Natural Resources Management—Financial Provisions

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia)—Expiation Fees Variation  
Road Traffic—Safety helmets

*Ministerial Statement*

**NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE ROYAL COMMISSION**

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:07):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** As I have previously informed the house, the government established the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission in March last year. Today, I update the house on the next step in the consultation process following the presentation of the commission's final report to the Governor on Friday 6 May.

First, I thank the former governor of South Australia, Rear Admiral the Hon. Kevin Scarce, for his thorough, highly detailed report, and thank everyone who took part in the public forums, made a submission or gave expert evidence. The royal commission heard from 132 expert witnesses over 37 sitting days and attracted a further 170 direct responses after its tentative findings were released on 15 February this year.

The report makes 12 key recommendations, including pursuit of the establishment of used fuel and intermediate-level waste storage facilities in South Australia. The report found that it is both safe and viable to pursue a used fuel waste storage facility and that this would have an extraordinary economic benefit for South Australia. However, it also found that, without broad social and specific community consent, such a proposal would not be achievable. While, ultimately, the government is responsible for deciding if South Australia's role in the nuclear fuel cycle is expanded, all South Australians will have the opportunity to express their views through a consultation process in coming months.

The report recommended the government take immediate steps to establish a dedicated agency, overseen by an advisory board, to undertake community engagement. Last week, I announced that the government would establish those two bodies and, today, I confirm that cabinet has approved the establishment of a Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission Consultation and Response Agency and the appointments to the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission Consultation and Response Advisory Board. The purpose of the new agency, which will draw upon existing government expertise and expertise from the royal commission itself, will be to increase awareness of the royal commission's report and facilitate the community consultation process.

The independent advisory board will oversee the agency throughout the consultation process. The advisory board includes prominent Australians with high levels of integrity and awareness of the importance of working with the South Australian community. The board will be chaired by the Hon. John Mansfield, member of the Order of Australia and retiring justice of the Federal Court. He will commence the role immediately after his retirement from the Federal Court.

The other members of the board will be: Parry Agius, former chief executive officer of the South Australian Native Title Service; Adjunct Professor Daniela Stehlik, Griffith University, one of Australia's leading social scientists in the fields of sustainability, human services and social cohesion,

with a particular focus on families and communities; Rebecca Huntley, social researcher and former director of the Mind and Mood report, Australia's longest-running social trends report; and Professor Deb White, Director of Cancer Research at the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute (SAHMRI).

The outcomes of this community engagement process will help inform the government's response to the report, which I intend to deliver to the parliament by the end of this year. The royal commission identified political bipartisanship as critical to the long-term intergenerational impact of its recommendations. So, to assist the parliament's considerations of the recommendations today, I have given notice that I will introduce a motion to establish a joint house select committee to consider the findings of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission, focusing on the issues associated with the establishment of a nuclear waste storage facility. I proposed that the committee comprise two government members, two opposition members, and two crossbench members.

The royal commission's final report provides a substantial evidence base for South Australians to consider and marks the start of a very important conversation about the future of our state. We need an informed discussion leading to wise judgement on our state's role in the nuclear fuel cycle, and the royal commission's report presents a substantial body of evidence which will assist us to do just that. I encourage all South Australians to familiarise themselves with this report so that they can participate in this important decision about the state's future.

#### **DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING**

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:12):** I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** On Tuesday 26 April, Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull announced that his government would deliver on its promise, made ahead of the 2013 federal election, to build 12 submarines in Adelaide. At that time, it was also announced that the government submarine building partner would be the French company DCNS, of which the French government is a major shareholder. The South Australian government, which fought for the outcome of 12 submarines to be built in Adelaide, welcomes this announcement and congratulates DCNS and the French government on their successful bid.

During the competitive evaluation process, we have laid the foundation for an important relationship with DCNS and the French government, hosting a number of inbound delegations and conducting meetings with the French defence ministry. Now that Adelaide has secured this contract, our priority is to maximise the local build. That is why I visited France immediately after the announcement of their successful bid was made. Upon arriving in Paris, it was clear that it was big news for the people of France, who had Australian flags waving proudly across the city of Paris.

In Paris, I met with senior DCNS executives at their headquarters. We learnt that DCNS has based their project job numbers on very conservative estimates and on an eight submarine program, not 12. On this basis, it is likely there will be significantly more jobs based in South Australia than had been previously anticipated. DCNS told us that they will move quickly to establish their Australian head office in Adelaide. They will also be keen to move quickly with the infrastructure work required at Techport.

They see many of the French people who will be coming to South Australia as broadening the relationship between the two countries and, in particular, South Australia. DCNS appreciated the South Australian government's engagement and support and the priority that we put on getting to France to consolidate the relationship immediately after the announcement. The following day, in Cherbourg, we toured DCNS's key submarine building facilities. We were provided with a presentation of the 3-D virtual reality modelling they use as a key part of the submarine design and building process, which will be a key component in the design of the Shortfin Barracuda.

We were also taken on a site tour of the hull construction and assembly. This gives us a firsthand idea of the scope and scale of the construction work required at Techport to prepare for the build of the submarines. We estimate that \$50 million worth of construction work may be required just to build the sheds for the future submarines.

Later that day, we were hosted by the Chief of the French Navy, Admiral Bernard Rogel, where we toured the French naval base in Brest where the operating submarines are maintained. In Brest, we also met with the French defence company Thales and were given a tour of its systems integration and sonar capabilities in surface ships and submarines.

In Brittany, I was hosted by the French defence minister, Jean-Yves Le Drian, where we spent the day discussing ways South Australia and France can deepen their ties. He is also the President of Brittany, and he offered to explore a deepening of our relationship beyond just a business relationship with a focus on cultural, sporting and academic exchange.

The government stood up for South Australia and made the federal government keep its promise of building 12 submarines in Adelaide. This government will now stand up for South Australia to ensure that we maximise the jobs potential from this historic project.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament students from Grant High School, who are guests of the member for Mount Gambier, and I welcome students from Samaritan College, who are guests of the member for Giles.

*Ministerial Statement*

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CIVIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**

**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) (14:17):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** The South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal was established to streamline and simplify the review of administrative decisions in the state. SACAT was created as a one-stop shop for adjudication of administrative decisions, to improve access to justice, consolidate and streamline registry and administrative functions and to keep costs to a minimum. SACAT opened its doors to the public on 30 March 2015. As a new organisation in a rapid state of change, it has made significant progress in delivering benefits to the public, including the pooling of skills and expertise across numerous jurisdictions.

On SACAT's commencement, the Guardianship Board, Residential Tenancies Tribunal and Housing Appeal Panel were dissolved and replaced by SACAT. Appeals of decisions of the Valuer-General to the Land and Valuation Division of the Supreme Court were also transferred to SACAT, as well as decisions of the Registrar-General under the Real Property Act 1886. Jurisdiction under the Lobbyists Act 2015 was conferred upon SACAT in April of this year. There is currently an extensive legislative program across a number of ministerial portfolios that proposes to confer further jurisdiction on SACAT.

Since commencing operation, SACAT has been faced with challenges associated with the centralisation of separate decision-making bodies into a single tribunal. Challenges include the operational challenges of converting from a paper-based working model to an electronic paperless case management system, and workload issues associated with a more accessible tribunal.

Work is currently being undertaken to improve the business practices of SACAT to ensure that it is operating in a sustainable high-volume manner, and that the future conferral of jurisdiction does not have any adverse impact. For this reason, the government has made the decision to slow the conferral of future jurisdiction on SACAT while current systems and workload issues are resolved.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** The government remains—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** The government remains committed to the SACAT model and to the future conferral of jurisdiction. We look forward to recommencing this work in the near future.

#### ARRIUM

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:20):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Members will recall that last November the state government established the Steel Taskforce with the aim of securing South Australia's steelmaking future. Chaired by Mr Bruce Carter, the task force's work is focused on securing the long-term viability of Arrium's Whyalla steelworks and its mining operations. The Steel Taskforce continues to work closely with all relevant stakeholders to secure Arrium's operations in Whyalla, and it is currently aware of at least three enterprises interested in potentially buying the business.

The government also continues to pursue opportunities with the commonwealth government for coinvestment and last week the Prime Minister, Mr Malcolm Turnbull, wrote to the Premier committing both commonwealth and state officials to work together on a review of potential investment opportunities. Time is critical to ensure Arrium and Whyalla can move out of this administration period into a brighter, more successful future.

Now that we are in the midst of a federal election campaign, we will be seeking commitments from both major political parties to partner with us in an innovative investment in the business to secure Arrium's commercial position and ensure a positive transition out of administration. As we did with Nyrstar, the governments worked together to design an innovative package that locked in \$563 million of investment and secured the future for Port Pirie. I envisage we can do something similar to secure Whyalla's long-term future.

We have been working hard to support the people and businesses of South Australia's second largest regional centre, and we have responded to the hardship and uncertainty caused by Arrium's administration by appointing former Olympic Dam task force chief, Paul Case, as regional coordinator in Whyalla to oversee a one-stop shop for community access to financial and other services. Supported by his team, Mr Case will primarily focus on engaging with the community, including businesses, individuals, local government, and associations to understand their needs and ensure that appropriate services are being delivered by government agencies.

Earlier this month, the government also announced a \$10 million Whyalla small business loan/grant program to support the trade creditors directly affected by Arrium being placed in administration. Interest free loans or grants of up to \$750,000 to eligible businesses are now available to assist these creditors to overcome severe cash flow issues. The Office of the Small Business Commissioner has also arranged for specialist legal advice to be provided to Arrium's Whyalla-based creditors.

I also welcome OZ Minerals' recent announcement that Whyalla is its preferred site for a new copper concentrate treatment plant to support its Carrapateena project. The plant will require 100 jobs during construction and a further 100 during operation, which will help diversify and strengthen Whyalla's economy. I look forward to this project progressing through the relevant approval process.

This government is doing all it can to seek a positive path forward so that Arrium can emerge from its administration as soon as possible. I thank the member for Giles for his support and his advocacy on behalf of his community.

**Ms Chapman:** But we buy steel from China for the O-Bahn.

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned.



**MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSIONER**

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:26):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS:** This government will always place a high priority on mental health in South Australia. In October last year, this government announced that we would be establishing the South Australian Mental Health Commission to fulfil our \$9 million election pledge. Dr Stephen Christley, South Australia's former chief public health officer, took the reins as the interim mental health commissioner in November so the commission could begin its work immediately.

Dr Christley has done an outstanding job, building on his significant experience in the health system and already laying the foundation for a strong strategic direction in mental health in this state. I sincerely thank those people with lived experience, service providers, stakeholders and staff in our system who have already provided constructive input to the interim commissioner. I am very grateful for his positive support, help and advice during this period, and his involvement, and wish him well in his future endeavours.

It gives me great pleasure today to announce to the house the appointment of South Australia's new Mental Health Commissioner. The new commissioner is Mr Chris Burns CSC. Mr Burns has an extensive record within the veteran and defence community, working with people with a lived experience of PTSD and other mental illnesses. His work with the Australian Defence Force, Defence Teaming Centre and, more recently, the Veterans Health Advisory Council has demonstrated that he is a capable and high-profile advocate.

The commissioner is an experienced senior executive with a strong passion for improving services, the delivery of services and the community's welfare. Mr Burns' appointment is welcomed by the Mental Health Coalition of South Australia, the state's peak representative body of the non-government mental health sector in South Australia. I would like to acknowledge Paul Senior, the president of the Mental Health Coalition, in the gallery today. Thank you for joining us.

I am confident that Mr Burns will be able to use his many skills to engage with all parties across the community in this diverse sector to develop innovative and pragmatic solutions to a challenge that is growing. He will ensure the voices of people with lived experience, consumers, carers and NGOs are incorporated into the everyday work of the commission. The commissioner will lead the development of the state's mental health plan and drive ongoing reform towards integrated mental health services in our state.

I have also asked the commission to explore and develop an action plan that can assist people living with borderline personality disorder and take their lived experience into account. I expect at all times that people with lived experience will be at the centre of the commissioner's work to strengthen mental health care for South Australians.

In my former role as a parliamentary secretary to the Minister for Health, I had the privilege of spending significant time investigating commissions around the country. During my research, I received much good advice and I believe the New South Wales commissioner, John Feneley, got it right when he spent many months out and about with consumers, their families, carers and stakeholders, both government and non-government representatives.

Commissioner Feneley fostered a sense of community, with stakeholders owning the commission. I want South Australians to feel the same about this commission—it is our commission, all of our commission. It is important because when people are at their most vulnerable they need a strong system that delivers to them the best possible care and support.

I am confident the SA Mental Health Commissioner will be an inclusive voice for a lived experience community and a strong advocate for bringing people together for a vast array of services and stakeholder perspectives. I wish Commissioner Burns all the best in his new role, and I look forward to working with him to build a great system.

*Parliamentary Committees***ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:30):** I bring up the 89<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2014-15.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:30):** I bring up the 108<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Regional Report, March 2014-April 2016.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***ROAD FUNDING**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31):** My question is to the Premier. Is the state Labor government committed to funding the remainder of the estimated \$2.5 billion required for the Adelaide Link project, as well as the remaining sections of the north-south corridor which are estimated to cost \$3 billion and, if so, will the state government's contribution to these projects be included in the July state budget?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:31):** It's wonderful to see the Leader of the Opposition joining in the celebration of this fantastic announcement today of \$500 million by a federal Labor government, should they be elected on 2 July. This is a wonderful thing for South Australia and, of course, the money comes with no strings attached. It actually does not require the South Australian government to make a co-investment.

It is an investment by the federal Labor government in public transport without any strings attached. They obviously have been attracted by our vision for 2036, which was set out in the transport and land use planning report, which was a landmark report. It has been taken up by Infrastructure Australia and remains a priority project on Infrastructure Australia's list. Of course, this was a plan that we promoted out to 2036. It was a long-term plan and, indeed, I think the indicative time lines set out in our—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, if you listen, and maybe if you go back and read the report, you will realise that there was a long-term time line laid out for the building of that tram network. This \$500 million investment gives us a massive impetus, and frankly, given that the federal Liberal government ripped \$500 million out of our automotive assistance, it is only fair that we should have this investment going back into South Australia.

Can I contrast the two documents—our 2036 document, which contains detail and policies and investing programs, and the empty, arid, pointless document that was promoted by those opposite in desperation to save the leadership of the South Australian branch of the Liberal Party. That's what it was. Let's be honest and let's have a moment of candour about what that document was about: it was about trying to prevent the Springborgs or, indeed, the Barnetts creeping their way into the South Australian electoral system. That's really what this was about.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The SPEAKER:** The house falls silent for a member for Morialta point of order.

**Mr GARDNER:** As it should, sir. Standing order 98 requires that members answer the question, not debate it.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen very carefully to see that the Premier is answering the substance of the question. The Premier appears to have finished and therefore I call to order the Treasurer, the members for Davenport, Adelaide, Stuart, Morialta, Unley, Goyder, Mitchell, Kavel, Hammond,

Schubert, Newland and Chaffey, and the leader. I warn for the first time the members for Morialta and Mitchell, the leader and deputy leader.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is warned a second and final time, as is the leader and the member for Mitchell.

### REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:35):** My question is for the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house about the process that led to the selection of the RSL as the preferred bidder for the Repat site?

**The SPEAKER:** The minister seems bright-eyed and bushy-tailed.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:36):** I am, sir, and what a good question it is from the member for Fisher. She does always ask excellent questions. When the state government sought expressions of interest for the Repatriation General Hospital site, it couldn't have been more clear about what was and wasn't acceptable for its future use. We welcome rehabilitation services, we welcome respite care, we welcome retirement services, we welcome primary health services, and we welcome teaching and academic use, but we specifically ruled out commercial residential development or retail or office accommodation.

These things are worth repeating because some opponents of these plans chose to try to misinform the public. We heard that we were trying to get the best financial outcome, that our plans for the site were 'to carve it up like a roast'. Neither of those things were true, and we said so when the process began. In assessing the expressions of interest, we applied several criteria. Handing it over to the highest bidder was never—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is on his last warning.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Handing it over to the highest bidder was never one of them, and I can confirm that we didn't choose the highest bidder. We wanted the site's future to be consistent with existing uses. Far from carving it up, we made it clear that our preferred solution was to sell the site as a whole.

We are pleased to accept the proposal brought to us by the RSL. It's a plan that means that South Australia will have more health facilities, more community facilities, more primary health, more residential aged care, more retirement living, and more affordable housing. As well as having those services delivered by the RSL, existing services at the Repat will be available at other sites.

It's obvious that some people either haven't understood this or, bizarrely, have some problem with the RSL investing \$125 million into the Repat site for services we should all welcome. Just yesterday, I heard, 'This has all the hallmarks of a fire sale to get rid of a political issue, rather than a well-considered process to get the best value for the people of South Australia.' This person also said, 'I've got real concerns, particularly when the minister says there was more money on the table from other proponents.'

It's not surprising that some in the public might think that we were motivated by the proceeds of the sale while others thought we would accept anything to offload the site, but what is surprising is that these two contradictory views have both been advanced by the opposition. It was the Liberals who said we would carve it up like a roast, through their media Twitter account, and it was the opposition spokesman who, on the other hand, talked about getting the best health outcome, not just the best financial outcome, but yesterday was worried about other bidders putting more money on the table.

This is why you can't take the opposition's position seriously—even they can't work out what it is. That is what happens when you don't have policies: it's opposition for opposition's sake.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the Minister for Health to order for violating the standing orders in his answer, and I warn for the first time the members for Hartley and Finniss.

#### **PUBLIC TRANSPORT FUNDING**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39):** My question is to the Premier. Was the Premier, Treasurer, or any other member of the government, advised of federal Labor's plan to announce this tram funding before the decision to shift the date of the state budget from 23 June to 7 July, after the federal election?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:39):** I don't think so. I certainly wasn't. No, it doesn't seem so. I have looked—nobody seems to be.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** You heard me right the first time.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

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

#### **HEALTH REVIEW**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, what recent changes have been made to health services across the Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:40):** Thanks again to the member for Florey for her avid interest and advocacy for her local hospital—in fact, my local hospital—the Modbury Hospital. One of the major aims of Transforming Health is enabling more people in our northern and north-eastern suburbs to receive hospital care closer to home.

That is why in October last year I announced a realignment of services between the Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals. These service moves began on Tuesday 15 March, with the second phase taking place earlier this month. This involved relocating medical and cardiology inpatient and orthopaedic emergency and multiday activity from Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin. It also marked the beginning of an expanded breast care service at Modbury Hospital.

Although it is still in the early stages of these realigned services, patients in the north and north-eastern suburbs are already seeing heartening improvements in their care. When I announced these changes last year, I was particularly concerned about orthopaedic waiting times at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, where patients were waiting up to 150 hours for surgery. I am pleased to advise the average wait for hip fractures is now less than 15 hours.

In addition, since the orthopaedic service expansion began last November, I was told that there had been 37 fewer transfers from the Lyell McEwin to the Royal Adelaide Hospital compared to the same time last year. This not only means patients receive their initial treatment closer to home but they are less likely to have to travel into the city for follow-up and appointments.

Despite the scaremongering of some people, the transitions have gone smoothly, and both Modbury Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital have comfortably accommodated the service moves while still maintaining beds and access flow. I understand the admission process means the majority of patients are being transferred from Modbury directly to an inpatient bed at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. They are not having to go through the emergency department.

To aid transfers, a dedicated ambulance is located at Modbury Hospital and also started in March since the second stage of changes earlier this month. I understand the vehicle is transporting on average 12 patients a day, which is well within our predicted ranges. Early data shows the Lyell McEwin emergency department is demonstrating consistent improvement in both admitted and discharged patients. In fact, the Lyell McEwin Hospital continues to improve on the national

emergency access target and, on average, is the highest or best performing hospital in South Australia.

These achievements are testament to the hardworking and dedicated doctors, nurses and allied health workers who care for our community every day. This is only the beginning of improvements to health services in our northern and north-eastern suburbs, with a \$32 million upgrade to Modbury Hospital now underway and more critical services to be expanded at the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Unlike others who are now depending on the chief architect of the disastrous privatisation of Modbury Hospital for their health policy, this government cares about people in the north and north-eastern suburbs by employing former health minister Dr Michael Armitage. The opposition's health spokesman has signalled his direction, where he wants to go back to the future with Modbury Hospital, but other public hospitals are probably in line for privatisation as well. Unlike the Liberal Party, it was the government that brought Modbury Hospital back into public hands and it is this government that is investing in its future.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the minister for the first time, for introducing irrelevant argumentation into his answer.

### TAXATION REFORM

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44):** My question is to the Premier. Given the fact that South Australia has had the nation's highest unemployment rate in trend terms for the past 16 months, will he commit to reversing his decision to remove the small business payroll tax rebate from 1 July this year?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:44):** Can I say that, unlike among those opposite, there is surging confidence in the South Australian economy. Can I just report that South Australia's business confidence improved by 5.3 index points in the December quarter to reach 94.2 on the back of a 5.2 gain in the previous quarter. This business confidence improvement is the biggest improvement in business conditions since the March 2010 quarter, so there is surging confidence. We saw the statistics—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** We saw the recent data that emerged—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** We saw the surging highest price data, which came out the other day, as well as the lending data in relation to houses. We have seen the extraordinary response to the announcement of the submarines contract that is occurring. Just this week—yesterday, indeed—we celebrated, together with Ingham's, the announcement of 850 jobs to be created over the next 12 to 18 months largely based in the northern suburbs, plus an additional 700 jobs in the construction phase of those premises.

Just a few weeks earlier, we had that substantial announcement of 100 construction jobs at Whyalla, as the proposal by OZ Minerals to embark on an agreement with Arrium for a processing plant in Whyalla would also create an ongoing 100 jobs. All across the length and breadth of this state, we are seeing growing confidence in the South Australian economy.

There is no doubt that the transformation is underway. We have seen more job growth in the last 12 months than we have seen in the previous five years. This is what is happening in the South Australian economy. I know that there are those opposite who are desperate to talk down the South Australian economy—

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Mr GARDNER:** The Premier is completely avoiding the substance of the question about payroll tax and is instead debating.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has two minutes to turn his attention to payroll tax.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The discussion that accompanied the question was about the business conditions and the unemployment rate in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** South Australia enjoys the lowest payroll tax take in the nation and we are proud of the fact that this Treasurer, in the last budget, also introduced nation-leading taxation reform, such that we now have the lowest regime of business transaction taxes anywhere in the nation. And it is working. KPMG also did a survey of capital cities around this nation and found us the most cost-competitive capital city in the nation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** You get the strained laughter from those opposite. Those opposite will also, in a few weeks' time, get to enjoy the benefit of our next budget, prepared by this Treasurer. All of the measures that he is asking questions about will be revealed in that budget and it will be about continuing the transformation of the South Australian economy, but it will also be about making sure that nobody is left behind in that process.

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the member for Morphett. I warn for the first time the members for Stuart, Schubert, Kavel, Hartley, Unley, Davenport, Adelaide and Morphett and I warn for the second and the final time the members for Stuart, Unley, Hartley and Schubert. The member for Napier.

#### INVESTMENT AND TRADE INITIATIVES

**Mr GEE (Napier) (14:49):** My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Can the minister update the house on investment attracted to South Australia?

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:49):** I thank the member for Napier for his question. It was a great day yesterday, when the Premier unveiled the massive expansion plans for South Australia by Inghams Enterprises. It was a good example of a major national enterprise choosing to expand in South Australia where, in their own words, they saw the best conditions for businesses to make such decisions.

I congratulate the Treasurer for his initiatives in last year's budget to add to the attractiveness of doing business in South Australia. Yesterday, the poultry producer Ingham's confirmed that more than 800 jobs would be created by the expansion of its South Australian facilities in multiple locations. It is another feather in the cap of the Investment Attraction South Australia agency, in partnership with Regions SA and my friend the member for Frome. I thank my colleague (the Minister for Regional Development and Independent member for Frome) for his work on the project. We want to create jobs in the regions.

It's a big win for jobseekers with trades, skills in high technology equipment and process workers, and it comes just days after the opposition tried to whip up some bad media about the investment agency's activities. Well, the very following day, here was the fruit. The opposition would have you believe that the investment agency is just a group of public servants who process grant applications. Tell that to the more than 800 people who will get jobs as a result of the Inghams decision. The opposition doesn't like public servants, and it sure doesn't understand winning.

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

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** Hundreds of jobseekers were winners yesterday.

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

**Mr GARDNER:** The minister is—

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be seated.

**Mr GARDNER:** —defying you right now and, before that, he was debating.

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

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, I will try to contain myself. Inghams will double its production across 15 sites in northern Adelaide and the Murraylands. The \$275 million investment will create more than 380 direct roles and generate more than 460 contractor jobs.

In October 2015, the South Australian government established the Investment Attraction SA agency to lead the state's efforts in pursuing investment from overseas and interstate. In the nine months since then, eight companies have been provided assistance, primarily in the form of case management services. This has led to more than \$890 million worth of investment projects for the state that will create more than 3,300 direct and associated jobs in South Australia. I very much look forward to budget estimates and questions from those opposite so that we can go into the details.

These investments have included ScreenAway, Orora Limited, Wineflow, Micromet, Hornsdale (Neon France), West Franklin Development on Franklin Street, Buddy Platform and now Inghams Enterprises. These results support the findings of Deloitte's Investment Monitor report released in March 2016 which shows that the value of investment projects in South Australia has risen 14.2 per cent in the year to date to reach \$41.5 billion—a credit to the government and the businesses that have made that a reality.

The state government is committed to ensuring development continues in South Australia, which is why we have committed \$10.8 billion in the 2015-16 budget towards a capital investment program over the next four years to support 4,700 jobs per annum. We have also announced \$670 million in tax cuts in the Mid-Year Budget Review and will assist in driving private capital investment in South Australia. I look forward to further negative carping about the investment attraction initiatives of this government because it allows us to repeat the success of the past months and the latest success story, and there will be much, much more to follow.

#### REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise the house how much will be paid by the RSL for the Repat site, whether any proposal was received for a private hospital on the site, and whether those other options will be released?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:53):** I can't at this stage reveal how much the RSL will be paying for the site because they still have to do due diligence, but I expect that, once that process has been completed, I will be in a position to say what the sale price is. It was a very, very thorough process, contrary to what has been said by the Hon. Stephen Wade, where we invited expressions of interest. We did receive, essentially, three significant proposals, but the RSL proposal was certainly the one that was most in keeping with what we had said were our intentions for the site.

Of course, the RSL has proven runs on the board when it comes to these sorts of developments. They gave a very convincing case to the valuation panel that looked at all of the proposals, and I think this is an absolutely spectacular outcome not only for veterans, because there will be much-needed facilities that veterans in South Australia are looking for on that site, facilities that are better attuned to what the needs of modern veterans are, but indeed facilities for the southern suburbs, for those surrounding communities, this will be very welcome. I am looking forward to continuing to work with the RSL on this magnificent proposal, this magnificent development, which they are going to undertake.

#### PLANNING POLICY

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:55):** My question is to the Minister for Planning. How are the government's planning policies encouraging investment in the state?

**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) (14:55):** I thank the member for Newland for that excellent question. I will pick one example: the Osborne shipyard is an example of where our planning policies have helped

to enable shipbuilding activities to continue over the years and to make the shipyard the ideal place to build all 12 future submarines, as recently announced by the commonwealth government.

Over the years, through the use and support of crown development pathway and the Development Assessment Commission, the development of the Osborne ASC shipyard has expanded. The shipyard currently supports around 1,500 employees by day and approximately another 291 by night. Various planning development applications and approvals over time have seen wharves, offices, workshops, warehouses, education and training facilities and other facilities being built at Osborne, enabling it to be a site for the construction of ships and now the 12 future submarines.

With the recent successful passage of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 we will further significantly enhance our planning system to better encourage investment in the state. In particular, the planning and design code will provide a more consistent and clearer set of planning rules, and together with the new performance-based assessment processes it will provide developers with certainty and confidence to invest by giving them an early yes or no to their development applications.

Work on these significant planning reforms has already begun, with reforms to be introduced in stages over a five-year period. The confidence that our planning policies bring to investors was also recognised yesterday with the announcement that Ingham's will be expanding its operations across northern Adelaide and regional South Australia. This investment could yield more than 1,500 jobs. Ingham's executive chairman reportedly said in a statement that our 'investment-friendly environment' was one of the reasons for the investments concentrated in this state, lauding our planning policies amongst other things. The government will work to ensure that our planning policies in South Australia continue to encourage investment and growth.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** If the leader would care to stop interjecting, he can ask a question.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister update the house on whether the technical completion of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will be achieved tomorrow week, 25 May, as in accordance with the advice that he provided to the house on 22 March this year?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:58):** I think it's pretty unlikely, and I point out that at the time I said I had very little confidence in that date, but that was the date that we were being provided with by SAHP. So, I have been very, very clear from the very beginning that I did not expect that technical completion would be done on 25 May; however, that was the information we were being provided with.

With regard to what is going on in the process, we are still in consultation with SAHP, and we have made very, very clear that what we expect from SAHP is a date that I can have confidence in so that we can go to the people of South Australia with a firm delivery date so that we can make the planning we need to do to deliver this hospital.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I know the opposition have never liked the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and scream and shout, and all the hysteria we get from the Leader of the Opposition, perhaps the most pathetic Leader of the Opposition we have seen in modern times in South Australia—

**The SPEAKER:** The minister is warned for the second and final time for gratuitously violating the standing orders by insulting the Leader of the Opposition, who, of course, invited it by interjecting.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I also warn for the first time the member for Hammond. The Minister for Health has more?



**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I do have a little more, sir. We, of course, are working with the consortium partners. I have made very clear a few facts. Firstly, we expect a reliable delivery date. It is simply not good enough that we are flying blind with regard to when the hospital is going to be ready. I want to be able to talk to nurses and I want to be able to talk to doctors with some firm plans about when we are going to be moving from the old RAH down to the new RAH, and the fact that we haven't been able to extract that from SAHP is simply not good enough.

The second thing, I can inform the house, is that I have also made very, very clear that we will not pay a dollar to SAHP until we get a hospital that is complete and ready for us to move into. They are my two conditions, my two priorities, and I hope that we will be in a position to make an announcement with regard to our dates of completion and moving-in dates very, very soon. But these are matters that we are working through and pursuing every possible avenue that we can to have this matter resolved as soon as possible.

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN AND FRENCH RELATIONSHIP**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:01):** My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, can you inform the house about the relationship South Australia shares with France in the food, wine and agricultural sectors?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:01):** I thank the member for the question, and—

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart is on his final warning. Minister.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Our state has had, obviously, a long association with France, going back to Flinders and Baudin through to the First World War and the wonderful service that so many South Australians gave on the Western Front, and that is something that is not lost on the French. We continue to work with them across all portfolio areas because it has always been a strong—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is on his final warning.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —relationship and one that we want to further enhance as we enter into a once in a generation deal that will give us a manufacturing base, with the 12 submarines being built and serviced here for the next 50 years.

Last year, I met up with the department of agriculture in France and worked on some collaborations that we can continue to do here. We have a lot in common. Obviously, we are both producers of very good wine and food. France has a ban on the growing of GM crops, one that it reinforced last year when all the EU nations got to decide on that. France was among the many that decided to stick with the prohibition on the growing of GM crops.

The other thing that we have, obviously, is French-owned companies that have major investments in South Australia in the agricultural sector. Pernod Ricard is, of course, one of the three biggest exporters of Australian wine around the world, and it does a tremendous job in terms of getting South Australian wine out not just into France but into the rest of the world as well.

Parmalat, which has its offices down here and which produces milk, is owned by the French group Lactalis. Also, the iconic South Australian company R.M. Williams is now owned by Louis Vuitton, and I know that it has ambitions to take that wonderful footwear and fashion up into the premium level not just here in Australia but right around the world. So, these three companies are just a small example of some of the great collaborations that we can have with our friends in France.

In terms of exports, we export \$24 million worth of food and wine to France each year. Exports include oil seeds, almonds, onions, premium beef, lamb and kangaroo, as well as seafood, such as oysters, lobster and kingfish. We know that in the past there have been some barriers there towards all of Europe—not just France—in terms of getting our agricultural produce into the EU. I

had a meeting with the ambassador to Australia and New Zealand from the EU two weeks ago, and he is keen to see some work progressed at that federal level.

Of course, as a state that is Australia's premium producer of food and wine, a state that produces 80 per cent of the nation's premium wine, he thought it was important to come here and seek South Australia's view, and it's one that we have—that we will work together with the EU ambassador and our own federal government to work on anything that would be beneficial to South Australian producers. The more markets that we can open up, the better it's going to be for everyone.

Another French connection is through education and research, and we have SARDI (our South Australian Research and Development Institute) working very closely with the agricultural sector in France on ways that we can come up with better ways of packaging and better ways of farming that can benefit both countries. The VTT study we did last year is looking at taking our premium goods and turning them into luxury goods with the help of the French universities.

### ROAD FUNDING

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:05):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister detail why he has refused a \$400,000 offer from the commonwealth government to undertake work on the state government's Kulpara to Kadina road when it requires a commitment of just \$100,000 to make the project happen?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:06):** I thank the member for Goyder for his question. I think that the member for Goyder is referring to one of a list of projects which was put to the government as part of a \$25 million roads package some time ago, as the member for Goyder just says, from the previous federal assistant minister.

It's a good question because it's a question that many people have asked, particularly in regional communities where some of these projects were highlighted to be. I made the point to the then federal assistant minister and again recently, only a couple of weeks ago, to the current federal minister for major projects that the commonwealth doesn't seem to appreciate that while their offer of more road funding to South Australia is, in principle, very welcome—and I say 'very welcome', of course, because it comes following a very significant funding cut of road funding both to local government and to the state government in the first Coalition budget in 2014—in that context, it is a welcome commitment that \$25 million would be provided.

What that commitment overlooked is that it was a redirection of \$25 million which was to be spent by South Australia, as one of four basin states in the Murray-Darling Basin, for water initiatives. Redirecting it to this purpose would necessarily (the advice from state Treasury and, I also understand, concurred with by federal Treasury) trigger a readjustment of our GST revenues.

In the course of the discussions that I have been having with the former minister and the current minister, I have been working hard and trying to find other ways to deliver these funds to South Australia in a way which wouldn't mean that we would, in effect, be paying all of the money for all of these projects because of the reduction of GST funds subsequently. I have certainly, in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate—

**Mr Pederick:** It's a Liberal seat—that's the problem.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Well, the point gets raised that it was in Liberal seats and, yes, that might have been the reason why those road projects were suggested above any other road projects in the state. Notwithstanding that, there was my wholehearted commitment and support to work with the federal government to try and deliver this \$25 million to South Australia and, as I was saying, including, in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate, working with the Mayor of Wattle Range Council for some funding and, indeed, road swabs, for example, to be able to fund stage 2 of the Penola bypass, a project which was first committed to by the former federal Labor government, as well as the former transport minister Patrick Conlon.

Why was that particular road project that the member for Goyder raised not funded? That's because it was part of a larger package of road funding projects which, rather than ending up with an 80:20 federal/state funding contribution, would have in fact ended up as basically a 100 per cent state funding contribution. Notwithstanding that, my commitment, as I have expressed to the federal

minister, Paul Fletcher, remains. I will continue working with him; the federal department, the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development; as well as even regional mayors, if that helps, to try to deliver these projects in a way which doesn't penalise South Australia and cause us to lose this additional GST revenue.

### MAGNETITE STRATEGY

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:10):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Minister, can you inform the house of the nature of this state's iron ore resource and what can be done to unlock its full potential?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:10):** I would like to thank the member for this very important question, as it goes to the priority this government has assigned to unlocking the full potential of our resources, energy and renewable assets as a driver of sustained economic growth.

Our rich endowment of iron ore has played a central role in the industrial development of South Australia and indeed the country. Much of the current surge in supply of iron ore from Australia, and in particular the Pilbara, relies on hematite, one of the various types of iron ore. Hematite is also known as a direct shipping ore because you can simply shovel it up and ship it out without very much in the way of value-add beyond crushing, screening and blending.

This is what Arrium has been doing since the initiation of Project Magnet, with hematite sourced from the Middleback Ranges. South Australia is also richly endowed with magnetite, another form of iron ore which, unlike hematite, needs complex processing, which may include pelletising, before it can be used as feedstock for the steelmaking process.

Here is the good news for our state: that processed magnetite product is highly prized by steelmakers because it contains lower levels of impurities and allows blast furnaces to operate more efficiently with lower carbon emissions. South Australia is in the box seat to provide the world with cost-saving magnetite at a time when global steelmakers are looking to become more efficient and reduce their carbon emissions in response to their communities' commitment to the Paris conference on climate change.

Within five years, the global demand for magnetite product is expected to pick up, which means suppliers need to be making investment decisions now, today, so that they are in the best position to be able to meet this new and emerging market. South Australia has three major magnetite provinces: the north and south Gawler Craton, and the Braemar formation. Currently, only Arrium mines South Australian magnetite, the majority of which goes royalty free into the Whyalla steel mill, and a small portion is destined for export.

Mr Speaker, you might be aware of news reports that last week I announced my intention to develop a magnetite strategy. This strategy will be an Australian first for this sector of the resources industry and mirrors the successful launch in February of a long-term comprehensive Copper Strategy for South Australia. The Copper Strategy has been well received, and I hope that we can achieve something similar with magnetite, providing a strategic pathway for future investment into South Australia.

With magnetite, much of the resource has been identified, and the trick will be gaining committed investment to getting it out of the ground, onto ships and into the world's steel mills. The magnetite strategy seeks to establish South Australia as the foremost supplier of quality magnetite to the world's steelmakers. To do that, we intend to lock in \$10 billion of investment commitment in projects within five years as a major step towards an ambitious target of producing—wait for it!—50 million tonnes of magnetite production by 2030 for export.

The investment means jobs and opportunities for suppliers as we construct mines and the supporting infrastructure that will benefit our regional communities. It won't be an easy task, but I have been heartened by the positive response of the magnetite proponents—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —at a workshop held last week, best summed up by the comments of the South Australian head of the Chamber of Mines and Energy, Mr Jason Kuchel, who said:

The magnetite strategy is a welcome opportunity which will identify initiatives that can bring some of the state's extensive magnetite resources forward, including our magnetite-rich regions throughout the Eyre Peninsula and the Braemar provinces.

Last week's workshop helped identify—

**The SPEAKER:** The minister's time has expired. The member for Davenport is warned for the second and final time and the member for Mount Gambier is called to order. The member for Stuart.

### ROAD FUNDING

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:14):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Given his answer to the member for Goyder explaining why the government would not put its funding with the federal funding for the Kadina to Kulpara road, can the minister explain to the house why the government has chosen to fund overtaking lanes with the federal government between Port Augusta and Whyalla in the electorate of Giles?

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:15):** The minister in his answer reminded me of the genesis of this whole debacle, and it is because the existing federal Liberal government broke its agreement with our government. It was negotiated with me personally with the former government. It was an agreement entered into in return for our commitments in relation to the River Murray.

When we got the 3,200 gegalitres of water down the river, part of the contribution was that our irrigators had to make a contribution and we had to offset the contribution that they made through getting a substantial commitment to the irrigators; first \$240 million that was to go for the Water Industry Alliance, plus an additional \$50 million which was to go to industry adjustment for the various communities up and down the river. This was an historic agreement. It was an agreement that was brokered by this state government together with the Riverland communities.

**Ms Chapman:** He's not answering the question.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Those opposite—I am certainly answering the question. It was a deal that was ratted on by the current federal Liberal government and we insist on it; we insist on the deal being honoured, and that is why we have consistently raised this question. They keep promoting—

**Mr Pederick:** Every other state has the money, Jay.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** We are not every other state.

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** This is the thing those need to get through their thick heads. This is not—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will not refer to other members of the parliament as having 'thick heads'. He will withdraw.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Mr Speaker, what they need—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, sir: you asked him to withdraw; I didn't hear him do so.

**The SPEAKER:** I would like the Premier to withdraw.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I withdraw. What those opposite need to understand, and it has been consistently said in this place and they refuse to accept it, is that we are a different state when it comes to the River Murray. We have different circumstances.

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

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

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Relevance. The question was about road funding and the inconsistency applied between a road that was funded in a Labor seat and one that wasn't funded in a Liberal seat.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen carefully to the Premier's reply to ensure that it is germane.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The approach that we have taken for this \$25 million is to hold this government to its agreements. That is the approach that we have taken and the reason we have sought to hold them to this agreement is that we are a different state when it comes to the River Murray. The history of the River Murray is that in 1969 we capped what we took from the River Murray, and we have always lived within our means in relation to taking of water from the River Murray. When there was a debate about how the burden of adjustment should be shared—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** When there was a debate about how the burden of adjustment should be shared to get the extra water back in the river, we said, 'We're not going to accept the same approach that's been taken in other states. We're not going to accept that because we have already made the adjustments.' That is why we wanted this resource to be applied, no strings attached, no handing you \$25 million and then you have to pay it back through the GST system. We wanted to make sure that that money was delivered to us so that we could deliver it to our Riverland communities.

The real question is: why aren't those opposite standing up for Riverland communities? Why are they selling out their own communities for the very agreement that was reached on their behalf by this Labor government? The truth is we stand up for the Riverland communities, why don't those opposite?

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

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

### SA WATER

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:19):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier now direct the Minister for Water to instruct SA Water to release its maintenance schedule for its metropolitan network for the last five years and also for the next five years?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:19):** I will certainly take that question on notice if that is of interest to members opposite. If it is a proper matter to be put into the public sphere I am more than happy to do that. I think what has been a cause of concern has been the apparent spate of burst water mains, which has—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, the truth is—

**Mr Marshall:** The apparent spate?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The truth is—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I have always been fascinated by how amusing the Leader of the Opposition finds his own voice. He can't deliver an interjection without laughing at the same time; I don't know what that is.

Obviously, these burst water mains cause real suffering and misery to the people who are directly affected by them, and I think that should be our principal concern. The truth is, in terms of our burst water mains, that they will be a fact of life; they will occur from time to time. I think the real question is how we respond to them. We need to respond to them quickly and we need to ensure that any of the loss associated with them is quickly remedied so that people affected can get their lives back to normal.

I have spoken to the minister about this and told him that this is something we should expect from our water authorities. They have to regard themselves not merely as engineering authorities that are, in terms of national data, doing a job that is well above average; they have to regard themselves as a customer organisation that responds quickly and effectively to the concerns of their customers. So, if it is proper material to put in the public sphere I am more than happy to ask the minister to supply it.

### CHINA TRADE MISSION

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (15:22):** My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Can the minister provide an update to the house on the outcomes of the recent business mission to China?

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:22):** I thank the member for Wright for her question. I know that jobs are very important in her constituency. When it comes to China, our most important trading partner, there is good news bursting out everywhere, when it comes to food and wine exports in particular. I know how infectious members opposite find this good news, because if you were representing a district in the regions you would have businesses coming to your electorate office on an ongoing basis giving you the good story.

It is South Australia's largest two-way trading partner, worth \$3.8 billion a year, with the potential to further develop our trading investment relationship. It is also the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of our special sister state relationship with Shandong and in April, on behalf of the government, the Premier led a very historic delegation to Shandong. This year, we chose to expand our business mission to further develop our relationship beyond Jinan and Qingdao to include the cities of Linyi, Zibo and Yantai.

Our business mission comprised 107 individual businesses—many of them from the constituencies of members opposite—with 170 business delegates. It was the largest ever business delegation to leave the state, reflecting the importance of trade and investment opportunities to grow their businesses. The mission was a resounding success, with the signing of more than 30 commercial cooperation agreements or memoranda of understanding. In addition, businesses have:

- secured 130 export leads, which should be worth about \$50 million to South Australia;
- identified 52 new investment leads, with one valued at approximately \$A20 million;
- made more than 370 business connections; and
- secured 12 export deals valued at more than \$500,000.

All of that is jobs, jobs in the regions and jobs in the city.

The South Australian government also signed two agreements: one with infrastructure giant China Railway Group, with potential investment in iron ore projects on Eyre Peninsula; and the second with Jinan-based ICT giant Inspur, a world leader in digital data, which will add to our growing reputation as a destination of choice for ICT companies.

In each city, the South Australian government launched SA-Shandong Connect. This bilingual website portal will directly connect South Australia and Shandong enterprises, providing business-to-business opportunities that will open doors, get trade and investment deals done, and develop commercial and professional links. This is another tool which will help grow the economic relationship with China.

While the South Australian government is regularly criticised for its business mission program, from certain members opposite, and international engagement activities described as media stunts or somehow irrelevant, the very people who are benefiting from these activities are in their electorates. The number of companies involved in the mission have contacted the government, particularly the Department for State Development, thanking them for their assistance in pulling together a strong program.

For example, Stoney Pinch Quarry in Renmark, the shadow minister's area, was able to make new connections in China and, as a result, has three new potential clients coming to Adelaide to continue discussions. Of course, Sustain SA are following up opportunities in Jinan, Qingdao and Yantai in sectors of environmental sustainability and aged care. Then there was the International Centre for Financial Services in the University of Adelaide—a very productive experience for them. It is good news all round—food and wine exports through the roof, our engagement delivering jobs and enterprise across the state.

### SA WATER

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:26):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier guarantee that everybody whose house or business was damaged by the recent mains pipe burst in Campbelltown and Paradise will be fully compensated, given the Premier's undertaking to the house during question time in March this year?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:26):** We will do what's appropriate. We will make the proper steps.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, the first thing it means is that some people have insurance, so it might be a good idea to consult their insurance first. Are we going to pay what would otherwise be an insurance obligation? No. Obviously, we are going to work with people who have been directly affected. Are they seriously suggesting that we should actually pick up an obligation that would otherwise be an obligation of an insurance company? This is cheap politics. A burst water main goes off and then the member for Unley is out there wanting to get his photograph taken next to it. I understand that gets a good run on the TV, but it is no substitute for a well thought-through policy. It is just the sort of—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** But this is the thing, they wake up in the morning and then they fall out of bed about 10am, or whatever it is, and then they get the paper, they read what is in it and then they tell us all what is in it. This is—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Surely the member for Unley's point of order isn't going to be relevance?

**Mr PISONI:** I'm always out of bed before 10, but the point here is that the Premier is debating.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold the member for Unley's point of order. Has the Premier finished? The member for Kurna.

### TOURISM

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (15:28):** My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Minister, can you inform the house how many tourists from France come to South Australia, and what is being done to attract more?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:28):** Merci. Bonjour. I thank the member for Kurna for the question and I think your seat used to be known as Baudin—a French connection there. We get about 14,000 visitors from France each year and most of you will know, in regional areas, that they disperse out of Adelaide. A lot of them are young, sort of in the under 25 age group. They go out and do work in agricultural and

tourism pursuits. You are likely to see them in the Riverland. I have seen four young pastry chefs up there and they had been out picking grapes. On Kangaroo Island we get a lot of them.

The member for Frome and I bumped into a group of French tourists out the front of the information building one day. It is great to have them coming here, but what we want to do now, with this renewed interest from France in South Australia, is to see how we can capitalise on getting even more tourists here and capitalise on our proud association and relationship between France and South Australia.

Of course, this week, the Australian Tourism Exchange is taking place on the Gold Coast. I was there with the head of Tourism Australia's European office, Denise von Wald, who is originally from South Australia, and we talked to her about ways in which we could increase our marketing into France and capitalise on the programs we have here.

We, of course, welcomed Qatar Airways for the first time into South Australia, bringing in their A350s—the only route anywhere in Australia that any airline is flying on. They have, through Doha, a connection to Paris. Singapore Airlines, Emirates and Cathay Pacific also have flights, via their hubs, from Paris into South Australia and we are going to work with them. We are going to put some more money into marketing South Australia to the French market.

In this year's budget, we put an extra \$35 million into the tourism sector to grow our visitor economy. Our target is to increase it from \$5.2 billion to \$8 billion by 2020, and we want to create more jobs in the sector as well, so this commitment in the budget for \$35 million contains \$14 million that will be used for marketing South Australia to the world. I also want to thank Christian Prudhomme, the head of the Tour de France, and a very good friend of South Australia, who probably has the numbers of every important person in France in his mobile phone.

He plays a very important role, and he is very good friends with the defence minister, with whom the Premier spent time on his tour of Brittany, so I want to extend my thanks to Christian. He is going to allow us to promote the Tour Down Under—the biggest race outside Europe—during the Tour de France this year when, appropriately, stage 2 finishes in Cherbourg, which is where the submarines are built and where the big relationship between Adelaide and France is concentrated.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:31):** I rise today to bring to the house both the greetings from thousands of residents of Rostrevor, Woodforde, Teringie, and Magill and their displeasure with the government and, more particularly, with the Minister for Planning. Last week, on Thursday 12 May, the member for Hartley and I were pleased to be able to attend an Adelaide Hills Council community forum on the future of the site at the old Magill Training Centre and, particularly, the extraordinary traffic problems and challenges the redevelopment of this site will present.

We were most disappointed that neither the minister, nor the Minister for Transport, nor the Minister for Road Safety, were able to attend on that night, nor indeed anyone from the government, apart from—and I appreciated his attendance—Paul Gelston, from the Department of Transport, who I hope by now has had a chance to report to his minister on the extreme levels of concern in our communities in Hartley and Morialta, particularly in those suburbs.

Members would recall that in 2009 the government made a decision that the Magill Training Centre land was to be sold in order to build the new youth training centre at Cavan. So far, so good. Then, of course, we went through the DPA process. Hundreds of residents in this area attended public meetings in 2011 and 2012 and put forward many propositions and ideas. Unfortunately, the Minister for Planning, in releasing the ministerial DPA in the week between Christmas and new year in 2013, ignored most of that community consultation. Nevertheless, there was some forward motion and some appropriate restrictions on development were in place. Indeed, land division was eventually lodged with Adelaide Hills Council in July 2015.

The development is a joint venture between Devine Limited and Starfish Developments, and we hope that it will produce many good houses, but our understanding was that it would be in the region of 250. The DAC has now taken over and the proposed number has gone up to 400 dwellings in total. It is proposed that three large lots will accommodate residential apartment buildings, which



may total up to 100 dwellings, and that a number of regulated trees and eight significant trees are proposed to be removed.

The significant issues that were raised last Thursday night were largely around, firstly, the inappropriate increase to 400 dwellings that the government has allowed, but that is not something that can be changed. The government does still have, however, the capacity to improve the transport infrastructure to this site. I am talking about public transport opportunities which we hope the minister will take on board and improve to that area. With cycling infrastructure, there are opportunities for improvement but, in particular, there are some real trouble spots that are major trouble spots now and deserve attention now.

The increase to 400 new dwellings in the area will increase traffic movements by thousands to and from that site every day, so there will be an impact on intersections such as Glen Stuart Road and Norton Summit Road, Norton Summit Road and Woodforde Road, Norton Summit Road and Coach House Drive, and Norton Summit Road and Magill Road. That whole precinct is going to present extraordinary challenges going forward. As it already presents challenges now, with thousands of new traffic movements, it will be very difficult. Going in the other direction, the corner of Moules Road and St Bernards Road has also been identified as a significant problem.

Mr Gelston would have heard the message from the in excess of 120 people who came along on a cold, rainy night last Thursday to express their concerns about these intersections. I have previously written to the Minister for Transport. Along with my colleague, the member for Hartley, we jointly wrote to him on 14 December outlining a number of these issues. I will not read it now for lack of time, but I encourage the minister to follow up on the concerns that we raised in December.

We particularly sought a commitment from the government for a full road management plan to complete investigating and addressing these matters so that treatments that will be suitable for these intersections and the whole precinct might be considered. This is the responsibility of the state government, who is receiving in excess of \$60 million for the development of this area, so the state government has a responsibility to our communities to ensure that this matter is addressed fully.

The residents in our area demand some action here. We have put out a survey, and before the end of May we will receive all those responses, but we have already received in excess of 100: loud and clear, they demand that the government take action on this matter.

#### **NICK XENOPHON TEAM**

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (15:36):** While some members of this house may disagree, I do not personally have a lot of bad things to say about Senator Nick Xenophon. I think that if he were to be re-elected by the people of South Australia, then that would be fair enough. I will, of course, be supporting our strong South Australian Labor team. Senator Xenophon is in a safe seat and needs only 7.7 per cent of the vote; in 2013, he achieved over three times that, so it is a pretty sure bet that he will be heading back to Canberra for six more years.

But with such a strong vote, the question becomes: who else might he take with him on his coattails? Potentially, three additional senators and several MPs in the lower house, but one thing is for certain: these people will not be clones of Nick Xenophon. They will all have their own opinions and policies, and in no way will they be able to be bound by Nick Xenophon.

We know that very well in this parliament, when Ann Bressington was elected to the Legislative Council in 2006. She was an embarrassment to this parliament and to Senator Xenophon, promoting bizarre conspiracy theories and waging war with Senator Xenophon himself over election funding. So, I believe it is important that all candidates running under the Nick Xenophon banner are exposed to the type of scrutiny they would receive if they were running for a major political party.

The Nick Xenophon candidate in my local area is Mr Damian Carey. Mr Carey describes himself as a 'Doctor of Chinese Medicine' and a 'self-taught massage therapist'. Damian Carey has self-published an unscientific paper, not peer-reviewed, in which he asserts that genital acupuncture can cure infertility. In his paper, he dismisses IVF and encourages Chinese medicine, including methods like acupuncture of the perineum as the 'first choice for infertility treatment'. Highlights of the paper include:

Chinese Medicine (CM) appears to have a better record than Western Medicine (WM) in treatment of unexplained infertility...

...the use of Huiyin (CV 1), situated in the perineum, between the anus and vagina...is rarely used due to the invasion of personal modesty, yet it is a potent point with clear relevance to this case, having the functions of regulating the Chong and Ren vessels, regulating Yin and calming the spirit...

...careful use of draping to minimise exposure is also highly recommended.

His paper also questions the science behind IVF or, as it is otherwise known, ART. He says that a:

...broader dilemma exists in ART's ability to artificially override the normal physiological filtering of unhealthy gametes, leading to the potential for generations of sub-healthy ART children to be born.

For this outrageous smear, I believe Mr Carey owes an apology to all the parents who have given birth to children through IVF.

Damian Carey openly condones the antivaccination movement. When asked by *The Australian* if he empathised with the antivaccination movement, Mr Carey said, 'I hear the arguments and they sound reasoned.' His attitude encourages the pseudo-science behind the antivaccination movement that puts our children at risk. Mr Carey wrote to the Chinese Medicine Board complaining that he did not have the appropriate qualifications for registration and therefore he should not have to provide evidence for the treatment of his clients. He said:

...with regard to the grandfathering of practitioners such as myself who do not have qualifications equivalent to current standards...I shall have to provide de-identified client record notes of twenty clients...Such a proposition is ludicrous, physically, logically and ethically.

Frankly, I believe that Damian Carey is a quack, a snake-oil salesman. He is peddling unscientific nonsense on vulnerable people in their time of need. He is anti IVF, anti vaccination, pro acupuncture on the perineum, anti tough standards for health professionals.

I believe it would be dangerous for Mr Carey to take his quackery to our federal parliament, potentially playing a crucial role in a hung parliament. It is very scary that Mr Carey could have an influence over national vaccination programs, over medical research programs, over medical payments for unscientific treatments, or over our school curriculum.

In this election, there is a risk that voters may suspect that they are supporting Senator Xenophon's election in the lower house not realising they are supporting the likes of Mr Carey. I call on Senator Xenophon to disendorse Mr Carey from the Nick Xenophon Team. I encourage all South Australians to consider the individual candidates in the local area very carefully and avoid letting into parliament the type of quackery promoted by Mr Carey.

**The SPEAKER:** Can the member for Mount Gambier match that?

#### **DAIRY INDUSTRY**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:41):** Probably not, sir. Dairy farmers in southern Australia have been subject to an unprecedented milk price step-down and clawback of earnings from milk processing companies, led by Murray Goulburn but quickly followed by Fonterra Australia, Lion and others. Australian milk prices are based on the milk fat and protein solid content of milk supplied off farm. Unlike many countries around the world, there is no legislative control over the price milk processing companies pay farmers for their milk, with all prices within the industry set by market forces.

What happened the other week is unprecedented in Australian history, and it will have devastating effects on this industry. To put it in context, Murray Goulburn was offering \$5.60 to \$6.05 in terms of fixed price as a parameter per kilogram of milk solids. They are now paying \$4.75 to \$5. People might say, 'Well, so what?' Well, 'so what' is that the cost of production is around \$5 a kilogram of milk solid. In terms of this price drop (and this is the kicker a lot of people do not understand), for the last nine months, since July 2015, Murray Goulburn has indicated that it has been overpaying farmers, so farmers now must pay that money back. Having spoken to just one mid-size dairy farmer in my electorate, I note that is a \$280,000 bill they are now facing.

If you think about it, if the cost of production is \$5 and if they get \$4.75, they are getting up every day, working double shifts from four in the morning until four in the afternoon and losing money.

It is absolutely outrageous. It is going to lead to some devastating effects, not only for farmers but also on the mental health of their families and communities as a whole. The other kicker in all this—it just gets worse—is that Murray Goulburn shares have crashed. Many farmers invested heavily in Murray Goulburn on the stock market where it peaked at \$2.57 some 18 months ago but which is now paying 85¢; so, this is a triple whammy for dairy farmers.

If you had based your revenue on what you were told you were going to be getting, and then had that corrected, then told you have to pay back nine months' worth and then also invested in the Murray Goulburn stocks, you would be in serious trouble. The reality and the truth is that only the most robust farms and farm businesses are going to survive this second enormous financial blow in seven years.

The other financial blow, which many dairy farmers still have not recovered from, is, of course, the global financial crisis, which they were told was a once-in-a-lifetime financial catastrophe—or so they thought. This dairy farmer I am talking about was grappling with a \$500,000 debt taken on due to the global financial crisis, and they had only just finished paying that back when now this second one is going to hit.

Unfortunately, dairy farms are dynamic yet cumbersome operations. You cannot just turn things on and off with ease, and it is this point that people in the city need to understand. It takes time to line up all the fundamentals of a dairy operation: correct fodder supplies, major infrastructure, water licences, valuable herds, cows that are calved in the correct sequence and timing for seasonal management, and, of course, continual debt servicing and management.

It is not possible to swing this around quickly or easily just because the price of milk is poor. There are many, many farmers in the South-East of South Australia who are going to go broke. These are second and third generation farmers, and I tell you that, from some of the conversations I have had in my office, I worry that those farmers will not be here in 12 months' time because they feel the debt of three generations and they are feeling like they are a failure. So, we need to do something to support them, and I am here just raising that issue.

#### **WORKING WOMEN'S CENTRE**

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:47):** I rise to speak on an urgent issue very close to my heart. The South Australian Working Women's Centre, which has operated since 1979 and which was the first of its kind in Australia, is under threat again. The Working Women's Centre does incredible work with and for vulnerable working women and on the gendered nature of many employment issues.

Its services are invaluable for women with nowhere left to turn, particularly women who work in low paid jobs, in un-unionised workplaces, and who have not had access to good information about their workplace rights. In the last financial year, it delivered 83 information sessions with over 2,500 women in attendance, answered over 1,300 women's questions about work, took on 230 new cases and 120 ongoing cases.

Through the tireless work of its committed staff, led by an extraordinary leader, Sandra Dann, it kept hundreds of women employed who had issues that were able to be resolved. The South Australian Working Women's Centre has been advised by the federal Turnbull government that its funding is now secure only until 31 December 2016 and that between now and then it will be required to engage in an open procurement process with no guarantee about the type of services it will be tendering to provide and whether it will be focused on the needs of working women or will be generalist.

The process itself is not clear, and there is no suggestion that the process will be one that results in sustainable, ongoing funding. Given the lack of certainty about funding, the jobs of these incredibly talented staff are at risk and their ability to continue to provide high quality services to women who need them is under threat. The Working Women's Centre's services are targeted towards vulnerable women who do not have the means to access assistance elsewhere. Its clients include Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, women from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, women affected by disability, and women who live in remote areas.

In addition to its excellent service provision, the Working Women's Centre produces educational materials, delivers community education, provides valuable policy advice to government

and makes public comment based on its considerable expertise. Rightly, we will be hearing more from it about the risk to its vital services created by a cruel federal Liberal government that does not care about the most vulnerable workers in our community.

Women experience particular issues that impact on their ability to maintain connection with the workforce, and it is these issues that our Working Women's Centre professionally confronts. Women make up 42 per cent of our workforce, but earn 17.2 per cent less than men. Average superannuation balances for women at retirement are 52.8 per cent less than those for men—retirement incomes that put women at risk of living in poverty.

Working Women's Centre figures indicate that up to one in four women has experienced some form of sexual harassment in their workplaces. In discussion with the Working Women's Centre about issues of funding, it provided me with so many examples of real and complex issues faced by vulnerable working women and inspiring examples of how it has supported women to resolve them.

For example, a young woman chef without strong English language skills experienced unwelcome and frequent touching and sexual advances in her workplace. Her head chef repeatedly requested a sexual relationship with her and she repeatedly told him that she did not want one. Her coping mechanism was to remain focused on her work and to remain polite. The unwelcome sexual advances continued for over a year and over that time the head chef became more coercive in his manner and threatened her that if she made a complaint it would lead to her dismissal.

The young woman—an international student—felt powerless to challenge the unwanted behaviour, given her impending 457 visa application could not be made without her employer's support. Eventually, her mental health deteriorated and she told a young friend about her situation. Fortunately, the friend she told knew about the Working Women's Centre and they were her saviour.

We know that the Australian workforce is highly gender segregated and that women continue to be concentrated in industries traditionally offering lower pay and less security than male-dominated industries. We know that women are more likely to be engaged in insecure work, more likely to be award reliant, less likely to be unionised, and still discriminated against due to pregnancy and family responsibilities.

To ensure the safety and security of all women at work and the accessibility of effective advice for women, we need to value the services of the Working Women's Centre. We need to fund them effectively and sustainably. We need to respect their profound contribution to the lives and wellbeing of South Australian women. In doing so, we will ensure women continue to have access to quality, independent advice that makes a difference and helps to guide and empower women at their most vulnerable moments.

### **CELLAR DOOR LIQUOR SUBSIDY SCHEME**

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:52):** The wine industry in South Australia is one of our great success stories. In South Australia, we have about 40 per cent of the national crush—just over 700,000 tonnes worth of grapes that we process and turn into about \$1.8 billion worth of wine: a great value-add to be able to take grapes of that variety and that magnitude and turn them into an extremely valuable export market.

In this place, we have heard the Minister for Agriculture parrot on time and time again about how food and wine from our clean green environment is one of this government's priorities. Whilst the minister will stand here and talk endlessly about his support for this industry, what I think we really need to cut down to are the facts around how much the government actually provides on the table in terms of direct support for this industry. Last week, quietly trying to shuffle out a press release in the shadow of the federal election campaign in order to hide, the minister announced the fact that he was cutting almost \$1 million from support to our much fabled, much vaunted wine industry.

The changes to the cellar-door subsidy scheme that we are talking about have been on the table for quite a while. Certainly, there needs to be some change to that scheme. It was decided earlier last year, in 2015, that it needed to take place so the minister, in conjunction with PIRSA, put together a consultation program running through May, June and July. In May, June and July they put forward a proposal that is extremely vague and the crux of it is, basically, that it might include

infrastructure improvements to help wineries increase their capacity, innovative winemaking approaches, new cellar-door facilities, and targeted promotional events.

Those sound like laudable causes, except that between July last year and now, for 10 months, last week the minister and PIRSA sat on their hands and did nothing and came out last week and said, 'In six weeks' time we're going to move to the new scheme, except we can't tell you what it is yet or who's going to be eligible, and who, potentially, could get the money.'

After sitting on their hands for 10 months, they are now going through another consultation process over the next six weeks to try to understand what it is that they are going to do with this Cellar Door Liquor Subsidy Scheme. It is interesting that, whilst there is no certainty around what this scheme is going to encompass, the thing we can be certain of is the desire of this government to cut the almost \$1 million from that scheme. It is a real kick in the face for one of the few bright spots that we have in the South Australian economy.

This is one of the few areas where we are actually able to grow exports. Indeed, the Minister for Investment and Trade comes into this place and talks about the success of the wine industry and its ability to break into markets in China, when really this government should be backing up that rhetoric with solid and firm action. This is as bungled a process as you can get. Even though the minister goes to the media and says, 'I know a lot of people who are supportive of what we are trying to do,' only two out of 703 wineries in South Australia expressed support for their very vague proposal.

As a business, you make decisions based on tax, regulatory and financial environments. Indeed, we are here in the middle of May and businesses will already understand what their marketing budgets and their business budgets are going to look like for the next year. What we have is a situation where the government has ripped out from underneath the wine industry almost a million dollars worth of funding, with no certainty but also no time, because this comes into effect on 1 July—no time.

If we are talking about trying to build confidence and provide certainty for industry, this is one of the most disgusting examples that shows up the government's hypocrisy in this area. The government will say, 'The new scheme will create jobs,' but the truth is that the current scheme also underpins jobs. Indeed, I was talking with some wine industry people and some winery owners who talked about how they use this funding to underpin new tourism experiences, and renovations and upgrades to their cellar door so that they can pay penalty rates and keep cellar doors open on public holidays.

What the government is seeking to do here is punish those who have actually been successful in becoming must-visit destinations in their regions. Wineries in my electorate, in the Barossa Valley in particular, have been extremely successful in creating themselves as a must-visit wine tourism destination, and those successful businesses that created those must-see experiences are now being punished. What is also being punished is their desire to add on to those experiences so that we can remain at the forefront of tourism.

These changes are disgusting. There needs to be a pause put on this so that there can be proper understanding of what is going to happen going forward, otherwise this industry is going to suffer as a direct result of this government's maladministration.

## NUCLEAR WASTE

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:57):** I had the opportunity last week to meet with representatives of the Adnyamathanha Traditional Lands Association, Regina and Vivianne McKenzie, Heather Stewart and Cat Eaton. They wanted to brief me with regard to their association's view, along with that of the Viliwarinha Yura Aboriginal Corporation (VYAC) and the Yappala Group of Properties (YGP). This was about the commonwealth government's search for a national waste facility under the National Radioactive Waste Management Act (NRWMA).

Despite South Australia's current laws about there not being support for intermediate-level waste to be stored in this state, under the federal NRWMA, the federal resources minister can override any state or territory with regard to legislation. The most dangerous waste in Australia is

classified as long-lived intermediate-level waste, and I understand that this waste needs to be kept safe for thousands of years or more.

At present, there is a need reported for over 500 cubic metres of intermediate-level waste. As my friends told me today, if Aboriginal people 40,000 or 45,000 years ago had nuclear waste, we would still be managing that waste today. I think they make a very pertinent point in the current debate about nuclear waste. I also understand that it is proposed that this level of waste will not be buried but kept in dry storage in a large above-ground shed.

Australia's most hazardous waste is produced at Lucas Heights and a small amount of intermediate-level waste is generated from the health sector, industry and universities. The Lucas Heights nuclear reactor's fuel rods are sent overseas for processing and reprocessing, and that waste is returned to Australia. I am also advised that the first shipment came back to Australia in December 2015 and was taken to Lucas Heights for storage.

My information is that medical and scientific institutions produce a very low level of radioactive waste in Australia and could be stored also at Lucas Heights, so concerns are now being raised at Wallerberdina and Barndioota, Flinders Ranges (or what is commonly known as the Willie Wagtail home), being short-listed as a site for a possible national nuclear waste dump. I quote in part the submission of Ms Regina McKenzie on behalf of the VYAC. She says, amongst some other very important points, that their corporation:

...is located in South Australia, approximately 350km north of Adelaide, and approximately 6km northwest of Hawker. [This area] consists of 5 pastoral stations, 4 of which have been declared as Indigenous Protected Areas...administered by the South Australian Aboriginal Lands Trust...

We view this proposal as an attack on our cultural beliefs, history and heritage. We do not want this waste dump on our ancestors' yata [which means land]. Our mudah is our past, our present and our future. No is a very simple word in...English...and we are wondering why people are struggling to understand the simplicity of the word 'No'.

Our history in this area goes back to pre-European settlement, and since settlement our people have had traditional access to this land for generations because of its significance to our culture.

This area is part of an ancient...trading route, this is why there is a high density of archaeological sites within this area. Our community has worked with the Aboriginal Affairs Reconciliation Division of South Australia...in recording Aboriginal...heritage sites and artefacts in this area, and this is...an ongoing process.

In the years...to date we have found thousands of artefacts as well as calcified human remains of great archaeological significance (see Scribe Archaeology Cultural Landscape Mapping Report 2015).

That report was enclosed in their submission. There are many other issues that I do not have time to address, but I wish to represent the views of these women, who are very important leaders in their community.

#### *Condolence*

#### **BRIGGS, PROF. FREDA**

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (16:02):** By leave, I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of Emeritus Professor Freda Briggs AO and places on record its appreciation of her long and meritorious service as an authority on child development and protection.

Like, I am sure, many in this chamber, I was saddened to hear of the sudden passing of Emeritus Professor Freda Briggs AO last month. She was an outstanding citizen of this state and nation, and throughout a lifetime of research, advocacy and activism she was a world-renowned expert on child protection and development. With seemingly limitless energy and a gift for plain speaking, she helped immeasurably to raise public awareness about this vital field of social policy.

She was adept at mastering theory and technical detail. At the same time, she was able to explain complex matters in straightforward terms and to understand the practical concerns that arise from policy implementation. Freda never had difficulty in speaking truth to power. She was certainly unafraid to critique or even excoriate governments at all levels and of all stripes, including my own, where she identified what she believed to be failure in competence or a lack of resolve.

As a result of her shining a light on a subject that historically had been too long in the shadows, she was a leading member of a movement that has profoundly changed attitudes and made this a safer world for young people. Born in Huddersfield, Yorkshire, on 1 December 1930, Freda grew up in a strict household and her early years cycled around family and the Methodist Church. She once wrote that her interest in social justice was fostered by the Methodists and that 'the church taught me to relate well to people who are disadvantaged and not to be judgemental'.

After leaving school early and taking a job as a clerk at a chemical plant, she decided to become a police officer after seeing a newspaper advertisement. 'It was the perfect solution,' she wrote in 2007, 'It offered free accommodation, free food, free uniform, £7 a week, and the opportunity to leave my overly restrictive home for adventure.' Within the police force, Freda became a specialist in child protection, and saw firsthand the challenging social circumstances in which many young people in London grew up.

After getting married, having children and becoming a foster carer with her husband, Ken, she completed year 12 by correspondence, studied teaching and started a second career in a very tough school in Chesterfield. It was there that her interest in child welfare deepened and she realised that teachers were the most important professionals in child protection because they were especially well-placed to spot the early signs of abuse.

Freda and her family moved to Australia in 1975. After a period at the State College of Victoria, she established, in Adelaide, the first university level, multiprofessional child protection course in the world. She helped establish similar courses internationally, and she worked closely with police forces both in Australia and New Zealand. She had a long association with the University of South Australia and its earlier incarnations, eventually rising to the position of Professor of Childhood Development. Freda was a truly lifelong champion of children, and she kept working well after many of us would have been happy to retire. Indeed, it is significant that she passed away very soon after returning from Zurich and Jakarta, where she had spoken and run workshops.

As far as formal recognition is concerned, the list of honours bestowed on her is long and impressive. They include the inaugural Australian Humanitarian Award in 1998, Senior Australian of the Year in 2000 (the first female recipient), and a Centenary Metal in 2001. On 13 June 2005, in the Queen's Birthday honours of that year, Freda was made an Officer of the Order of Australia; specifically, she was recognised for 'service to raising community and professional awareness of child abuse and neglect, and as an advocate for effective child-safety education programs'.

Professor Briggs' legacy is evident today in the numerous books and pieces of research she published during her career. We see it too in the field of teaching, including as part of South Australia's nationally recognised 'Keeping Safe' child protection curriculum. With determination, with fearlessness and sometimes with anger Freda Briggs brought to light the uncomfortable truth about the widespread and insidious nature of child abuse. She revealed that it was much more prevalent than previously thought, and she helped us understand that properly confronting and combating the problem required governments and society generally to take a more vigorous and systematic approach. She highlighted the fact that professionals working with or near children needed to be more worldly, alert and responsive to abuse.

It is extremely unfortunate that we in Australia have had to hold so many inquiries, including a royal commission nationally, one here in this state and, of course, the earlier Mullighan and Layton inquiries, to uncover and fully comprehend the things Freda Briggs had been talking about for decades. The incidents, details and implications of child abuse are so monstrous that they are difficult for many people to contemplate, but collectively we are no longer able to ignore or to diminish the importance of the matter. Indeed, collectively we can no longer say that we are surprised about these matters, as horrible as they are. We have no excuse now.

I hate the idea that decent citizens who have the best interests of children at heart now have to be thoroughly scrutinised and are occasionally viewed with suspicion. I hate the fact that when you see a fantastic youth worker who has an extraordinary relationship with children and with the parents, you have to ask yourself whether he is grooming those parents for his subsequent behaviour. It is sad that we have to have a regime of police checks in place and that certain professionals who come into contact children are now required to work only in pairs.

However, in light of what Freda Briggs and other experts have taught us, it is right and proper and necessary for us to do this. The truth is that where there is vulnerability there are predators, and we have to be vigilant. As a community we have to be scrupulous in the measures we put in place. We must do everything possible to protect, support and nurture children. In 2016, child abuse still occurs and it is highly unlikely ever to completely disappear. However, this is a safer and better world than it would otherwise have been for children as a result of the courage, compassion and honesty of this dedicated and pioneering woman, Freda Briggs.

On behalf of the government of South Australia, I wish to extend my condolences to the entire Briggs family, especially to Freda's son, Alister; her brother, Gwyn; her four grandchildren; and those who have travelled a great distance to be here. I look forward to honouring Freda Briggs' contribution to our community in a public way at a later time.

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:10):** I rise today to speak on the sad passing of the champion of children, Emeritus Professor Freda Briggs AO. Professor Briggs was an internationally renowned child protection expert. She was a national treasure, and the people of South Australia were exceedingly lucky to count her as one of our own for so long.

Professor Briggs was born Freda Akeroyd in the market town of Huddersfield in West Yorkshire, England, in 1930. The daughter of a railway clerk named Horace and wife, Hilda, Freda was encouraged to embrace education and books from a young age. She once told an interviewer that books were so treasured by her parents that she always had to wash her hands before she was allowed to read them. She grew up in the Great Depression and lived through World War II, which taught her the value of thrift, hard work and community.

After a short-lived career as an office clerk, Professor Briggs left Huddersfield to join the London Metropolitan Police where she worked in the child protection field. This new job would shape the rest of her life and led her to her greatest passion, child protection. In 1952, she married Ken, a craft bookbinder from the British Museum whom she had met at Sunday school. Their wedding photo appeared on the front page of the evening newspaper with the headline 'Policewoman marries museum man'. They would go on to become foster carers and have two children of their own.

Professor Briggs subsequently undertook teacher training at Warwick University and embarked on an academic career. As a lecturer, she trained educators to identify children who were victims of abuse or neglect. In 1975, she emigrated to Melbourne to take up a pioneering position as Director of Early Childhood Studies at the State College of Victoria. In 1980, she established the first university level multiprofessional child protection course in the world. Everyone told her she was wasting her time because child abuse did not happen in Australia or, if it did, it only happened in Sydney.

Five years later, Professor Briggs moved to Adelaide and was appointed Dean of the Institute of Early Childhood and Family Studies. She continued to provide advice on child protection to institutions around Australia and internationally from her home here in Adelaide. Professor Briggs was tireless in her pursuit to ensure that all children were safe and protected in Australia. Professor Briggs campaigned against teaching 'stranger danger' to children, noting that most children were abused by people they knew. She also highlighted that most children do not know what a stranger is, believing that strangers are mostly men in cars wearing masks rather than people who might appear friendly or kind.

She wrote about the importance of teaching children in school about what constitutes abuse and how to report it and that teachers needed to be specially trained in educating children about these dangers. She believed it was not enough to leave it up to parents who were still telling the same 'stranger danger' stories she had been taught back in the 1930s. This work made her a target, with some people accusing her of creating a child protection industry. She was criticised in the media, the parliament and by other academics. She received threats to her safety and her life and was the target of a number of disturbing letter writing campaigns. However, nothing would stop her from the work that she was doing because she knew that she was right.

Professor Briggs provided Australia with a mirror. She asked us to look at ourselves and question: are we happy to live in a country where child abuse is swept under the rug? The answer,



of course, was no. When asked in recent years how she continued to work with such passion and dedication, she said:

My energy probably comes from anger. I get very angry with the way that people, governments and courts treat children. It makes me angry that governments can waste millions of dollars advertising their own policies while departments fail to investigate child abuse cases because they do not have sufficient resources.

Professor Briggs earned many awards and accolades during her career. In 2000, she was the first woman to be named Senior Australian of the Year for her work in child protection education. In 2004, the Prime Minister of Australia (Hon. John Howard) recognised her work by awarding a \$10 million endowment for the provision of the national child protection research centre at the University of South Australia.

In 2005, she was appointed Foundation Chair of Child Development and Emeritus Professor lecturing in sociology, child protection and family studies at the University of South Australia. Professor Briggs was also awarded the Australian Humanitarian Award and a national Centenary Medal and became an Officer of the Order of Australia in 2005. Professor Briggs was the recipient of an ANZAC Fellowship, the Jean Denton Memorial Scholarship and the Creswick Fellowship.

In 2009, Professor Briggs received an honorary Doctor of Letters degree from the University of Sheffield for outstanding research publications and contributions to education relating to child abuse and child protection. Professor Briggs provided assistance to royal commissions and parliamentary inquiries and wrote numerous submissions to state and federal inquiries relating to child protection, including the Mullighan inquiry and the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. She advised police forces in Australia and New Zealand and was a media consultant on child protection issues relating to TV, movies and computer games.

Professor Briggs was a patron of the Adelaide Women's and Children's Hospital paediatric palliative care project and a South Australian ambassador to the Prime Minister's department on the recognition of women. Only a month before she died, Professor Briggs wrote a submission to a federal Senate inquiry into the harm caused to children by online pornography.

Professor Briggs also campaigned successfully against mandatory retirement, ensuring that the contributions of many South Australians are properly valued. In 1995, the same year that she published four books and was appointed Associate Professor, she received a letter saying, 'We note that you will be 65 in December. We will require your resignation.' Despite support from the Dean of the University, she was forced to take part-time contracts to get around the federal law, which was then abolished within the year.

However, Professor Freda Briggs would never truly retire. She worked up until the end of her life, dying suddenly whilst returning from a conference overseas. She once lamented all the people who questioned why she did not retire and said:

While constant cries for help delay retirement, I like to escape when I can. During my time off I do crazy things like climbing the Sydney Harbour Bridge and parasailing. When I was Senior Australian of the Year, I met a wonderful 91-year-old who had been abseiling in the Blue Mountains. She said, 'If I kill myself falling down a blue mountain, it's better than dying in a nursing home.' I have adopted that as my philosophy.

I believe that Professor Briggs died doing what she loved, which was campaigning for the protection of children. She was a national hero and, on behalf of the entire Liberal Party of South Australia, I extend my sincere condolences and those of our party to her family and to the countless families she has helped. Vale, Freda Briggs.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**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) (16:18):** I would also like to say a few words in relation to this condolence motion. In doing so, I know that my ministerial colleague the Hon. Susan Close, who is unfortunately not well today, would also have wished to have participated in saying a few words, so perhaps I speak on her behalf as well.

Professor Briggs obviously dedicated her life to the protection of vulnerable children and education about the devastating effects of child abuse for individuals in our community. She shone a light on issues which were often very difficult to face but which, ultimately, led to better awareness and greater protection for our children.

As members would be aware, we are presently involved in a process where we have a royal commission presided over by former Justice Nyland looking into yet another example of terrible treatment of children, this time in particular by a worker employed by the state to look after them. I have to say, on behalf of Susan and me, that the process of following this royal commission and all that it has thrown up has been an eye-opener and a profoundly moving experience. It is the sort of thing that you would hope, in a society like ours, none of us would ever have to be thinking about but, unfortunately, that is not the case.

There are so many issues around protection of children that have come to my attention and to Susan's attention over the last two years, and no doubt will be focusing the attention of this parliament once Commissioner Nyland makes her report in August of this year. I feel confident that all of the members of the parliament, irrespective of their political affiliations, regard these issues as being extremely important and issues that transcend party politics.

These issues invariably discomfit governments. Unfortunately, there are some times when it is necessary for governments to be discomfited because there are things that need to be done. We have done many things in the past, from the Mullighan inquiry through to other bits of work, but this is work that never ends. We have to continue trying to incrementally improve the position, and will hopefully significantly improve the position when the royal commission report comes out later this year.

I think it is fair to say that the royal commission and its outcomes, in part at least, will be seen by many if not most people as an epitaph to the work of Freda Briggs. On my own behalf, and on behalf of minister Close who, as I said, is not well today and unable to be here, I wish to place on the record my acknowledgement of her great work. I would like to pass on to her family, aside from condolences, would be that you can be assured that her work will continue because, having started this issue in the public mind, it is not an issue that is going to go away, it is not an issue that can be ignored, and it is not an issue that will be ignored.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:21):** It is fitting that this motion is before the house and that we recognise Emeritus Professor Freda Briggs AO on the sad occasion of her passing. Can I say that, whilst our leader and of course the Premier have made a contribution as to the historical work of Freda Briggs both in Britain and here, I had occasion personally to meet with her in the mid-1980s, fresh out of criminal courts, at a time when the legal profession, the psychiatry world and the police department were all at their complete wits' end as to how they were going to deal with what appeared to be an explosion of reporting of alleged child sexual abuse in South Australia.

It was only in South Australia, and some inquiry was made at the time as to why there were so many cases, some resulting in prosecution of alleged offenders and many, of course, resulting in families breaking up and, almost inevitably, children being separated from one or both parents. It was a highly destructive time.

I have often reflected on why that occurred here, and I think the principal reason is that a number of our esteemed members of the medical profession and psychiatry world went to England in the early 1980s and learned, particularly at places such as the children's hospital at Great Ormond Street, that there had been a pattern of indicia of behaviour that was developing and a sufficient body of evidence created to support the assertion that, when presented, could correspond to a child being a victim of child sexual abuse. It was being studied, it was being listened to and it was being acted on.

So, because of a number of these pioneering, mostly female, professionals who came back to South Australia and were practising in South Australia, there was a high level of alertness, awareness and commitment to deal with this pressing issue. At the time, a number of us were challenged about how we would be dealing with the social consequences of allegations, but there were also very forensic concerns, namely, how we protect children from being contaminated in the

interview process so that they would not inadvertently cause a successful prosecution to fail where it should have proceeded and been successful and also to ensure that agencies such as the South Australian police department, again, were not inadvertently, perhaps through inexperience and lack of training, effectively sabotaging what should have been successful resolution.

These cases are rarely just resolved by a criminal prosecution. Sometimes it is immediate and sometimes it is necessary, but inevitably, as I say, you have a fractured family and a child who is at the centre of it and usually the greatest victim of all the consequences that flow. So, there was this explosion, there was the determination of a number of people to remedy it, and Professor Freda Briggs (Mrs Freda Briggs in those days) came on the scene. She had police experience in Britain, and she came at a very important time to help us work our way through that.

I can remember having conversations with her at times when she was either a witness for me or when I was cross-examining her when she was a witness for somebody else. The important thing that she conveyed was that children have to be listened to, children have to be believed. There is a problem, it does need to be addressed, and, from her perspective, it certainly could not be ignored.

We both often discussed the question of what would arise if there was a too frequent reporting of alleged child abuse to the extent that nobody would then act on it. It was a 'crying wolf' syndrome, where everybody was going to jump on the bandwagon, where every child who was presented at a childcare centre who wet their pants during morning sleep time was identified as a child who might be the subject of child sexual abuse, and some of them no doubt were.

There had to be some very quick work done to identify the reliable indicia that combined would enable intervention and action and for the authorities to take action. She was at the forefront of that. She was criticised at times for her recommendations, but she never wavered in her determination to continue to be an advocate for children principally in the area of child sexual abuse, but there were a number of other areas of abusive circumstances that she wrote about, reported on, gave evidence on, and where she tried to assist families, in particular children, to have their lives restored.

I thank her for that commitment. In the time that I have known her it was over 30 years worth, but clearly in her 85 years she made a very substantial contribution in other countries, and we thank her very much for that work. I convey to her family my personal appreciation for her professional contribution and her personal commitment to that.

**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) (16:28):** I too would like to express my condolences to the family and friends of Professor Freda Briggs AO. Freda made a remarkable contribution to generations of children and their families, not just in South Australia but worldwide.

She was in many ways a woman ahead of her time. She was a police officer in the Metropolitan Police in London in the 1950s, when many women were still confined to the domestic realm. She was an academic, a researcher, an advocate whose voice would not be dismissed. As we have heard, as a police officer in London in those early days, her interactions with vulnerable children and their families set the foundation for Freda's lifework advocating for children's safety and protection.

Studying teaching at Warwick University, Freda learned about child protection and began her lifelong campaign to educate others about the importance of this issue. She recognised education as the key to empowering children to keep themselves safe and for adults to build safe environments for children. In an era when the prevailing view was that children should be seen and not heard, Freda was already advocating for their protection and wellbeing and giving them a voice. She also redefined ageing, refusing to step back from her work or even slow down right until the end. She continued working into her 80s with a vigour that would put people half her age to shame.

When Freda came to Adelaide in 1980 to become Dean of the Institute of Early Childhood and Family Studies, she began developing her pioneering child protection course. She went on to

establish child protection courses based on that early model in countries as far and wide as the United States, Germany and Brazil. Freda had an enormous impact on the way Australians and people around the world looked at child protection.

She was committed to advocating for vulnerable children and giving them a voice in circles to which they would never have access. She was instrumental in changing the community's perception of who perpetrates child abuse. She shifted attention from the concept of 'stranger danger' and turned our focus inward to recognise and acknowledge that abuse was, more often than not, perpetrated by the very people children trust and rely upon.

Freda consistently and continually advocated for a professional child protection system to address the harm caused to children in their family homes. She also helped create the foundation for the establishment of 'child safe environments' in organisations providing services to children. Freda Briggs was the preeminent voice on child protection, and we were fortunate to have her here living among us, teaching and guiding us and keeping the welfare of children front and centre.

Countless child protection workers, academics, educators and public policy-makers and, of course, the legal profession (as the deputy leader mentioned) have been influenced by Freda's extensive body of work across her career. I understand that the Minister for Education and Child Development regularly met with Freda to discuss child protection and child development matters and to seek her input on current matters in these areas. Freda also provided similar counsel to previous ministers and advisers in this portfolio area.

Freda simply never gave up trying to make the world a safer and a better place for children. Though she is no longer with us, Freda's legacy, her research, books, curriculum and ideas will continue to influence and shape our approach to child protection. I thank her for her great work that will continue to live on here in South Australia and throughout the world.

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (16:32):** I rise to support the condolence motion moved by the Premier to acknowledge the work and contribution of Professor Freda Briggs AO. I would like to start by reading into *Hansard* a note from Ian Henschke, a close friend and admirer of Freda:

Freda Briggs left the world a better place than she found it. But it was a long process and one she never gave up on. Born in Yorkshire in 1930, her childhood was spent during the Depression and World War 2. In 1945 she left school and got a job at Industrial Chemical Industries. In her own words 'I made history when, at 15, I reported the chief engineer of ICI for sexual harassment.' Management acted and moved the engineer elsewhere.

It was a powerful sign of things to come. She wanted to make society safer for children, scarier for paedophiles and uncomfortable for people who cover up, play down or pass over the damage caused by child abuse. She joined the Police Force in London after her stint at ICI and specialised in child protection. She completed year 12 by correspondence and became a teacher realising quickly it was the crucial profession in child protection 'because victims over the age of four are usually in school and give signs of abuse that informed teachers can recognise'.

Freda then became an academic, educating teachers and others involved in child welfare. She also wrote twenty books during her long career. Forty years ago when she was invited [to Australia]...with her pioneering knowledge she found a country that thought telling children about stranger danger was the answer. Freda knew the stranger was the least of our worries. She knew how paedophiles groomed their victims. It could be, as we soon learned, the family friend, coach, children's entertainer, priest, magistrate [or even a police officer].

I was shocked when I heard Freda had collapsed on a plane returning from yet another speaking engagement earlier this month. This one had been in Jakarta talking to the people who run international schools. After her plane landed she was taken to the [Royal Adelaide Hospital] where she later died surrounded by her family and close friends. I knew she was in her mid 80s but I didn't think of her as old. She seemed invincible. Her eyes shone when she spoke and she spoke with eloquence and passion.

She will be remembered as fearless Freda. She gave a voice to the voiceless. She told it how it was. In 2003 she conducted an inquiry with an eminent QC into the way the Governor General Peter Hollingworth had handled child abuse in the Anglican Church when he was an Archbishop...

When Freda Briggs was named in the Advertiser this year as one of the 100 most influential women in South Australia's history I wasn't surprised...Freda Briggs fought to change the law so victims can now prosecute historic child abuse cases. She also oversaw the updating of the child protection policy at schools and the training of those who work with children. Freda is no longer with us but her good work will always be there. And if there's a heaven I'm sure she'll be having a good chat about 'Spotlight' winning the Oscar with Mary McKillop and about the way things have changed and the way some things never do.

That was from Ian Henschke.

I first met Professor Freda Briggs AO just after the 2014 election when I was helping the Hon. Stephen Wade in the other place on some foster care and child protection issues prior to my becoming the shadow minister for families and child protection. I stayed on long after Stephen had left, spending several hours feeling like a sponge taking in every word Freda spoke. She was passionate, knowledgeable, and generous of her time. I left with copious notes and a thirst for knowledge on how I could improve the lives of the many, many children in our state who suffer neglect and/or abuse, mostly at the hands of those they trust to nurture and protect them.

I recently received an email from Dr Pamela Schulz OAM, who was here in the chamber with us today. It states, 'Just to let you know that [Freda] had three wishes which I hope the [South Australian] Parliament could promote into the future of her great legacy.' So that they will be forevermore in *Hansard*:

1. A Protocol standard (gold standard level) so that investigative officers social workers teachers and others know how to interview vulnerable children and their families and that they will be believed.
2. A Child Protection Review Council for cases bogged down through indecision or ongoing or even cold cases needing review...to be convened by the State Government authorities 6 or so times per year to ensure the ongoing best practice is considered in regard to Child Protection matters and that Chloe Valentine's death will not be in vain.
3. Embedded in all University courses a significant input into Child Protection identification and intervention for teachers, lawyers working as ICL (Independent Children's Lawyers in courts [currently] do not require knowledge or training in Child Protection), and especially social workers.

Over the last two years, I had many meetings, many conversations and numerous emails at various times of the day or night from Freda. Freda would often point out what was not working in child protection in our state and what needed to be done. She advocated for many children, foster carers, and anyone who had misgivings about our current system.

My last conversation with Freda Briggs followed a radio interview, when we were both interviewed, along with the Minister for Child Protection. Freda stated on the radio that Families SA was dysfunctional and that it would never be fixed. I called Freda immediately afterwards to tell her that, while I knew fixing Families SA would not be easy and that Labor had failed in their 14 years to improve the department, I told her in no uncertain terms that if it were ever possible to be changed only a Liberal government could change it and that I would do everything I could to make sure that happened.

I do not have the knowledge and the experience that Freda had, but I am in a position to facilitate change and I have the determination, tenacity, and the belief that it can be done. I promise you, Freda, that I will do all that I can to protect the children of our state both in your honour and because it must be done. Rest in peace, Freda, in the knowledge that your work may not be finished yet but that it will be continued. My condolences go to your son, Alister, and your four grandchildren. Heaven has another angel. Vale, Freda.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:39):** Freda Briggs's immense contribution is legend, and I acknowledge all the biographical information and list of awards that have already been placed on the record here today. I did not know Freda well though, like nearly everybody here, I definitely knew her and respected all she had achieved. She had many friends, some of whom I have approached for some information and others of whom, through my dear friend at UniSA, Deirdre Tedmanson, have kindly given me some thoughts on Freda that I would like to add to the record today.

Dr Pamela Schulz OAM is an adjunct senior research fellow at the School of Communication, International Studies and Languages at UniSA. Pamela told me it was an honour to know Freda and something she had valued for 30 years, 25 of which saw them as academic colleagues who became long-lasting friends. During this time, Freda was nothing but supportive and committed to women, in particular, that they had an opportunity to be heard.

Pamela and Freda often reminisced about how tough it was being 'a council house kid from Huddersfield in Yorkshire', a place where women's rights were hard-wired through a long-established tradition for the fight for suffrage and where women railed against another tradition of the time, that girls should have little jobs until they married. Together they mentored people who went back to study

as mature-age students. As Freda always said, 'You are never too old and it's never too late to learn a new skill, to get an education and to make a difference.'

I hear from Pamela, who is here today, that one of their great shared joys was a Friday night gathering of women friends and colleagues, members of the gin and tonic club, where talk was about how they could and would make the world a better place. I am told Freda often said, 'There's nothing that can't be solved with a discussion over a gin and tonic.' Pamela remarked on Freda's life work and fierce determination to protect children, what she called the most precious part of our society and our future, for without them being in a safe place there is no future at all.

Another friend, Professor Fiona Arney, who is the director of the Australian Centre for Child Protection at UniSA, remembers Freda as fearless in challenging injustice related to children's rights and children's safety. She changed the lives of thousands through her individual work with victims and survivors, as an educator of the next generation of practitioners and researchers and in her role as an expert and advocate in policy and system reform.

This advocacy for and representation of victims and survivors has changed child protection systems across the world. Freda highlighted the importance of listening to children, believing them and understanding how their behaviour reflects their experience. She was dedicated to enhancing the research and evidence base in child protection and in ensuring that what we do know is translated into practice and policy for future generations. Her foresight and advocacy in this regard led to the creation of the Australian Centre for Child Protection based at UniSA.

Another esteemed colleague, Dr Elspeth McInnes AM, a graduate research coordinator at the University of South Australia's School of Education, says Freda never spared herself in her mission to protect children and was always open to parents and children in distress who sought help. Freda's police training stood her in good stead when questioning victims, perpetrators, protective parents and professionals working with children. She would go straight to the heart of the matter and ask direct questions.

Freda raised the ire of numerous family law system professionals because she told the truth, and she was canny enough with the law to ensure she could not be targeted by them, although many tried. One of her key messages was the lack of knowledge of child development, trauma and abuse, and abuse dynamics, amongst people who make decisions about children's lives. She was most concerned also that people were too quick to discount, minimise and deny what children had to say about their circumstances.

Freda knew from her research that children with disabilities were particularly vulnerable to abuse. She knew that children were easily tricked by offenders and needed practice in skills to keep themselves safe, and she was tireless in her work to educate people about child abuse. I also spoke to a mutual friend, Dr Marie O'Neill AM, a clinical and child psychology and forensic psychology practitioner, who I also believe is here today. It was through her work that Marie knew Freda in a professional capacity in another area.

She would like to add to the record that during the eighties and nineties Freda became intensely interested in the need to bring child sexual abuse and incest to notice, and she embarked upon and expanded research that would enlighten authorities both in Australia and overseas on relevant factual information about sexual abuse. This related to both adults and children. There had been a rapid increase in reports of child sexual abuse and there was an urgent need for the development of personal safety curricula for young children.

By 2003, Freda had produced more than 10 books and multiple reports and had become well known as a public speaker, being used by the media as a high profile expert in the area. At the time of her death, she had produced 20 books on early childhood education and sexual abuse of children and adults. She had worked intensively with the federal and state police and was fearless in her pursuit of knowledge in the area of sexual abuse and in efforts to bring to justice those preying on children.

Freda was a mother, a grandmother, a humanitarian, an author, a teacher and a talented, tireless supporter of the underprivileged and abused. The loss to the community is most significant and difficult to gauge. Freda is widely admired and her enormous contribution will be remembered by all. Her legacy is the people who now continue in her field. I offer my condolences to her family

and legion of friends and colleagues who carry on the work for a better world for which Freda always strived, something that we here too must use our power and influence to achieve.

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:45):** I too wish to share condolences for Professor Freda Briggs and support the Premier's motion, supported by the Leader of the Opposition. I first met Freda when I was first appointed as the shadow minister for education and early childhood development, I think it was about 2008, when she was still living in Magill. My memories of that time are of how generous she was with her time and how committed she was to her life's work. I think that, from that very first meeting, there is no doubt that virtually all my education, my guidance and my advice on child protection in particular came from either Freda firsthand, someone Freda had worked with, someone Freda knew or something that Freda had read or was aware of.

Many of you would know that when you are in opposition you are very scantily resourced, so you are very pleased when somebody is prepared to work with you in an area that you are working on. When I had that role in the families portfolio, a number of cases were sent to me by email, by letter and through people coming in the door, and I have to say that, for the uninitiated, it takes a while to develop an understanding of just how broad and complex family problems can be in our community in South Australia.

One of the things that stood out about Freda and her work was how practical she was. Yes, she was very well admired and formally educated in those areas, but she had a very practical view as to the way things should be dealt with. I remember her continued frustration with people suggesting that children had to be a certain age in order to be believed when they made allegations of sexual abuse. It was from her that I learned about learnt behaviour.

I remember dealing with a matter with the member for Hammond not long after I was appointed in the role, where a five-year-old child at a school in Murray Bridge was behaving in a very sexualised manner. It was Freda who explained to me that kids do not make that up: they learn that and they have witnessed that. That then kicked me into action to want to do something about that child who was exposed to that situation; and not only the situation that child was exposed to but also what that child was exposing to other children at the school, and of course that is where the complaint came from.

After learning that, it surprised me that the complaint had to get to me before anything was done about it. Teachers would have been witnessing that same behaviour that those children and their parents were witnessing. I thank Freda very much for spending the time with me and helping me understand why what those parents had seen and what those children were experiencing was wrong.

That is just one occasion; there were many others when Freda would take a phone call from me or would return a call, and she would be frank and direct with her advice. She was also very concerned at the fact that when children were interviewed by police, on many occasions those police were not trained to understand how to interview a child who had made allegations of sexual assault, to get to the truth. As she said, children do not make this stuff up; she was very passionate about that.

I think we are so much more aware of the risks to children because of the work of Freda Briggs and her passion, and it should be said that the Australian Centre for Child Protection was established here in Adelaide because of the advocacy and work of Freda Briggs. I remember her telling me, and being very proud of the fact, that John Howard provided \$10 million to the University of South Australia to establish that centre on her advice. It was extraordinary, the amount of credibility that woman had in her life, amongst decision-makers.

I thank Freda for her public service, for her protection of children, for being interested in helping all those, regardless of their qualification, who want to make a difference when it comes to protecting children, helping them to achieve that goal. Vale, Freda Briggs.

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:51):** I rise to contribute to the condolence motion for the late Professor Freda Briggs, author, academic, child protection advocate and definitely a champion for children. I also acknowledge the biography that has been presented in front of the house today with a great deal of respect.

She was a mentor and a leader without peer in her field, and I had the privilege of sitting in on several of her wonderful speeches, as well as the absolute pleasure, more recently, of being able to sit with her and quietly pontificate about our shared experiences around foster care and how we could change the world, one child at a time, in a very real way. I find it quite incredible to think that the last time I spoke with her she was 85. She was such a vibrant and wise woman I had no idea she was in her 80s. I had a great deal of respect for her.

Professor Briggs was highly respected across South Australia, and I shared many conversations with people working in education about her leadership and energy in the field of child protection, not only here but across the nation and internationally. Her tireless commitment to the protection of children and young people was incredible.

For more than 20 years Professor Briggs had a close collaborative working relationship with our education department, now the Department for Education and Child Development. She was influential in the development, evaluation and review of the 'Keeping Safe' child protection curriculum that is mandated in all South Australian public and Catholic schools as well as in preschools. It is also taught in other states of Australia. It is a wonderful legacy, and it grows in its reputation overseas as well, including being taught in Indonesia where, as we know, Professor Briggs most recently visited prior to her passing.

She was definitely unafraid to ask the hard questions of governments and institutions and spoke her mind as she saw it. In doing so she spoke up for so many of the children, the thousands of vulnerable children, who did not have a voice of their own. She was a definite champion of children's rights to her very end, and her loss will be felt by many who were touched by her deep intelligence, her sharp wit and her unwavering devotion to demanding more be done to prevent child abuse.

I share her love for changing the world over a gin and tonic. Whilst her loss will leave an enormous hole, her legacy stands tall and will remain ongoing in her more than 20 publications and, importantly, in the state's child protection curriculum, which is making a very real difference in the lives of our children. As a parent, I can attest to that.

In all of the legislation and other policy impacts that continue to be touched by her work, we will remember her. Professor Briggs, I salute your work and send my condolences to your friends and your family and also to your many colleagues who are not here today. Vale, Professor Freda Briggs.

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (16:55):** Today, I rise to pay tribute to the remarkable Professor Freda Briggs AO. My condolences go to all her family and friends, some of whom are here today, to Alister, Gwyn and Freda's grandchildren. While I understand you must be saddened at Freda's passing, you must also be very proud of who she was and what she achieved, and you will all have so many great memories to hold dear.

Freda stands tall amongst us for all she did for child protection and in recognising that every child matters and every child counts. She gave a voice to children, our youngest and most vulnerable and voiceless members of our community. She advocated on behalf of their rights and needs and spoke truths on their behalf in recognition of their worth and importance and their need to be protected.

She never backed away or backed down on what she knew to be right. While we are saddened by the loss of Freda, I can imagine her keenly encouraging us to both celebrate her life's journey and achievements and continue to champion the work she deeply believed in and dedicated her life to. Her 85 years were rich, diverse, challenging and most of all a story of achievements. She undeniably left her mark and will be greatly missed both personally and professionally.

She was a remarkable person—dynamic, passionate and always driven by endless energy and enthusiasm—and at the epicentre of her drive was her focus to advance child protection and education. I was very privileged on a number of occasions to share in Freda's company and engage in lively conversations and debate—moments I will always be grateful for.

At this point I wish to make mention of my friend Dr Pamela Schultz OAM who is in the gallery today and I am pleased to say not only is she one of my good friends but I know she was one of



Freda's dearest and greatest friends. When I asked Pamela to describe Freda she said, 'She was an amazing woman and a close mate for over 30 years.' Pamela went on to describe Freda as fierce and courageous, determined, tenacious with a fierce intellect, a brilliant analyst, a friend and mentor, and a champion for children as our best investment.

Freda inspired, instigated and ensured that children were the first priority in child protection and to this end she championed legislation, protocols, curricula and training at which she worked vigorously. Freda's story does not begin as one of privilege, as she was raised in a poor household during the Great Depression, living in an industrial town in Yorkshire. Freda had recounted her upbringing giving credit to her mother's skill in managing and stretching the family budget by growing veggies, keeping chooks, preserving eggs, making jam, bottling fruit, salting beans, knitting, and making clothes—very tenacious.

Freda was exposed to child protection when she joined the London police force after seeing an ad in the local paper seeking female police recruits, and the offer of free accommodation and food was, Freda admitted, an enticement to her. It was apparent that this experience with the police force began to fuel her passionate career, and for that we are all grateful. She worked as a teacher and social worker, she completed a graduate degree in education and postgraduate qualifications in psychology and sociology, and became a lecturer in child development.

As Dean of the Institute of Early Childhood and Family Studies here in Adelaide from 1980, Freda began a world first multiprofessional course in child protection, also helping universities in the United States, Hamburg and Brazil to create similar courses. Freda was honoured countless times for her work as a researcher, an educator and a champion and protector of all children, but especially vulnerable children, and was described on more than one occasion as an inspiration.

In her 70s, she was acknowledged as Emeritus Professor at the University of South Australia and her extensive list of achievements includes publishing more than a book a year since the age of 60. Incredible! Our state—indeed, our nation—has lost a powerful, honest, dedicated advocate on the rights of the child. She will be profoundly missed and always remembered. Vale, Professor Freda Briggs AO.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

#### *Bills*

### **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

#### *Adjournment Debate*

### **DAIRY INDUSTRY**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (17:02):** When bottled water is sold for considerably more than liquid milk, society has lost all reason. The dairy industry needs price stability at profitable levels to allow it to perform securely and with confidence. Dairy farmers are price takers from both ends of the market. They do not get to stipulate the price of their commodity for sale and are readily sacrificed by those charged with the duty of selling their product.

Margins are too slim in most years, and now farmers are not even making ends meet. They are looking at substantial losses for some time to come. The cost of doing business in Australia is way too high. Items that many dairy farmers see as overpriced are wages, superannuation, WorkCover, energy costs, water licences, procurement, insurance, freight, right down to concrete and machinery.

Farmers and regional residents generally also note that the South Australian state government is shifting significant assets from rural areas so that Adelaide can prosper, while foisting increased fees back on those same regional ratepayers. A great example of this is the NRM levy, with fees being put back onto farmers at the worst possible time, particularly dairy farmers. Outside the primary production community, there seems to be no appreciation shown to food producers. Yet, everybody expects the freshest and best quality food at the cheapest possible price.

I note that there is now a strategy in place of checking on your mate's mental health, and the government's household income support will be easier to access for dairy farmers, but quite frankly this is like putting a bandaid on a gushing haemorrhage. The real solution is paying dairy farmers a decent price for their milk so that none of these other measures would be needed.

One such suggestion is putting an emergency dairy levy of, say, 50¢ per litre on milk to halt the decline in the dairy industry in Australia. This is serious and needs serious intervention; otherwise, as I said before, we are going to see many dairy farmers going broke and we are going to have a boom and bust cycle in the dairy industry. Another long-term measure worthy of investigation, which is also milk-based, is co-funding. Co-ops have invested funds that are waiting to build new infrastructure that will take milk from a low-value commodity into a higher, value-added, specialist product. A government co-contribution could help build these new plants a lot sooner.

Another strategy is of course increasing the profile and appreciation of dairy farmers in this state. It is one of those areas in which we are going to see considerable stress on southern regional South Australia which, I would say, is accumulating into the same type of disaster that Whyalla has faced with Arrium. Many southern areas are going to see a market downturn, a selling off of cattle, a selling off of land, and then we are going to have an undersupply of milk going forward.

### **MOBILE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:06):** I take this opportunity to rise on behalf of the people of Stuart, and also regional South Australia more broadly, to talk about mobile phone blackspots. On 25 June last year, the federal government announced that it had completed its \$100 million Mobile Black Spot Program and was going to deliver 499 new mobile phone towers across Australia.

That was done in cooperation with the New South Wales government, which contributed \$24 million and got 144 new towers. Victoria contributed \$21 million and got 110 new towers, Queensland contributed \$10 million and got 68 new towers, Western Australia contributed \$32 million and got 130 new towers, Tasmania contributed \$350,000 and got 31 new towers, and there was also \$1.7 million from local governments, businesses and community organisations.

There is one very sad omission from that list, and that is South Australia. Our government did not contribute any money towards that program. The federal government was good enough to put 11 new towers in South Australia but, of course, if our government had contributed even just a relatively small amount of money, we would have done much better. Out of 499 towers across the entire nation, we got 11 because our government chose not to contribute to the program. It is quite a reasonable principle that, if you put some additional money in on top of the \$100 million the federal government had on offer, then of course your state will do much better.

On 30 June last year, 2015, I asked the Minister for Regional Development about this and why it was that the South Australian government had not contributed the money. It turned out to be the Minister for Education and Child Development who was actually the responsible minister in this house for this program, and she explained that at the time, on the spot, she did not have all the information she needed to answer the question, but she did say very clearly that the government would consider contributing to the next program.

Right now, there is another \$60 million on the table from the federal government for exactly the same style of program again. The Minister for Education and Child Development, at the time, said that the government would, and I quote, 'make a considered decision, as a government, as round 2 becomes available'. I asked her, 'When will the minister complete that assessment?' The minister's answer to that question was, 'In time for round 2.' So, here we are: we are now in time for round 2.

I acknowledge that the federal election has put this program on hold due to the government being in caretaker mode. So, instead of June, it will be July or August this year when the federal government will announce how it will roll out its \$60 million, plus whatever state and local governments, businesses and community groups contribute. In fact, in one sense I welcome that delay because it now gives the state government another month or two to decide exactly what it will do.

I call very clearly and firmly upon the state government to contribute this time around. This is the time for them to decide. Not only have they been given an extra month or two due to the federal election but it is also budget time in South Australia. The Treasurer is right now determining exactly what he is going to do with his budget, and he has given himself an extra week or two, which makes sense to me. All the ducks should be lined up. There should be absolutely no excuses whatsoever for the state government not to contribute something in the order of perhaps \$5 million or \$10 million, which will get South Australia dozens of brand-new mobile phone towers to fill in blackspots.

This is incredibly important for regional South Australia and for metropolitan people who travel into regional South Australia for holidays, tourism, visiting friends and relatives, work, or whatever it happens to be. Mobile phones are not just for chatting to your friends and improving your social life. Mobile phones are not just a convenience. Mobile phone towers are standard infrastructure these days. They enhance safety, they enhance business, they open the way for employment in regional areas, and they are fundamental for community development.

This is not an opportunity that the state government can afford to miss if it wants people to think that it takes regional development seriously. This is an incredibly important opportunity. The state government must take it up. The biggest issue facing our state at the moment is unemployment. We have the highest unemployment in the nation. We have the lowest business confidence in the nation. Contributing to the development of more mobile phones in blackspots in South Australia allows people to conduct their businesses far more successfully and contribute to the greatest challenge that we have in our state, which is unemployment. More people could be employed in regional South Australia if the government contributed to this program.

#### **LIGHT ELECTORATE**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (17:12):** I would like to take this opportunity to highlight some issues of concern in my electorate of Light and also talk about some really great things that have happened in the electorate over the past week. Last week was Volunteer Week, and I had the opportunity to attend a number of events in my electorate that acknowledged and celebrated the work of volunteers in our community. As I have said on a number of occasions, there are very few walks of life in our community that are not touched by the work of volunteers. Not only do they make a contribution to our community with their skills, abilities and time, but the reality is that they also help build the community, and they also get something out of it by being engaged with the community.

There are two events I would particularly like to mention; one is the Light Regional Council volunteer afternoon tea, which I was invited to and attended. The council acknowledged the contributions made by volunteers in various walks of life in its area. I also attended the Inner North Country Health Services event for its volunteers, people who volunteer at a number of health services throughout both the Light electorate and the Barossa area, where there are number of councils, including Tanunda, Angaston, Gawler Health Service, Kapunda and Eudunda hospitals. I apologise if I have missed out any hospital that is not in my electorate. The event is held at the Gawler Health Service to thank volunteers for their contribution.

There are people who have actually contributed over 30 years to those services, from driving vehicles, from getting patients from A to B, from helping out in the kiosks in the hospitals, to doing a whole range of different activities. It was quite clear from the people who spoke and who run the health services that a lot of things just would not happen if it were not for the contributions made by these volunteers. I would like to put on the record my thanks and acknowledgment of the work of volunteers in my community.

I also took the opportunity to publicly thank the volunteers who work in my electorate office and who help out as well. Again, if it were not for the volunteers in my electorate office we could not serve the community to the standard that we endeavour to maintain. We have volunteers who help out with JP services, we have volunteers who stuff envelopes when we are doing a major mail-out and we have volunteers who make phone calls and help follow up inquiries.

We have volunteers in many parts of our work, and without the help of volunteers we could not actually support our community to the standard we would like. Again, I would have at least one or two volunteers in my office every day of the week, plus weekends, who help out. We have volunteers of all ages. In fact, only in the last couple of weeks we have another young volunteer, a

19 year old, who has joined us and who is working, making phone calls, helping out and doing all sorts of activities in our office. Volunteers do a whole range of work, in schools, in churches and, obviously, with the CFS and the SES, which I will say a bit more about in a moment. So, there is a whole range of areas in our community in which volunteers do great work.

I also took the opportunity last week, being Volunteer Week and also Wear Orange Day, to meet with the emergency services workers in my electorate. I met with the captains and the unit managers and also with the local station officers of the three services, namely, the SES, the CFS and the Metropolitan Fire Service in Gawler. We had a great discussion about how we can actually work together to improve community safety. I must say that, at the grassroots level (and I have some experience and background in this area), they do work very well together. There is a whole range of common issues right across the services which I will raise with the relevant minister to bring to their attention.

Interestingly enough, they are very keen to improve the community's understanding of a whole range of issues regarding safety, not only bushfire safety but safety dealing with rivers, water and flooding, etc. When we talk about safety we often think just bushfires, but most often the people who die in fires are those who die in homes during winter time and at times other than during bushfires. So, we need to increase people's understanding of safety in the home, and I will be working with my local MFS and CFS people to improve that information. There are simple things that people can do to keep themselves and their families safe in the home.

Last week, my office supported and I participated in a local forum and expo, the Domestic and Family Violence Forum held in Hewett, one of the suburbs within my electorate. That was a direction-setting forum. It is made up of a whole range of local community organisations that are working together to raise awareness of domestic and family violence in the community, but more importantly to work out the local strategies that will actually reduce the rate and hopefully eliminate family and domestic violence so that we have healthy families in our community. That group has been, like I said, supported by my office. One of my staff sits on the organising committee, and they are now actually setting up a group to work out how they can engage with the community to raise awareness of this issue.

Last week, I also attended a meeting, which I organised, in Angle Vale, one of the communities in my electorate. This was in response to concerns I had received regarding a particular development application for development in Angle Vale. It was a land division application which resulted from a rezoning process, which in itself is as a result of the 30-year plan and also the rezoning DPA process which was undertaken from 2011 onwards.

About 250 to 300 people attended, and there were quite a few upset and angry people at this meeting. Certainly, they were concerned about, if you like, the rapid rate of growth or the actual proposal itself. I would like to mention that I think government, and certainly local government, need to do some more work to make sure people understand the philosophy behind the 30-year plan and the so-called 70:30 rule, where we are actually trying to increase the amount of infill and therefore not only put less pressure on the peri-urban areas but also reduce the cost of service in our communities, and that means the taxpayers.

This area of Angle Vale predominately has allotments which are 1,800 square metres or more, not because it was planned in that way but essentially because there was no sewer out there and that is the minimum size you can have to have a septic system or some related system to do with wastewater. The sad part about this community is that it has grown in an ad hoc way for about 30 or 40 years. As a result, there is a distinct lack of infrastructure.

What has happened is that rather than the detailed planning which now takes place as a result of the 30-year plan—and I appreciate that some people do not like some aspects of the 30-year plan and the DPA which is now in place—for 40 years this town has grown in an ad hoc way. People have developed five allotments here, 20 allotments there, and as a result there have not been any reserves or parks provided, etc. There is a lack of a whole range of infrastructure, such as footpaths, and stormwater is a major issue in this town that has been raised with me a number of times.

The good thing about the current plan, the new plan, is that this development will actually help and retrofit some of the rest of the town and improve the amenity of the town. What was partly disappointing was that, certainly, it was a ministerial DPA which gave rise to this plan there is no hiding that fact. It was a government-initiated proposal to rezone this area. There was a lengthy process; people indicated that they were not aware of it, but I personally did quite a bit of consultation and in fairness to the City of Playford they did quite a bit of consultation, but still a lot of people were not aware of it.

So, there is some angst about where this whole plan is leading. It did not help when some people admitted at the public meeting that they got my leaflet and just chucked it in the bin and did not bother reading it. I thought, 'Well, there's only so much I can do to help you be aware of what is happening in your community. If you choose to disregard the messages, that's a choice you make.'

What I have heard from a number of residents, though, is that despite the fact that this plan was a ministerial and worked in conjunction with the City of Playford, and the City of Playford had quite a bit of extensive involvement, the City of Playford have almost washed their hands of the development and have just been telling people, 'Well, it's a ministerial DPA—nothing to do with it. We just have to assess it now and we have to wear it.'

I think local government tries to have it both ways. Local government has to stop playing Pontius Pilate. They are either part of the game or they stay out of the game. The reason they often lose their powers is that they play these silly games sometimes; they are not prepared to be responsible. For 40 years, they sat on their hands and this town was allowed to develop in an ad hoc way. The government steps in and does something with them and then they blame the government. As I said, local government needs to play the game fairly and stop being Pontius Pilate.

#### *Bills*

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

#### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

### **HEALTH CARE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 10, page 4, after line 26 [clause 10, inserted section 89]—Before the definition of *declared day hospital* insert:

*conscious sedation* means the sedation of a person by the intravenous administration of one or more drugs such that communication with the person may be maintained during the sedation;

No. 2. Clause 10, page 4, line 39 [clause 10, inserted section 89, definition of *prescribed health service*, paragraph (b)]—Delete 'simple '

No. 3. Clause 10, page 4, after line 39 [clause 10, inserted section 89, inserted definition of *prescribed health service*]—After paragraph (b) insert:

(ba) a health service that involves the administration of local anaesthetic; or

No. 4. Clause 10, page 5, lines 3 to 6 [clause 10, inserted section 89, definition of *simple conscious sedation*]—Delete the definition of *simple conscious sedation*

No. 5. Clause 10, page 5, after line 6 [clause 10, inserted section 89]—After line 6 insert:

(2) Paragraph (ba) of the definition of *prescribed health service* does not apply in relation to the following health services involving the administration of local anaesthetic:

- (a) a health service provided by a medical practitioner in the course of practice as a general practitioner;
- (b) a health service provided by a dentist in the course of general dentistry practice;
- (c) a health service, or health service of a kind, prescribed by the regulations.

No. 6. Clause 10, page 5, after line 10 [clause 10, inserted section 89A]—After inserted section 89A(1) insert:

- (1a) In establishing standards under subsection (1) the Minister should consider any relevant codes, standards and guidelines.

No. 7. Clause 10, page 6, lines 17 to 33 [clause 10, inserted section 89D]—Delete section 89D and substitute:

89D—Conditions of licence

- (1) Each private day procedure centre licence will be taken to be subject to the conditions prescribed by the regulations.
- (2) The Minister may impose such other conditions on a private day procedure centre licence as the Minister thinks fit.
- (3) The Minister may, on application or the Minister's own motion, vary or revoke a condition of a private day procedure licence imposed under subsection (2), or impose a further condition on such a licence, by notice in writing given to the holder of the licence.
- (4) If the Minister imposes a further condition under subsection (3) on the Minister's own motion, the condition will not, except with the agreement of the licensee, take effect until the expiration of the period of 30 days after service of the notice imposing the condition.

At 17:23 the house adjourned until Wednesday 18 May 2016 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***INDIGENOUS AND SOCIAL HOUSING**

**50 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (8 September 2015). In reference to Indigenous and social housing:

1. How much of the South Australian Housing Trust's investment program has been allocated to remote indigenous and social housing for each of 2014-15 and 2015-16?
2. What projects are being funded and how much is each project receiving through this funding measure?

**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):** I have been advised:

1. The South Australian Housing Trust investment program does not fund capital works in remote Aboriginal communities. Capital works in remote Aboriginal communities are managed by the state government and funded through the commonwealth government, under the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing.

The budget for capital investment in remote Aboriginal communities was \$11.3 million in 2014-15 and \$11.1 million in 2015-16.

2. The following remote Aboriginal capital programs are being funded during 2014-16 in South Australia:

- Capital Works:
  - \$8.2 million for rebuilds; and
  - \$4.8 million for refurbished dwellings.
- \$9.5 million for the Employment Related Accommodation Program.

The South Australian Housing Trust built 14 houses in 2014-15, which included two properties each at Pooraka, Brahma Lodge, Gilles Plains, Daw Park, Ottoway and Keswick. One property was built in each of the suburbs of Peterhead and Glossop.

In 2015-16 there will be 14 houses built in the suburbs of Angle Park, Clearview (2), Enfield, Greenacres, Morphett Vale (2) Northfield, Seaton, Smithfield Plains and Stirling North. There are also properties which will be built in country locations at Maree, Port Augusta and Whyalla.

**DEMPSEY'S LAKE AND YORKEYS CROSSING**

**90 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (9 September 2015). In reference to artefacts at Dempsey's Lake and Yorkeys Crossing:

1. What is being done to protect the indigenous artefacts and paleontological and scientific artefacts at Dempsey's Lake and Yorkeys Crossing?
2. Is consideration being given to building a fence to protect this area from rubbish dumping, destruction by sheep and cattle, trail bikes and 4WD vehicles etc.?
3. Will access for scientists and palaeontologists, who want to preserve the interests of the area for scientific, academic and cultural reasons, be considered?
4. When will access be provided for scientists and palaeontologists who wish to access the site every two months?
5. Has consideration been given to providing extra protection to this area and making it a cultural tourist destination?

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

In relation to Dempsey's Lake, which is currently managed by SA Water, a number of actions are planned or in progress to protect and conserve the Aboriginal heritage values at Lake Dempsey. Initial activities focused on targeting and managing the primary threat associated with illegal access include the following:

- In conjunction with the local council, Madland Street was temporarily closed. Council has also placed earth barriers across the access tracks off the Old Tarcoola Rd and large concrete blocks are being added to these mounds to further restrict vehicle access.
- Installation of a 2.4m high fence to restrict access to the rail crossing at Madland Street. Further reinforcing of the fence with horizontal steel bars is to be undertaken this financial year. Cyclone gates are proposed to be installed at the boundary of the Lake Dempsey site, these gates will be locked and

will be installed with anti-tamper measures to prevent people attempting to unthread or remove the gates.

- The boundary fence has been re-strung where there are posts available to do so.
- Ongoing surveillance is being undertaken by SA Water operational staff of past illegal access hotspots.
- Drone surveillance is planned for ongoing monitoring of the boundary fence of Lake Dempsey and its surrounds for signs of illegal access. A pilot of this approach has been undertaken. SA Water signs have been placed around the site boundary to discourage trespassing and further signs are proposed to be installed.
- SA Water is progressing a scoping study to guide the management and long term protection of Lake Dempsey. The study includes reviewing the values and impacts for the Lake Dempsey site from a range of stakeholder perspectives and developing appropriate management options.

All requests for access to SA Water landholdings are assessed under the SA Water Public Access & Land Use Policy. Specifically, at Lake Dempsey any access would be subject to ensuring that the relevant provisions and approvals under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988* are in place and that the views of traditional owners are taken into account so that the access protocols are culturally appropriate and all legislative requirements are met.

The outcomes of the scoping study currently being undertaken by SA Water for Dempsey's Lake, will assist with guiding Aboriginal heritage risk management and long term protection of the site, including the identification of any additional protection measures. Under current land management arrangements, SA Water would not be supportive of making Dempsey's Lake a cultural tourist destination.

#### WORKERS IN TRANSITION

**152 Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (9 September 2015). How many service provider contracts were there in place to support Workers in Transition as at 30 June 2015?

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

There were a total of 16 service provider contracts in place to support Workers in Transition at 30 June 2015. Fifteen of these are registered training organisations that have been approved to deliver skills recognition. One of the service providers has the capability to deliver career advice and transition services.

#### HOUSING SA

**170 Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (24 September 2015). Can the minister please advise the number and percentage of high needs occupants in Housing SA for 2013 and 2014 calendar year and provide an explanation for the increase?

**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):** I have been advised:

Data is not collected on the total number of occupants of Housing SA properties, and whether they currently have high needs. Instead, data is available relating to level of need at the time of allocation to a Housing SA property.

The activity indicator listed in Budget Paper 4: Agency Statements on page 117 identifies the number of high needs clients placed in housing by Housing SA, with data provided for the financial years of 2013-14 and 2014-15 and projected for 2015-16.

#### ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AND FAMILY CENTRES

**173 Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (25 September 2015). In relation to the Aboriginal child placement principal in Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 30, 'Performance Indicators'—

1. What is the percentage of children placed in accordance with the Aboriginal child placement principal in 2014-15?
2. Given this figure was 74.4% in 2011-12 and dropped to only 67% in 2012-13, can the minister explain the reason for the drop and what is being done about it?
3. Has the capacity been reached? If so, what does the minister plan to do?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

Compliance with the Aboriginal Child Placement Principle reported annually as part of Report on Government Services (ROGS) national reporting. Preliminary 2014-15 data from ROGS indicates a slight decrease in the proportion of children placed in compliance with the Principle from 67.2% to 66.5%. However this slight decrease occurred at a period where there was an increase in the number of Aboriginal children in out of home care. This was an increase of 57 Aboriginal children to a total of 844 Aboriginal children at 30 June 2015, from 787 Aboriginal children at



30 June 2014. South Australia increased by 34 the number of children placed in accordance with the Principle measure to 559 at 30 June 2015 from 525 at 30 June 2014.

It is acknowledged that the overall percentage for SA decreased from 2012 to 2013 as noted by the member for Adelaide. This decrease coincided with a change in the accommodation reporting data base from the retired CIS system to C3MS. An investigation into this decrease indicated that this result was due to a correction of a counting error in the old system rather than a decline in actual performance.

Capacity has not been reached as children continue to be placed in accordance with the Aboriginal Child Placement Principle. Despite an over 7% increase in the number of Aboriginal children placed in out-of-home care at 30 June 2015, 66.5% were placed in accordance with the Aboriginal Child Placement Principle

The government is continuing to develop strategies to increase kinship care and when that is not possible foster care for children in out of home care.

The government is continuing to develop strategies to increase the pool of carers including:

- Increasing funding for current foster care agencies for recruitment, support and training of foster carers
- Reviewing and improving processes to identify, assess and support kinship carers
- Increasing the use of Other Person Guardianship Orders and Specific Child Only Carers.

The government is actively working to increase placement options available for children coming into care which is expected to improve appropriateness and stability of placement:

- Increasing kinship and other home based care placements
- Transitioning children from residential care to family-based placements
- Late stage reunification of young people within residential care to increase the capacity in residential care

Families SA continues to strengthen the cultural proficiency of its practice and improve its cultural competency through a range of measures focusing on practice, staff knowledge, service improvements and community engagement. This includes reviewing the assessments, supports and engagement of our clients' family to strengthen kinship placements.

Senior Aboriginal Families SA staff assess and review Aboriginal clients in out-of-home care to ensure that meaningful and appropriate activity is undertaken to ensure stable long-term placements preferably with family or kin.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**180 Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (24 September 2015). Has Families SA now implemented proactive measures to ensure a child's safety rather than waiting until there is chronic neglect or extreme danger before getting involved and can the minister list the programs and amount of funding that has been attributed to each program as part of these measures?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

Families SA has been implementing a range of family support services to support families at risk of breakdown so that children can remain safely at home.

Family support services include two programs, which are Targeted Intervention and Family Preservation and Reunification Service. These services are provided to children, young people and families to improve family functioning, prevent family breakdown, decrease the occurrence of child abuse and neglect and reduce the likelihood of children entering out of home care.

These services were developed in response to the increased number of notifications and children entering out-of-home care. Services are currently delivered by six non-government organisations across South Australia in close partnership with Families SA offices.

The types of interventions offered through these programs may include: parenting skills development, counselling, practical structured in-home assistance, therapeutic interventions, children's services in relation to playgroups and links to other community networks and services.

Funding allocated to family support services for the two financial years 2014-15 and 2015-16 is as follows.

- In 2014-15, \$6,163,276 is allocated to the Targeted Intervention Program and \$3,714,028 to the Family Preservation and Reunification Services, totalling \$9,877,304.
- In 2015-16, this increases to \$6,409,804 allocated to the Targeted Intervention Program and \$3,952,246 to Family Preservation and Reunification Services, totalling \$10,335,050.

#### SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (22 March 2015).

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

On 7 March 2016, four bursts occurred on a 450mm cast-iron water main in the north eastern suburbs (two in Campbelltown, one in Paradise and one in Newton).

All of the bursts were repaired by Thursday 10 March 2016 and associated remedial work completed. All customers whose water supply was affected by the burst had water supply to their properties restored on 10 March 2016.

As a result of system changes to isolate the damaged water main, some customers are experiencing pressure changes to their water supply. SA Water is encouraging customers who experience any pressure changes to contact its customer service centre so that impacted customers can be directly identified.

**TRANSFORMING HEALTH**

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 March 2015).

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):**

At the heart of Transforming Health is quality, as we strive to deliver the best care, first time, every time to all South Australians.

Through Transforming Health, we are creating a health system where what's best for the patient comes first; which means changing the way we work.

It is important that our health system is responsive to the needs of our population today and adaptable to changes we will face in the future.

We have a responsibility to our patients, our staff and all South Australians to equip our workforce so we are in the best possible position to adopt emerging technologies and new standards of best practice.

Transforming Health will offer new opportunities to staff by developing new and expanded roles, including expanded practice roles and increased health capability.

I have established a Ministerial Clinical Advisory Group (MCAG) to lead Transforming Health's significant clinical improvement agenda to ensure changes under Transforming Health are clinician-led and quality focused.

The MCAG is being chaired by Professor Dorothy Keefe, Clinical Ambassador, Transforming Health, with membership of doctors, nurses, midwives and allied and scientific health professionals from across SA Health.

It will be supported by clinical working groups to develop models of care for specific elements of the health system that meet the clinical standards and quality principles agreed by our clinicians.

Consumers will be an important part of the process as members of the working groups to ensure the needs of patients are considered in planning our services.

Once new models of care are developed, detailed workforce profiling and modelling will be undertaken; and consultation will occur with clinicians, staff and the unions that represent them.

**TRANSFORMING HEALTH**

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 March 2015).

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):**

As at 30 October 2015, McKinsey & Company has been paid \$4.78 million (GST exclusive) in 2014 and 2015 for consultancy services pertaining to clinical services planning and initiation and progression of the Transforming Health program. This also included the development of the Transforming Health business case.

In addition, a further \$9.37 million (GST exclusive) has been paid in 2015 supporting implementation of the Winter Demand Management strategy. The engagement resulted in the achievement of a range of productivity improvement efforts across the Adelaide metropolitan area including; patient access and movement to create hospital capacity and improving the flow of patients through emergency departments.

No further amount has been committed to be paid to McKinsey & Company for Transforming Health consultancy services.

**ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL**

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (2 July 2015).

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):**

1. Expenditure to the end of June, 2015, was \$169.9 million.

2. This decision was made at a joint meeting of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital Project Steering Committee and the EPAS Program Board.

3. The decision to transfer the remaining budget for the EPAS Program to the Department of Treasury and Finance was approved in October, 2014.

4. Total budget including contingency for the EPAS Program is \$422 million. This is a 10-year total cost of ownership figure and not just the cost of configuration and deployment of the system.

Cabinet originally approved a budget of \$408 million on 5 December, 2011. This was subsequently revised to \$422 million to provide for inflationary indexation. .

5. No.

6. The EPAS Program budget for the 2015-16 financial year approved at the beginning of the financial year was \$61.7 million. This budget was recently revised down to \$54.1 million.

#### PALLIATIVE CARE

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (8 September 2015).

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):**

The Statewide Model of Care Framework for SA Health Specialist Palliative Care Services has received endorsement from the Ministerial Clinical Advisory Group which Professor Keefe chairs. It will be publicly available on the SA Health website in coming weeks.

The document outlines the framework for SA Health specialist palliative care service provision within South Australia. It provides health professionals with a consistent, clear guide to accessing support and the anticipated service response for people with a life limiting illness who require Specialist Palliative Care Services.

The Model of Care Framework is in line with SA Health's Palliative Care Services Plan 2009-16 service delineation profiles and reflects current palliative care practice which has significantly shifted from its early days of predominantly managing the terminal phase of an illness.

Palliative care is now introduced much earlier in a person's illness journey to improve quality of life through active symptom management, which is also in alignment with the World Health Organisation's recommendation for palliative care provision.

The shift in practice, which is supported by the Model of Care Framework, was a key consideration for the Palliative Care Services Clinical Working Party members established to support the relocation of Southern Adelaide Palliative Services, and reinforced the decision to move to Flinders Medical Centre which assures access to medical and diagnostics services required for good symptom management.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (23 September 2015).

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):**

The relocation date and ramp-down period for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital (new RAH) is still being considered but this will occur between the commercial acceptance of the building, currently scheduled to be 3 July 2016, and prior to the end of November, 2016.

The Department for Health and Ageing has convened a Ramp-down Steering Committee to facilitate the reduction of activity at the RAH in coordination with the other Local Health Networks and Transforming Health. The Ramp-down Steering Committee will ensure activity levels across the state can be managed within the existing bed-stock to allow the RAH to move safely. The ramp-down period will be minimised to reduce the impact on other services across SA Health.

The construction phase for the ward repurposing at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital (TQEH) will be planned around the ramp down strategy for the new RAH. This will enable TQEH to support the transition of the RAH to the new RAH.

#### RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (25 September 2015).

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

The late stage reunification initiative seeks to address a service gap by engaging young people in residential care, commercial care and their families to reunify them. The late stage reunification program will be structured to maximise family contact and involvement in case planning in order to strengthen the prospect of reunification.

I am pleased to note that dedicated project staff have been appointed to this program, and the development of a service model is underway. Work is also progressing to identify those young people and their families that have good prospects for reunification.

#### LEIGH CREEK

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (13 October 2015).

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier):**

A final report will be provided by Dr Jane Lomax-Smith as part of a 90-day project following Country Cabinet's meeting in Quorn.

Dr Lomax-Smith is on a term contract on a part time basis equating to 27 hours per week. The maximum payment to be made to Dr Lomax-Smith for the term of the contract, from 12 October 2015 until 30 June 2016, is \$69,715.80, plus compulsory superannuation.

#### INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (17 November 2015).

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

The Department for Education and Child Development (DECD) Families SA ICT Strategic Plan is being incorporated within the DECD ICT Master Plan due for approval in 2016.

The Families SA business continuity plan has been finalised.

Business continuity/disaster recovery plan testing will now occur in the first quarter of 2016 due to Families SA and Education ICT integration activities.

C3MS Change Management Procedures have been reviewed/updated and published on the Families SA intranet.

A formal assessment of IT risks has been conducted with assistance from DECD Audit and Risk and is now complete.

C3MS is on the DECD Internal Audit schedule for the third quarter of 2016.

A six monthly periodic review of C3MS User access is now in place.

The relevant ICT team is to be notified when an employee leaves the department to remove their access and user accounts via a form available for download from the Families SA Intranet site. An automated system is in place that disables any C3MS accounts which are inactive for 30 days.

#### BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (3 December 2015).

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

A regional state consultation process to identify issues relevant to the Mobile Black Spot Program (Round Two) is currently underway, including in regions such as the Adelaide and Mitcham Hills.

#### SCHOOL EMERGENCY PROTOCOLS

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (9 February 2016).

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

Eleven of the schools affected by hoax telephone threats over the course of 4 and 5 February 2016 use or possess a dedicated SMS notification system as part of their emergency communication protocols.

Schools and governing councils have the autonomy to decide the most appropriate communication methods for their community. This will inevitably vary, dependent on the location, size and demographic of the school and its community.

For example, there is no value in the use of a SMS notification system in areas with consistently poor mobile reception or the use of 'push' notifications on a smart phone app in communities that cannot, or habitually do not, access a mobile internet connection.

For these reasons there are no present plans to mandate the use of SMS notification systems in all schools.

#### ARTS SOUTH AUSTRALIA

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (23 February 2016).

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):**

1. \$561.38 was spent on merchandising and display material to launch the rebranding. This material has since been repurposed and distributed to the cultural institutions to display the new branding.

Tasks towards the rebranding were completed at no additional cost, using in-house resources of the Department of State Development.

2. The rebranding was designed to reflect the outward looking national and international place in which Arts South Australia sits and to strongly align the agency with the state branding.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (9 March 2016).

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

As at 15 March 2016, 164 children currently living in residential care have been identified as being in a continuous residential care placement for 18 months or more.

The government is actively working to increase the number of children placed in family based out-of-home care.

The government has announced a commitment of \$9 million per annum over the next three years to recruit an additional 130 foster carers in South Australia. This funding will go towards implementing initiatives to assess and support, as well as increase the number of foster carers.

These initiatives are also expected to improve outcomes for children in care by transferring children from non-family based care accommodation into home-based foster care.

#### *Estimates Replies*

#### SAFEWORK SA GRANTS

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (22 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

Of the \$1,996,607 committed to fund grants in 2014-15:

- nine union or union-based organisations received \$1,038,300;
- one employer organisation received \$44,300;
- four community organisations received \$510,000; and
- four educational institutions received \$404,007.

Union or union-based

SA Unions—Young Workers Legal Service	\$80,000	This service assists young workers under the age of 30 with employment relations issues, such as unfair dismissal, underpayment of wages, bullying and harassment. Qualified staff will assist young workers to resolve disputes at the workplace through the legal process if required.
Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union	\$102,000	Health and Safety Workplace Partnership Program The program helps to raise employee awareness of work health and safety (WHS) through the improvement of training, resources and information available to workers, and to encourage participative programs to raise skill levels and ensure constructive involvement in WHS arrangements.
National Union of Workers	\$155,000	Health and Safety Workplace Partnership Program
Australian Services Union SA & NT Branch	\$157,000	Health and Safety Workplace Partnership Program
Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union	\$135,000	Health and Safety Workplace Partnership Program
SA Unions	\$35,000	Health and Safety Workplace Partnership Program

Independent Education Union of South Australia	\$102,300	Health and Safety Workplace Partnership Program
Australian Workers Union SA Branch	\$121,000	Health and Safety Workplace Partnership Program
Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees' Association SA Branch	\$151,000	Health and Safety Workplace Partnership Program
Total	\$1,038,300	

## Employer-based

Wildcatch Fisheries South Australia	\$44,300	Innovative Practice Grant Funding to develop eight drug and alcohol policies for different sectors by engaging all relevant sector bodies, and all key stakeholder groups across all South Australian regions in the grains, livestock, dairy, poultry, pork, horticulture, wine and seafood sectors. The policies are to be widely distributed to all enterprises and secure a commitment to effectively manage drug and alcohol issues within primary industry workplaces in line with state legislation.
Total	\$44,300	

## Community

South Australian Council of Social Service	\$50,000	Innovative Practice Grant The Healthy Minds, Healthy Workers project provides direct support to six workplaces in the community sector to pilot an organisation-wide approach to developing mentally healthy and resilient workplaces.
Asbestos Diseases Society of South Australia	\$25,000 + \$5,000 in-kind support	The funding is used to inform students of the dangers of asbestos in their homes and workplaces through the delivery of workshops at schools in South Australia.
Asbestos Victims Association	\$25,000 + \$5,000 in-kind support	The funding is used to promote awareness of asbestos in the community, in particular during home renovations. Promotional activities are also conducted in regional South Australia.
Working Women's Centre SA Incorporated	\$410,000	The funding provides information, advisory and support services to vulnerable women workers in South Australia. The Working Women's Centre also delivers education and training sessions on work health and safety and industrial relations matters to women with reference to state and relevant commonwealth legislation.
Total	\$510,000	

## Educational institutions

University of South Australia—two grants	\$66,324	WHS Commissioned Research Grant Coping with Shiftwork: Understanding and Communicating Resilience Strategies for Performance, Safety and Health is a project which examines individual and team strategies for coping with shiftwork to assist in improving worker health and wellbeing.
	\$124,967	WHS Commissioned Research Grant Designed with care: Improving job design in the SA Aged Care Industry is a project which works with an industry partner to co-design and pilot practical small-scale workplace interventions that improve psychosocial working conditions and reduce the risk of work-related musculoskeletal disorders.

University of Adelaide	\$113,740	WHS Commissioned Research Grant Reducing MSD risk in the aged care sector using multi-factorial evidence-based interventions aims to implement an evidence-based risk management toolkit for work-related musculoskeletal disorders, customise it for use by non-expert workplace users in aged-care facilities, and evaluate its effectiveness.
Central Queensland University (Adelaide campus)	\$98,976	WHS Commissioned Research Grant The YAWN program: developing and evaluating a web- and app-based fatigue intervention for young employees evaluates a sample of young workers to study the effects of fatigue. The participants access an educational website with information about sleep and fatigue, and across four weeks record details of their sleep and work hours and receive personal advice regarding their levels of fatigue, how it affects them and what to do about it.
Total	\$404,007	

#### PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (22 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

Schedule 10 Clause (20) of the Development Regulations 2008 provides that the State Coordinator-General may in certain circumstances appoint the Development Assessment Commission as the relevant authority for a development proposal.

The regulation clearly prescribed that each project be in excess of \$3 million and this test has been met for all determinations made by the State Coordinator-General.

On occasion, the State Coordinator-General has been approached regarding multiple development sites. Each individual proposal however has comprised works in excess of \$3 million. This approach has been on the basis of a proponent seeking one consistent planning entity to consider their portfolio of investment proposals, located in numerous local government areas across the state.

#### PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (22 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

The uploading of a web-based registration of interest form was uploaded to the current webpage on Wednesday 19 August. A member of the project team will monitor any registrations to ensure that an up to date data base is developed so that updates and information can be emailed as it is released.

Community consultation for the 30 Year Plan Update (30YP) is planned to commence later this year. This will include a new updated website.

It has been planned that the full website functionality will be available prior to commencement of community consultation and webpage content is still under development.

#### PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (22 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

The commissioner's office is supported by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI). An analysis of the support required for the office has identified a need for two roles, one of which presents a unique requirement that the incumbent is located on Kangaroo Island. The other role is more senior and will be required to commute between Adelaide and Kangaroo Island regularly to assist the commissioner with process issues raised by the community and businesses.

The vacancies have been advertised both internally and externally to the department to source the best possible candidates.

#### BLACKWOOD ROAD MANAGEMENT PLAN

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (22 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

The term 'secondary renewal area' referred to by the member is a term from a draft spatial framework prepared to inform directions for the forthcoming update to the 30-Year Plan. In this document, the Blackwood centre is recommended as a secondary renewal area within the 'south'. It also has a number of constraints associated with it such as its geography, topography, is bushfire prone and the rail line location, amongst other issues.

This area will continue as a key centre for the Blackwood Hills but not as a prime focus for urban renewal, particularly in a residential sense, because of the risks associated with the characteristics mentioned.

Nevertheless, the Blackwood area should continue to be a focus by the council as an area of commercial/retail development to serve as the key centre within the Blackwood Hills area.

#### STATE LIBRARY

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):**

The decrease reflects usage across all State Library web presences, not just the main website.

The change in the estimated result is due to a change in the website visit measurement system, which was discontinued part way through the year. The remainder of the year was measured using Google Analytics. This change has skewed the figures slightly.

The main State Library website needs to be redeveloped because it is built on technology that is over 12 years old and does not support many aspects of the modern library customers' needs, including access from mobile devices. The redevelopment of the Library's main website will make it a modern site that is more customer-focused.

#### AUTOMOTIVE SUPPLIER DIVERSIFICATION PROGRAM

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy):** I am advised:

1. For 2014-15, the South Australian Government approved \$1.23 million grant assistance under the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program.
2. For the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015, 11 applications were received under the Program—6 were approved, 2 declined and 3 were under assessment.
3. No.

#### AUTOMOTIVE TRANSFORMATION TASKFORCE

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy):** I am advised:

1.

2013-14 budget \$m	2013-14 expenditure \$m	2014-15 budget \$m	2014-15 expenditure \$m	2015-16 budget \$m	2016-17 budget \$m
1.1	1.011	7.865	4.565	8.539	7.54

2. The Board does not have a separate budget.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)



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

The Department of Treasury and Finance advises it is not SAFA's practice to disclose specific investor names due to the confidential nature of the financial markets.

As stated in the budget papers, SAFA issued a new 10-year bond attracting 37 investors across Asia, Europe and Australia.

**RISTEC**

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) has an Asset Purchase, Disposal and Reporting Policy as well as a Software Capitalisation Procedure which provide guidance to all staff in determining the appropriate treatment of expenditure related to the development and implementation of assets including software and information technology systems. DTF advises these two corporate documents are based on, and are consistent with the Australian Accounting Standards and the whole of government Accounting Policy Framework.

All expenditure in relation to RISTEC has been classified as either investing or operating expenditure based on the Australian Accounting Standards and the whole of government Accounting Policy Framework. In general:

- Operating expenses reflect a decrease in economic benefits during the accounting period in the form of outflows or depletion of assets, or incurrence of liabilities that result in decreases of equity other than those relating to distributions to owners.
- Investment expenses comprise projects and programs that result in the capitalisation of assets on the balance sheet. They include the acquisition and construction of, or addition to non-current asset, including property, plant and equipment and other productive assets.

Specific issues are determined with reference to accounting standards.

**RISTEC**

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The Department of Treasury and Finance advises that the updated cost reflects a range of factors, including:

- (a) Additional internal project costs—these costs were met from within the Department of Treasury and Finance's budget.
- (b) Cost associated with changes to tax policy as part of the tax reform process and changes needed to be made to RevenueSA's systems so that they properly interact with the new SAILIS system operated by the Lands Titles Office.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY**

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The Department of Treasury and Finance advises that SAICORP's free reserves as at 30 June 2015 totalled \$168.3 million.

**ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES**

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier):**

Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors:

- (a) 2013-14:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DPC	Manager, Finance Performance and Strategy	MAS3	Retention	\$16,027
DPC	Manager, Executive Services	MAS3	Retention	\$12,822

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DPC	Technology Manager	MAS3	Attraction	\$26,712
DPC	Agency Engagement Manager	MAS3	Retention	\$10,494
DPC	Principal Contract Manager	ASO8	Attraction	\$30,000
DPC	Manager, Procure to Pay	ASO8	Retention	\$15,000
DPC	Manager, Injury Management Services	MAS3	Retention	\$10,000

(b) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount	End Date
DPC	Technology Manager	MAS3	Attraction	\$19,713	03/01/2017
DPC	Manager, Finance Performance and Strategy	MAS3	Retention	\$16,428	20/08/2015
DPC	Agency Engagement Manager	ASO8	Attraction	\$10,756	03/03/2016
DPC	Technical Analyst	ASO7	Retention	\$11,387	29/11/2015
DPC	Principal Contract Manager	ASO8	Attraction	\$30,000	31/07/2017
DPC	Manager, Procure to Pay	ASO8	Retention	\$15,000	28/03/2016
DPC	Manager, Injury Management Services	MAS3	Retention	\$10,000	29/01/2016

#### RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

By 20 May 2015, an additional 177 FTE had been recruited, trained, and deployed across the Residential Care Directorate.

An additional 66 new employees were recruited in June/July 2015. These staff have completed their induction training and are now deployed across the Directorate.

Since September 2015, an additional 14 employees have been recruited, completed induction training and been deployed across the Directorate, making a total of 257 new staff.

A quarterly recruitment process for child and youth support workers and child and youth workers has been instituted in 2016. The first recruitment process commenced in February 2016 and is estimated to be finalised by mid-April with new workers commencing the six week induction training in May 2016.

The second recruitment process for child and youth support workers and child and youth workers will commence in May 2016.

Additionally, a recruitment process to recruit more senior child and youth workers and supervisors has commenced with applications closing on 1 April 2016.

All new Residential Care Directorate employees who do not already hold a Certificate IV in Child, Youth and Family Intervention must complete the qualification in the first 12 months of their employment as a mandatory employment condition.

Employees also hold qualifications in behavioural science, children's services, psychology, education, mediation, counselling and social work.

#### CHILD ABUSE REPORTS

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

In 2013-14 the total number of calls answered by CARL was 26,102. The total number of eCARL reports received was 13,355.

In 2014-15 the total number of calls answered by CARL was 26,529. The total number of eCARL reports received was 20,811.

#### INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC SERVICE

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

The Instrumental Music Service budget has a funding base of 86.3FTE. This provides funding for leadership, teaching and administrative salaries, as well as funding for Goods and Services.

The approved budget for 2014-15 was \$9,664,000.

The approved budget for 2015-16 is \$9,811,000

#### ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

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

Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors:

(a) 2013-14:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DECD	Principal	PRNA3	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$2,032.02
DECD	Principal	PRNA3	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$2,681.80
DECD	Leader Band B-3	LDRB3	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$7,119.42
DECD	Pre School Director	PSDA1	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$4,984.20
DECD	Leader Band B-1	LDRB1	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$2,952.18
DECD	Principal	PRNA7	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$5,009.56
DECD	Leader Band B-1	LDRB1	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$2,390.01
DECD	Principal	PRNA4	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$6,180.72
DECD	Principal	PRNA7	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$19,936.80
DECD	Deputy Principal	DPNB3	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$2,820.64
DECD	Principal	PRNA3	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$716.41
DECD	Principal	PRNA5	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$3,558.94
DECD	Principal	PRNA6	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$12,581.41
DECD	Leader Band B-1	LDRB1	AATTC—Attraction (C-Change Initiative) Allowance	\$3,542.00
DECD	Leader Band B-3	LDRB3	AATTC—Attraction (C-Change Initiative) Allowance	\$3,542.00
DECD	Leader Band B-1	LDRB1	AATTC—Attraction (C-Change Initiative) Allowance	\$3,542.00
DECD	Leader Band B-1	LDRB1	AATTC—Attraction (C-Change Initiative) Allowance	\$3,542.00
DECD	Leader Band B-1	LDRB1	AATTC—Attraction (C-Change Initiative) Allowance	\$3,542.00
DECD	Teacher	TCH02	AATTC—Attraction (C-Change Initiative) Allowance	\$3,588.00
DECD	Leader Band B-1	LDRB1	AATTC—Attraction (C-Change Initiative) Allowance	\$3,542.00
DECD	Speech Pathologist	AHP01	AATTP—Attraction Allowance (Speech Pathology)	\$1,506.50
DECD	Project Manager	ASO8	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$4,329.00
DECD	Senior Analyst Programmer	ASO6	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$12,761.80

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DECD	Principal Manager, APY Trade Training Centre	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$17,142.80
DECD	Board/Committee Member	COM01	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$1,163.34
DECD	Executive Manager, Policy and Quality	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$17,349.04
DECD	Assistant Director, Asset Services	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$14,640.60
DECD	Manager, Industrial Relations	ASO08	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$3,178.96
DECD	Speech Pathologist	AHP01	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$1,771.00
DECD	Manager, Performance & Development	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$9,827.33
DECD	Infrastructure Services Coordinator	ASO07	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$14,587.85
DECD	Manager, Marketing and Communications—Education	ASO08	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$5,184.00
DECD	Manager, Ethical Conduct	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$14,620.87
DECD	Manager, ICT Direct Services	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$15,833.80
DECD	Manager, Misconduct, Discipline and Advice Unit	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$15,174.94
DECD	Senior Analyst Programmer	ASO06	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$1,835.96
DECD	Manager, Misconduct, Discipline and Advice Unit	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$954.24
DECD	Business Manager, Early Years Project	ASO07	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$3,694.82
DECD	Principal Manager, Early Years	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$15,727.93
DECD	Regional Leadership Consultant	EAS01_PSM	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$4,800.18
DECD	General Manager, Programme Delivery	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$6,089.76
DECD	Manager, Corp HR, Strategy & Policy	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$10,554.40
DECD	EDRMS Project Officer	ASO07	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$3,504.32
DECD	Manager, Safety and Wellbeing	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$31,416.36
DECD	Manager, ECDWG Secretariat	ASO08	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$10,155.60
DECD	Manager, Injury Management	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$11,373.80
DECD	Registrar, Teachers Registration Board of SA	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$8,196.60

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DECD	Manager, ICT Infrastructure Services	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$15,833.80
DECD	Investigations Officer	ASO07	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$3,603.96
DECD	Manager, Budget Accountability	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$10,554.40
DECD	Manager, DECS Public Relations	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$31,665.80
DECD	Manager, Legislation Reform Unit	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$6,985.00
DECD	Assistant Director, Business Services	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$7,740.30
DECD	Manager	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$7,172.96
DECD	Cluster Manager, Anangu Lands	EAS01_PSM	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$24,077.52
DECD	Speech Pathologist	AHP01	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$2,990.00
DECD	Work, Health and Safety Consultant	ASO08	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$6,155.70
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Whyalla	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$5,369.36
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Coober Pedy	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$47,553.48
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor Family Connect	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$26,695.43
FAMILIES SA	Psychologist	AHP204	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$3,032.27
FAMILIES SA	Project Director, Child Safe	ASO803	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$14,651.78
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP302	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$8,592.36
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$1,760.42
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Assessment	AHP201	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$16,858.40
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Ceduna	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$7,450.36
FAMILIES SA	Project Officer	ASO504	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$38,505.97
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor, Financial Counsellor & Support Worker	OPS503	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$4,490.97
FAMILIES SA	Director, State-Wide Services	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$5,467.74
FAMILIES SA	Committee Member CDSIRC C	BDCM01	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$7,177.04
FAMILIES SA	Psychologist	AHP202	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$1,223.49
FAMILIES SA	Program Manager, Families SA Redesign	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$2,343.15
FAMILIES SA	Project Coordinator, FSA Re-design	ASO803	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$4,040.61
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP302	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$40,466.53
FAMILIES SA	Social Worker	AHP105	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$14,787.28
FAMILIES SA	Senior Practitioner	AHP202	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$830.43
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP201	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$20,723.70
FAMILIES SA	Assistant Director	AHP504	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$14,735.39
FAMILIES SA	Senior Practitioner	AHP200	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$6,876.39
FAMILIES SA	Senior Practitioner	AHP200	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$35,867.75
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Divisional Services	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$7,781.04

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
FAMILIES SA	Psychologist	AHP205	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$3,267.39
FAMILIES SA	APY Team Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$35,620.35
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP205	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$24,513.28
FAMILIES SA	Principal Clinical Psychologist	AHP404	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$2,029.72
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$17,239.36
FAMILIES SA	Senior Practitioner	AHP205	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$12,402.26
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Pt Augusta	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$5,161.63
FAMILIES SA	Manager	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$4,040.61
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Customer Service	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$1,802.46
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP204	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$22,179.54
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP202	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$8,304.25
FAMILIES SA	Project Coordinator, FSA Re-design	ASO803	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$4,040.61
FAMILIES SA	Director, Metropolitan Services	SAES1	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$15,813.20
FAMILIES SA	Assistant Director	PO0503	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$14,735.31
FAMILIES SA	Senior Practitioner	AHP205	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$1,244.72
FAMILIES SA	Social Worker	AHP104	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$23,295.95
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Ceduna	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$26,219.68
FAMILIES SA	Kinship Care Worker	OPS403	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$28,084.15
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP201	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$20,440.17
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$26,697.35
FAMILIES SA	Social Worker	AHP105	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$786.72
FAMILIES SA	Program Manager, Families SA Redesign	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$11,224.95
FAMILIES SA	Project Officer	ASO504	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$24,104.34
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor Guardianship T	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$21,773.10
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor, Clinical Psychologist	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$3,332.81
FAMILIES SA	Project Officer	ASO503	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$35,906.35
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor Financial Counsellor & Support	OPS503	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$5,279.60
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$20,125.74
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP201	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$13,329.07
FAMILIES SA	Social Worker	AHP105	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$1,819.07

## (b) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DECD	Principal	PRNA3	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$4,984.20
DECD	Principal	PRNA3	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$3,896.20
DECD	Pre School Director	PSDA1	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$4,984.20
DECD	Principal	PRNA7	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$12,287.60

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DECD	Principal	PRNA8	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$5,691.14
DECD	Leader Band B-1	LDRB1	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$3.14
DECD	Principal	PRNA4	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$6,562.84
DECD	Principal	PRNA7	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$19,936.80
DECD	Principal	PRTPN_PRNA2_SW	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$2,721.02
DECD	Principal	PRNA3	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$9,117.06
DECD	Principal	PRNA3	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$2,032.02
DECD	Principal	PRNA5	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$325.06
DECD	Principal	PRNA6	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$7,548.84
DECD	Assistant Director, ICT Education Management Systems	MAS03	AATTA—Low SES Incentive Allowance	\$7,016.22
DECD	Project Manager	ASO8	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$346.32
DECD	Assistant Director, HR Policy and Specialist Services	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$13,878.70
DECD	Senior Analyst Programmer	ASO06	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$13,099.20
DECD	Manager, Strategy and Governance	ASO08	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$783.56
DECD	Principal Manager, APY Trade Training Centre	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$13,847.00
DECD	Executive Manager, Policy and Quality	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$19,697.60
DECD	Director, Asset and Business Services	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$17,630.33
DECD	Snr Mgr Educational Measurement	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$15,747.00
DECD	Manager, Industrial Relations	ASO08	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$10,642.41
DECD	Manager, Performance & Development	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$10,828.84
DECD	Safety Consultant	ASO05	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$5,972.32
DECD	Infrastructure Services Coordinator	ASO07	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$14,789.41
DECD	Manager, Corp HR, Strategy & Policy	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$4,996.81
DECD	Manager, Marketing and Communications—Education	ASO08	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$5,321.20
DECD	Assistant Director, Business Services	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$15,883.70
DECD	Manager, Ethical Conduct	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$10,835.00
DECD	Assistant Director, ICT Tech Services	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$16,252.40

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DECD	Manager, Misconduct, Discipline and Advice Unit	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$27,212.66
DECD	Senior Analyst Programmer	ASO06	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$1,069.04
DECD	Principal Manager, Early Years	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$16,598.30
DECD	Manager, Corporate HR, Strategy & Policy	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$450.56
DECD	Manager, Corporate HR, Strategy & Policy	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$8,704.84
DECD	Senior Project Officer/Finance Trainer	ASO05	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$6,087.60
DECD	EDRMS Project Officer	ASO07	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$6,077.41
DECD	Assistant Director, EPHS	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$32,505.80
DECD	Manager, Injury Management	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$12,883.40
DECD	Assistant Director, Budget and Finance	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$692.78
DECD	Manager, ICT Infrastructure Services	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$16,252.40
DECD	Investigations Officer	ASO07	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$575.10
DECD	Manager, Budget Accountability	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$10,835.00
DECD	Manager, DECS Public Relations	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$2,580.69
DECD	Assist Director, ICT Strategy & Relationships	MAS03	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$20,659.08
DECD	Principal	PRNA4	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$675.73
DECD	Cluster Manager, Anangu Lands	EAS01_PSM	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$1,610.28
DECD	Speech Pathologist	AHP01	AATTR—Attraction Allowance	\$1,598.50
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Whyalla	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$1,276.05
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Coober Pedy	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$48,113.66
FAMILIES SA	Project Director, Child Safe	ASO803	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$16,091.40
FAMILIES SA	Care & Protection Worker	OPS303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$4,799.62
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$9,515.11
FAMILIES SA	Support Worker	OPS203	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$180.64
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Assessment	AHP201	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$8,903.04
FAMILIES SA	Business Manager	ASO504	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$5,287.36
FAMILIES SA	Project Officer	ASO504	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$16,544.88
FAMILIES SA	Committee Member CDSIRC C	BDCM01	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$7,177.03
FAMILIES SA	Project Coordinator, FSA Re-design	ASO803	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$1,443.08



Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
FAMILIES SA	Care & Protection Worker	OPS303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$4,460.67
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP302	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$42,107.63
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Executive Services	ASO803	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$2,687.83
FAMILIES SA	Assistant Regional Direct	PO0503	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$14,161.13
FAMILIES SA	Senior Practitioner	AHP202	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$16,502.35
FAMILIES SA	Project Officer	ASO502	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$11,104.04
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Murray Bridge	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$9,298.19
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP201	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$7,089.77
FAMILIES SA	Assistant Regional Direct	PO0503	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$12,750.28
FAMILIES SA	Assistant Director	AHP504	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$15,368.62
FAMILIES SA	Senior Practitioner	AHP200	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$11,043.09
FAMILIES SA	Senior Practitioner	AHP200	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$33,252.68
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Divisional Services	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$9,596.62
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP302	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$14,755.98
FAMILIES SA	APY Team Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$15,706.68
FAMILIES SA	Social Worker	AHP205	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$5,279.82
FAMILIES SA	Social Worker	AHP105	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$5,579.18
FAMILIES SA	Principal Practitioner	AHP504	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$7,246.07
FAMILIES SA	Care & Protection Worker	OPS303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$4,844.70
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$16,080.75
FAMILIES SA	Senior Practitioner	AHP205	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$721.18
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Gawler	PO0503	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$1,514.32
FAMILIES SA	Support Worker	OPS203	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$280.99
FAMILIES SA	Principal Aboriginal Consultant	AHP404	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$653.07
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Pt Augusta	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$5,917.84
FAMILIES SA	Project Coordinator, FSA Re-design	ASO803	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$7,503.99
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Customer Service	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$10,650.84
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP204	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$21,514.45

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
FAMILIES SA	Manager Human Resources	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$11,904.11
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP202	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$32,645.49
FAMILIES SA	Project Coordinator, FSA Re-design	ASO803	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$7,388.54
FAMILIES SA	Director, Metropolitan Services	SAES1	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$15,813.20
FAMILIES SA	Assistant Director	PO0503	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$14,210.58
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP201	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$3,398.49
FAMILIES SA	Social Worker	AHP104	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$7,443.77
FAMILIES SA	Aboriginal Family Practitioner	AHP103	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$8,257.52
FAMILIES SA	Manager, Ceduna	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$8,390.63
FAMILIES SA	Kinship Care Worker	OPS403	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$3,274.96
FAMILIES SA	Assistant Director	PO0503	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$6,855.13
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP201	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$15,537.68
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$10,034.27
FAMILIES SA	Project Officer	ASO501	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$8,312.57
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$1,227.02
FAMILIES SA	Senior Social Worker	AHP205	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$2,291.69
FAMILIES SA	Social Worker	AHP105	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$10,784.60
FAMILIES SA	Program Manager, Families SA Redesign	MAS301	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$6,087.40
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor Guardianship	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$2,535.00
FAMILIES SA	Project Officer	ASO503	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$23,156.05
FAMILIES SA	Supervisor	AHP303	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$4,172.76
FAMILIES SA	Social Worker	AHP102	ATTRACT & RETENT-GEN (%)	\$2,720.43

#### HOMELESS FIGURES

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

The Central Domestic Violence Service, as an example, has 11 crisis and 19 transitional accommodation opportunities for victims of domestic and family violence which, while not located in the CBD, are available in the eastern metropolitan area for women and their children escaping violence.

Crisis facilities for women and children escaping domestic violence are available in all regions across South Australia and are being fully utilised, with priority for access based on an assessment of risk and safety. The

service is working intensively with women and their children to upgrade the safety and security of their existing homes and/or assist them to find longer term, safe and secure accommodation.

I am further advised that 8,075 people, or 35% of the total number of clients who presented to specialist homelessness and domestic violence services during the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015, had experienced domestic violence.