

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 8 June 2016

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

### *Motions*

#### **SEXUALISATION OF CHILDREN**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:01):** I move:

That the Social Development Committee inquire into and report on the sexualisation of children and young people, with particular reference to—

- (a) the sexualisation of children and young people in television, electronic, print and social media and marketing;
- (b) the exposure of children and young people in South Australia to sexualised images and content in public places, television, electronic, print and social media and marketing;
- (c) the impact on children and young people of growing up in a sexualised culture;
- (d) adequacy of current measures at state and federal level to regulate sexualised imagery in television, electronic, print and social media and marketing, and the effectiveness of self-regulation measures;
- (e) measures to assist parents in fulfilling their responsibility to protect and educate children;
- (f) measures to educate children and young people and assist them in navigating the contemporary cultural environment;
- (g) possible measures that the state government can take to assist children and young people to navigate the cultural environment successfully; and
- (h) any other related matter.

The issue of the sexualisation of children is not new. It has been examined by a number of parliamentary committees both here and in the federal parliament over the years but, because we see the changes in media and social networking presentations travelling at the speed of light, we do need to make sure that we are staying on top of this very important social issue.

We need to make sure that we are giving children—the future of South Australia—the opportunity to make decisions based on experience that is going to be measured and is going to be a good experience, not just something that is, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many other parents, psychologists and teachers who have spoken to me, an experience which they think, and I think, is an unsavoury away of introducing the many wonderful things that happen in life.

The need to make sure that we are not encouraging young people to make choices that are beyond their years, to dress beyond their years, has been interpreted by a number of people in various ways, even today in the media reports on this motion before the house. The need to make sure that we are supporting parents is very important. This motion looks at that and asks the Social Development Committee to set up an inquiry into the influence of the media today on young people and the ripple effect on their families, on their schools and on the broader society.

The Australian Psychological Society (APS), in a submission to a New South Wales inquiry on the same issue, states:

Psychologists and other mental health professionals have become increasingly concerned about the prevalence of sexualised material in all forms of media and marketing in Australia. In particular, the increasing exposure of such material in online environments, including access to pornography, as well as through gaming and in young people's depictions of themselves (through social media and sexting) is of growing concern.

Viewing highly sexualised images of women, or violent material, for example, has many risks for children's psychological development and mental health, as well as concerning general societal effects like an increase in sexism, increased rates of sexual harassment and sexual violence, and negative impacts on how men regard women.

I am not attempting to be a moral policeman here. What I am attempting to do is to allow kids to be kids. I do not want young boys and young girls thinking that they need to be out there dressing in

what some people would say is a provocative fashion and in other areas acting in unwanted ways towards members of the opposite sex.

There is a massive push in Australia to come down on domestic violence and, if that was to be the end result of some of this influence we are seeing on our children today, that would be a deplorable thing. Everybody in this place I know would support the moves to try to reduce domestic violence and any foundations that might lead to domestic violence. The need to make sure that we have respect for members of the opposite sex, to see them as real people with thoughts and feelings, with a real value, is something that this motion I hope will help explore and deliver.

It will be very hard, but as I said to a media interviewer this morning, just because it is hard does not mean you stop doing it. An internet filter is something I have spoken about; in fact, many times I have spoken in this place about internet filtering and against compulsory filters, but I am greatly in favour of parents being able to opt into a powerful filtering system so that they can set the standards for their children.

A few parents do live their lives through their children, and I am aware of that, but I think we need to educate them as well that they do not need to, that they do not need to go down this path and that they can adopt a different attitude. It is not taking us back to the 1950s, it is not taking us back to the temperance unions' views of society: it is about making sure that our kids can be kids. We need to make sure that teachers are given the opportunity to portray people for what they are worth and not for how they look or how they act.

We need to make sure that the whole issue is explored and not seen as something we need to avoid because we are going to offend somebody or that there will be some perception that we might impinge on people's civil liberties—not that at all—but is about allowing our children to be children. I know it is of great concern to parents, I know it is of great concern to teachers, and I know that the health professionals, mental health professionals particularly, are very concerned about not only the immediate impacts but also the long-term impacts.

As somebody who goes to many schools around South Australia (and I know the Minister for Education and Children's Services will probably have views on this and support our very fine public schools), I know that our teachers are trying to do their best. We heard the Primary Principals Association president this morning talking on the radio, backing up the intent of this motion. We have seen many other people come on to the radio and my office has been inundated (that is not too strong a word) with support for this motion, the need to recognise the fact that we should allow our children to move from childhood into adolescence and then into adulthood with informed views and with secure opinions of themselves. It is not about wrapping them up and not exposing them to dangers or other opinions: it is about allowing them to make those judgements based on sound experience and advice. That is what this motion is all about.

The most important thing that can come out of this motion is if we are able to give parents and teachers the ability to be able to say to kids, 'Do you really think that is an appropriate way to act, way to dress, way to conduct yourself?' or, 'Is that attitude you're showing towards your colleagues an appropriate way to act?' I hope the house does support this motion.

I have written to the Social Development Committee anyway to ask them to look into this. I understand the Presiding Member has said that they are a very busy committee, as are most parliamentary committees, and that it may come on to the agenda next year. I hope we can start some initial investigations before then. The need to do something about this will not go away. As one media said on a national program this morning, it is everywhere, this is all pervasive, and we need to look at where we want to be in five or 10 years' time. Do we want our children to grow up with attitudes that really are not doing them any good at all, attitudes that are really testing the fibres of our society as we know it?

It is not about being the moral police, it is not about being a protectionist or coming down and trying to take us back to the 1950s or 1960s, but is about allowing children to cope with the absolute onslaught of material they are being presented with in the media today, whether print, electronic or in other forms.

The motion is fairly straightforward. A New South Wales inquiry along exactly the same lines is being conducted now. I hope that other states consider these sorts of inquiries. In fact, I hope the

federal government actually goes back and looks at these sorts of inquiries. The member for Torrens, I believe, was on a Senate committee in a former life and I look forward to her contribution to the debate on this motion.

We need to recognise that, as members of parliament, we do need at times to stand up and be accountable and represent our constituents to the best of our ability, which we all try to do. In this case, it will be a hard issue to enforce standards, particularly on the internet, but that does not mean to say that we do not try and just see what we can do. With that, I commend the motion to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LEVY PROPOSALS 2016-17**

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:11):** I move:

That the 109<sup>th</sup> to 115<sup>th</sup> reports of the committee, relating to various natural resources management board levy proposals and plans for 2016-17, be noted.

One of the statutory obligations of the Natural Resources Committee is to consider and make recommendations on any annual levy proposed by a natural resources management board where the levy increase exceeds the annual rise of the consumer price index (CPI) for Adelaide. This year of the six NRM regions proposing increases for 2016-17, all have proposed increases well above the 1.2 CPI reference rate.

I am advised that the reason behind these uncharacteristically high NRM levy increases was the imposition of a partial cost recovery of water planning and management charges. Cost recovery of water planning and management charges is in line with South Australia's ongoing commitment to the National Water Initiative agreement and its objectives. This round of NRM levy proposals attracted unprecedented interest from community members, businesses and elected representatives.

I would particularly like to acknowledge the submissions by members in this house, particularly the members for MacKillop, Chaffey, Hammond, Stuart, Bragg and Finnis. We would like to thank them for making those presentations to us. I know there has been a lot of discussion out of committee time and also in this place on this issue. The committee would like to thank all of the people who contacted our committee for their interest and their respective contributions to our committee's deliberations.

The Natural Resources Committee received advice in 2015 that several of the state's eight NRM regions were planning significant levy increases in 2016-17 in order to pay for these changes, along with rises in corporate services fees set by the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. The committee heard representations from seven of the eight NRM regions, with six regions forwarding plans proposing levy increases.

Reports on the six individual regions proposing levy increases have been tabled concurrently with this report. Following discussions with all eight resources management regions since the beginning of 2016, the committee determined to extend its support to the boards and the regional staff. The boards' success in natural resources management depends on maintaining good relationships with their communities, and the committee acknowledges their important work. Can I just say that the Natural Resources Committee feels that it is really important that, while we do have this responsibility, we also make sure that we show support to the representatives on the boards and also to the staff. We really appreciate the hard job they have and we really appreciate their work.

The additional expenses imposed on the boards this year are a heavy burden. The committee has detailed its concern in its recommendation to the minister, which is included on page 20 of this report. I might say that we spent a lot of time on the concerns we had, and we thought it was important that we identify them to the minister. The committee's concerns included that this additional cost recovery burden may have compromised the ability of boards to carry out their works effectively.

Also, the concern is a potential cause to damage the boards' relationships with their communities. The committee was also concerned that this significant above CPI increase to levies

might have the unintended effect of discouraging the next generation of board members. We sincerely hope that this does not turn out to be the case.

In this instance, the committee is satisfied that the boards have done their utmost to respond to these challenging circumstances. The committee believes that the boards have acted in good faith to carry out the directives of the department and the minister while attending to their NRM responsibilities. The boards have also engaged in diligent and thorough consultation, revising their proposals based on feedback in order to minimise any effect on their respective communities.

After extensive deliberation, a majority of the Natural Resources Committee resolved at its meeting on Friday 6 May that it did not object to division 1 or division 2 levy proposals in the following regions: Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges, Eyre Peninsula, Northern and Yorke, South Australian Arid Lands, South Australian Murray-Darling Basin, and the South-East. In minority were the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC and the member for Flinders.

I commend the members of the committee—the member for Napier, the member for Elder, the member for Flinders, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC and the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars MLC—for their contributions. All members have worked cooperatively on these deliberations and this report. Again, I also thank the members particularly in this house for their discussions and presentations to our committee.

Finally, I would like to thank the parliamentary staff for their assistance, Mr Patrick Dupont and Ms Barbara Coddington. I particularly note the very heavy workload that our research officer, Ms Barbara Coddington, has in trying to get all these reports done and the work ready for this house. I commend this report to the house.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:18):** I rise to acknowledge the presentation of the report from the Natural Resources Committee to the parliament that encompasses all the different NRM boards, but I do so with a level of concern. I listened very intently to the member for Ashford's words, and I commend her for the fairness of the presentation of the deliberations of the committee. I am not a member and I was not in a position to present on positions I hold on the Northern and Yorke NRM Board when invited to do so. However, I have listened to it and I have been engaged in conversations about it with others for probably the last six weeks at least and I want to put some things on the record.

I respect the board members who are on the Northern and Yorke NRM committee. They have been good enough to invite me on a very regular basis when they hold their meetings. I am not able to attend at all times, but I believe I have met with them in Clare twice and in Maitland once. I do review the documentation and I am very interested in what they are doing. For me, it probably stems from not just being a member of parliament but in having respected for a long time those people from the communities who become involved in environmental management issues in their regions.

In my early days, I was a local government officer and on the animal and plant control boards, as they were then, so I understand completely the dilemmas attached to the collection of the levy and the provision of services. I am very concerned, though, about the increases that are occurring this year which I understand are in the range of \$10.2 million across two financial years of an additional cost that NRM boards are being required to collect based upon what I think the member for Ashford referred to as 'partial cost recovery'.

I have been in this place long enough to remember another significant change from my era in the collection of the Northern and Yorke board fees when they went from a flat charge for all assessed property owners to one based upon capital value. Minister Gago from the other place was the minister responsible for the portfolio area at that time, and the review was being undertaken by the Natural Resources Committee, particularly where it was above CPI. In estimates questions of that year I made it obvious to the minister that it was necessary for that review to take place in the Northern and Yorke board because the increases to the five council areas within the Goyder electorate that year were 335 per cent, because of the complete change in how the levy was to be based upon individual properties.

That has passed—I understand that—and we all live with that fact, but this is an issue that has been brought to me a bit, not just as a regional member of parliament but from the perspective

of the shadow local government portfolio. Councils across the state, in the negotiations and discussions that I have had with them about rate capping, have brought to me the concerns they hold about the continued collection of the NRM levy.

I had been around long enough at that time as a local government officer to have supported the change in structure that came about in the early 2000s. Certainly, there was a significant attraction of the potential dollars that were going to come to communities as a result of it and the administrative processes that were put in place. However, as I understand it, and from the discussions I have had with people, it has changed amazingly in the last 15 years to a completely different structure. Now you still have well-intentioned community people who become board members, but they are driven so much on what the practical outcomes can be that it no longer becomes the focus.

All across the communities that I have the honour to represent, they support the principle of it but they want to see the on-the-ground impact of it. Others tell me that they are concerned that of the expenditure provisions within NRM areas, it seemingly has changed from on the ground being the majority to administratively being the minority, completely. There has been a swap on that. Communities want to see actual benefits occur from the levies that they pay.

When they hold that frustration that that is not the existent outcome but they continue to receive bills based upon a government decision for an increased amount of cost recovery, they get angry about it; that is only natural. Those who collect the levy are rather upset by it, too. Councils, as part of their wide range of feedback given to me, are really looking at opportunities to identify on the rate notice that they will be about to send out—and they have been responsible for 15 years to collect the levy—the fact that this charge is the responsibility of others, it is not theirs.

It has been determined by government, flowing through to the board who have to do it in effect because they do not have reserves to use up in other areas. They have to collect this money to continue operations, and they are going to make a specific campaign on the fact that this is a government decreed cost. I support them on that because that is where accountability comes into it, but it is part of the anger and frustration that has existed out there.

I do not intend to hold up the house for a long time on this and I commend the Natural Resources Committee for the opportunity provided to NRM boards to make presentations and the opportunity for members of parliament to make submissions. I commend those members who did. However, it is with a level of frustration that I note—and the member for Ashford referred to this—that a majority of members of the committee chose not to object. I know that the minority of members of the committee were not prepared to support that, and they voted against not objecting, which means that they did not support the increases, but things have to occur sometimes.

It shows that there is going to be a considerable political debate that will occur about this over the next few months at least, particularly as the bills are starting to be received by people. I think it is a responsibility to ensure that the political debate that occurs ties back to those who are responsible for that decision. When I talk to people, I am going to say it is not the NRM boards; they are being forced in many ways to make these challenging decisions. They recognise the impact it is going to have on property owners. It is purely a decision of government, and that is where I hope the people of South Australia realise their anger needs to be vented to, and I have no day no doubt that it will.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Colton.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:24):** Thank you very much. Given my back, ma'am, I will not be holding the house for very long—I just hope I can hold up myself. I am very pleased to stand today and speak about this report, most ably provided by the member for Ashford. It has always been fairly controversial, the natural resources management levy, and it will always be controversial. Under statute, it is required to be collected by council, and in my previous discussions with council they would be more than happy to collect it if they kept it, but that is not what is the case. That is not what is on offer, so they will continue to collect it and that is the appropriate mechanism by which it will be collected.

I note the comments of the member for Goyder about the outcomes that people within the community would like, not being seen in relation to the projects that are being undertaken. I am not going to suggest that is not true because I have not been out in the regional areas for a long while, but, in my most recent memory, it was a process by which the community would be engaged as to what were the priorities in regard to how that money should be spent and on what projects. I would be very disappointed if that were not the case now.

But I would temper that also by saying that, in my memory, it was people looking at projects that were their priority but not necessarily the priority of the vast area that is covered by the NRM boards. That will always be the case where you would say, 'It is not money being spent on the ground.' To paraphrase that, it often means, 'It is not money being spent on the ground in the area that I want it to be.' It is the role of a board, with the responsibility of making decisions, as to how best to spend that money in the broader interests of the community, the broader interests of the environment and, indeed, I expect still from a whole of landscape perspective, because that is the way in which we should manage our landscape.

On the matter of the costs incurred, which, again, are required under the National Water Initiative and there is a requirement to recover all those costs, what I would say is that I hope the NRM boards are making sure that the people who are providing that—and generally it will be DEWNR, I expect, under what was once the department for water—that their pencils are sharpened and that it is audited properly to ensure that they are getting the best value they can possibly get from that service that they require.

It does not make sense for all of our NRM boards to have water specialists that will do all the modelling and do all of this. It should be done by other organisations. It does not have to be the government department. As I understand it, they have the right to go out and get other people to engage it, but they have a requirement to make sure that that money is paid. I just say that, without creating any problems for myself or others, I hope they are requesting that their pencils are sharpened and ensure in the proper audit that they get good value for the money that they are paying for those services that they require in their statutory role of developing water management plans in the various areas in what is seen as another controversial issue.

To finish, I want to congratulate those people who represent their areas on the NRM boards. They do a very good job, but also there are some outstanding staff who are employed by the NRM boards and the importance of that is that, not only are they representing the communities in which they live but also they are the frontline and the interface between natural resource management and the people they represent in the community, and I commend them for the job that they do.

Sometimes it can be very difficult, as I said earlier. You cannot please everyone and sometimes there are difficult processes and decisions that need to be made, but I do know that they are the best people placed to engage the community, to work through those issues and to get an outcome that the significant majority of the people within that particular region and even beyond will agree with.

I actually think we get pretty good value out of the NRM boards. I have had a look at some of the projects by my NRM board (Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board). I think they do very good work and some might say that it is really on the smell of an oily rag. Some of the projects they undertake and the outcomes they get are very good. That is just a reflection of one of the boards, but I say that that is the case with all of the NRM boards that exist in this state.

We know that no-one likes paying taxes and no-one likes paying levies. No-one likes paying any money, but it is responsible for all of us to do that. It is then the responsibility of those who are collecting and spending the money to make sure that the outcomes that are being achieved are those that are required and ultimately supported by the community.

I think that the NRM system in South Australia is one that, to a certain extent, sets us apart from the rest of Australia, and I think that it does a very good job. The working relationships between the boards have improved significantly over the years. The working relationship between the boards and the councils have improved significantly over the years; indeed, the working relationship between the boards, the communities and the state government agencies has improved significantly over the years as well.

I commend the report to the house. I think that the member for Goyder said—and he will correct me if I am wrong—that a number of people on the board did not vote against the majority—

**Mr Griffiths:** They were not supportive, but were not objecting.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** They were not objecting. If you are not objecting, I think you are supporting it. The people who were not supporting it were actually those who opposed it, and a minority report came about. I think you are being a bit too cute with your words there; notwithstanding that—

**Mr Griffiths:** I was just repeating what the member for Ashford said.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** No, I do not think she said that; you might want to check the *Hansard*.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Anyway—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! My protective side is coming out for you, member for Colton.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Thank you very much, ma'am.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I cannot hear what the member for Colton is saying.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Hammond, your voice does boom. I remind you all that standing orders require silence for speakers. Member for Colton.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. Without being disrespectful, I am glad that you are protecting me, but I can protect myself. I will just finish off with this point. If you vote with the majority, you support it. If you do not vote with the majority, you have opposed it, and the majority is supporting this report. I commend the report to the house and I further commend the role and the function of the natural resources management boards and their employees across this state.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:31):** I would like the opportunity to say a few words about this report. I thank the member for Ashford for the opportunity to discuss by phone a few matters with the committee. I was not able to be there, but I had quite a lengthy discussion over the phone and raised quite a few matters. There is a need to do something about the NRM. It is working in some areas and not in others. I have two boards: a very small board and a very large board. It has been put to me—and I agree with this—that the problem is that the smaller boards raise a minuscule amount of money and the amount of money that the big board raises is gigantic.

In my view, the income that is collected across South Australia needs to be levelled. The board in the Adelaide Hills, which has enormous revenue, should be able to distribute some of that revenue to the smaller boards to enable them to do more. You can say that that is a rationalisation of public moneys and spreading the load, etc. You cannot expect a small board, such as the one I have on Kangaroo Island, to do anywhere near the amount of work that should be done with no money to do it.

The major complaint of many people from my electorate, indeed from officers themselves who have spoken to me privately, is that they spend far too much time sitting in offices filling out bureaucratic paperwork than they do getting out and doing things that they want to do and should be doing. In a couple of cases, some officers are attached to the board, and the feral species people go out and deliver a certain amount of lead, and by other methods, to species. They are out and about pretty regularly doing what they need to do, but other methods need to be put into practice to free up staff.

The board that controls much of the Fleurieu in my electorate has a multitude of people working for it, but even there I get the regular complaint that not enough is seen to be done. People want more done. My view is that there are aspects of the NRM legislation which took over animal and pest control, plant and soil boards. I think (and I speak as a former chair of an animal and plant board) that we actually got a lot more done when it was attached to the council and there was a much smaller group involved in directing what happened. It was more hands-on and there was more local interest in it.

So, my view is firmly that that side of it is not working and that something needs to be done about it. NRM puts a substantial amount of work into our rural electorates and collects a huge amount of money, as I said earlier, from the metropolitan area in particular. We have to get it so that some of that money that is in these larger boards goes to smaller boards—and the member for Flinders knows all about it; he has boards out his way, I am not sure how many he has. I put the case for getting more done, more on-ground works done, and not so many people filling out endless paperwork in offices.

I am lucky, as the board on the island is a particularly good board and I very pleased with the make-up of it; I have regular contact with it. The one in the Hills and the Fleurieu is a little more distant and it is a little bit harder to get information from it—and that is not being overly critical. It is just that never the twain shall meet between the big outfit and the small outfit, which is much more personal. I am interested to read the report that has been put forward by the member for Ashford and I will listen with interest to other members.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:36):** I will make a contribution on the 109<sup>th</sup> report. I acknowledge the good work, the hard work, that the Natural Resources Committee does, but this massive increase in levies is something that has gone past or through the committee and has been underwhelmingly endorsed by the committee. It was the state's responsibility and now has been really targeted at a much smaller constituency in South Australia.

It is quite clear that the minister has made a directive to the natural resources boards, and in some instances committee members on some of the boards were not aware of this massive impact that they were going to have to pass on to their constituency, and it really has hit my electorate in Chaffey as part of the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board. I want to put on the record that the member for Flinders, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC and the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC voted to object to these proposals, but they were overridden as it is a government-weighted committee, sadly. No disrespect to the Presiding Member, but I think we have to acknowledge the impact it will have on the greater productive areas in South Australia.

I would like to start by raising a few points from a letter. I receive many letters from constituents in my electorate because of the mammoth task and burden that the majority of particularly the farming sector are going to have to incur from levy increases. I was speaking to one constituent only on Thursday, and he is getting a \$2,000 increase, so it is clear that it is a cost shifting exercise to the most productive part of the state. It is outrageous that the minister has come out and given us all this polywaffle about justification on why his directive went to the boards when they really had no say.

One of the letters I received was that one of my constituents was at a consultation workshop hosted by the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board and options were given to this consultation workshop: no increase, 50 per cent, 100 per cent, 200 per cent, and obviously the highest preferred option was no levy increase. Of course that is the way people are going to vote.

People are always going to accept the Natural Resource Charter and that it is a responsibility of the state to have these programs, to have environmental programs in particular. In the Murray-Darling Basin, almost every South Australian is a beneficiary of good river management and good land management. What we are seeing now is that we are going to encompass a 10½ per cent increase to the levy, and it is important to note that inflation is around 2 per cent: it is not 10 per cent.

I would also like to touch on a couple of issues along the way. I did give evidence to the committee because I thought it was important that I speak on behalf of my constituents. One of the



notable pieces of evidence that came before the committee was given by the CEO of DEWNR. I quote from the report:

The committee heard from Ms Pitcher that the regions did not have a choice in having these costs imposed on them: 'it was certainly not a decision that presiding members had the power to agree or not agree,' she said. 'It is not a question of the boards deciding to lift a levy above CPI. They are the recipients of a government decision to take \$6.8 million indexed over the forwards.'

That is a quote from the CEO. That is a damning quote, that this minister has laid the heavy hand on the natural resources boards. I think it is a damning indictment of the minister, who continually bats away that this is a cost that needed to be forwarded on.

I want to touch on the impact and a few stats behind the NRM region in my electorate and what it means to South Australia. The Murray-Darling Basin NRM region extends from the Riverland area south to where the River Murray meets the sea at the Coorong, including Mount Barker at its western border and extending to the South Australia-Victoria state border. The region covers 70,000 square kilometres and includes six districts: the River Murray, Coorong Lower Lakes, Murray Mallee, Murray Plains, Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges and the South Olary Plains.

The region is home to more than 120,000 people living and working in 15 local government areas, eight of which are shared with the NRM regions. Regional natural resources support tourism, recreation and manufacturing, as well as the most productive agricultural area in South Australia. Eighty-two per cent of the regional land is used for primary production.

I think that is where we need to take note—that 82 per cent of the Murray-Darling Basin area is used for primary production. It is used for sustainable food production and it is used for supporting a healthy environment. Many of those people who are the eyes and ears of our natural resources are being hit with this hefty increase. I do not speak on behalf of them when I ask: will they walk away from their volunteer work, will they walk away from using their eyes and their ears as a great conduit to the natural resources boards, to the government? This directive is clearly inflammatory.

Within the region, the ecosystems are of national and international significance. We have three Ramsar sites that are all backed up by some government support, but the majority is volunteer support. These people are almost being driven away from something that is invaluable and an invaluable contribution. It just shows that this government is looking a gift horse in the mouth.

This region alone contributes \$2.2 billion in gross food production and generates about \$200 million worth of tourism, much of which is based around the river and its environment. Along the way, the evidence I gave to the Natural Resources Committee was a little overlaid with a lot of other good contributions. I notice the member for Hammond gave evidence as well. If we look at the councils at the moment, we see that they are furious that what was once an affordable levy that they accepted to pass on to their ratepayers is now a burden, and they are the bearers of that bad news. I met with three of my six councils on Thursday, and one of the main topics of conversation was the impost they were having to endure in collecting the NRM levy. They felt that it was unfair and that it unfairly targeted their ratepayers, just as I feel it unfairly targeted my constituency in Chaffey.

Along the way, there were also calls from Primary Producers SA for an independent inquiry into how the government could justify collecting and raising these ever-increasing levies. When South Australia is really under the pump economically, the government is clearly shifting responsibility for costs away from the state and onto some of the most productive areas in the state—just giving them another whack and poking the needle in that little bit further. It is making people more and more angry.

This cost shifting exercise has seen a small population of South Australia picking up the tab for the majority of South Australia. The electorate of Chaffey is picking up a large majority of this NRM levy increase, as are the South-East and the Mount Lofty areas. It is a cost shifting exercise that every South Australian should be aware of because those areas are the most productive in the state, yet they are being penalised the most.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:46):** I rise to speak on the 109<sup>th</sup> to 115<sup>th</sup> reports of the Natural Resources Committee relating to various natural resources management levy proposals and plans for 2016-17. I will be echoing comments from my colleagues on the side of the house that this

is an outrageous fee rise. I note my interest in natural resources, as I did when I presented to the committee. My wife is an environmental scientist and she helped set up integrated natural resources management maybe over a decade ago now, so I have a little bit of inside knowledge of what happens and I am still fed some information from some good people.

Natural resources management is vital to our productive state, but the frustration continually vented to me is that it appears that about 80 per cent of the levy money is spent on office work, reviewing plans which, subject to the act, are required to be reviewed on a three-yearly or a five-yearly basis. Volumes and volumes of work are being done every year right across the state by people just reviewing plans. It frustrates the practical people, the practical producers of our state who just want to do things on the ground and get them happening.

Interestingly, some feedback via a question I was asked during my presentation to the committee was that I did not support any of the work. No, that is not right. I do support the on-ground projects, but the issue for me is that it is almost like going to a crop trial site. Every time you go to one, there are always the same farmers and they are good operators—don't get me wrong.

They are the same operators whose good work you go and visit whether it is on the River Murray swamps, a dryland area or at Lake Albert. It is always the same people, so no-one can tell me that it involves thousands of properties in that manner across the region. In fact, I am going to see one on Friday morning in Murray Bridge. I think what cuts to the bone for people is the fact that, as is stated in the report:

Additionally...DEWNR intended to begin full cost recovery for corporate services (\$21,699 per FTE) from all regions commencing in 2016–17.

So not only are people paying this levy, their emergency services levy, they are straight-out funding the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. This is where it really sticks in the craw of the electors of this state: instead of these departments being funded, as they have been from general revenue in the past, now there is this so-called cost recovery that will again just beat up the good constituents of the regions and throughout the urban areas and take this funding from them.

In regard to the Murray-Darling Basin area, the 2015-16 budget was \$2,253,752 rising to \$5,827,400 in 2018-19, and in division 2 the water levy goes from \$7,079,782 to \$8,050,792. We are seeing these gross rises right across the board that impact on the producers of our state who contribute around \$20 billion a year to this state, especially in the light of the downturn in mining and manufacturing.

There has been some discussion about the attitude of councils to collecting the levy. I would like to note a motion that was put forward by the Mid Murray Council to the Murraylands and Riverland Local Government Association. It reads as follows:

That the Murraylands and Riverland Local Government Association:

- (1) Note the significant cost increase proposed in the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin NRM draft Business Plan 2016/17-2018/19 in the amount of levy raised through the NRM levy (land levy proposed to be increased by 136% from \$28.00 to \$66.00 and water levy by 10.5% from \$5.70 to \$6.30 per megalitre).
- (2) Considers that such a significant increase in the NRM levy may have a detrimental effect on the payment of council rates and council operations.
- (3) Request that the South Australian Regional Organisation of Councils (SAROC) consider the removal of the requirement by the state government for the collection of the local government Natural Resources Management Levy due to the reasons outlined.

It is sad to think that it has reached this level because I have had constituents ring me to say, 'Well, we're just not going to pay it. We're just not going to pay it.' I said, 'That's up to you; that's your call.' However, what is going to happen is that councils will have to pick up the slack because they will get the direct bill from the government.

While I am talking about natural resources management, something I presented in my submission was the effect of both corellas and the New Zealand fur seals in my area. Corellas are having a devastating effect on communities around the state, yet there is only one council, the Coorong council, that has put in a proper relocation program that permanently relocates some of

these corellas so that they never offend again. It is the only way to manage these birds, yet NRM flatly refuses to be involved. You would have thought that this was something that natural resources management should be involved in.

However, there is also the seal issue. I note a letter from Julie Jones, the daughter of the great Henry Jones who stood alongside so many environment ministers and environment shadows over his life, especially the last decade of his life, in fighting for the River Murray—a true champion. After a visit by the federal Minister for the Environment, Mr Greg Hunt, only the other day, Julie wrote a letter, and I quote from it:

Dear Minister Hunt,

Thank you for visiting Clayton Bay today and for listening to the concerns of our community. I reiterate what I said at the meeting through print as you requested.

Re: Destruction caused by the New Zealand Fur Seal & introduction of the herpes strain cyprinid herpesvirus-3 for carp.

PLEASE LISTEN!

We are distraught watching our fishing business and industry suffering as it has at the hands of the destructive New Zealand fur seals. And in total disbelief that despite the constant and desperate cries for help (through the right channels) we are not getting the right intervention from Government to rectify the problem.

As listed below...all trials have failed.

My name is Julie Jones and my son, Justin Phillips, is a Fisher in the Lower Lakes, mostly South of Lake Alexandrina. My sister is also a fisher, after taking over my father's (Henry Jones) fishing licence 2 & a half years ago. Prior to being employed by my sister, Justin fished with Henry since he left school (10 years ago). Our family has held fishing licences in this region for over 50 years.

At this time, my son is NOT working due to the horrific daily impact the NZ fur seals are having on the fishery. We are very concerned about the exhausted physical and mental health of the fishers in our Southern Fishermen's Association. There are fishers in our Association on suicide watch.

We see seals every fishing day. We see the destruction they wreak daily. The seals bite the pelicans' neck and feet and leave them to suffer. We are not seeing other species of birds that we used to see (i.e. the musk duck). New nets have enormous irreparable holes in them, the fish in the nets are NOT saleable as they are bitten in half. Our income has been highly affected making it impossible to meet the cost of licence fees, let alone daily living expenses. This, of course, also has a rippling social impact on businesses in our communities.

We have been asked for photos of the destruction, damage statistics, stock numbers, etc., and all of this has been collated and sent. We continue to send accurate information and statistics as requested.

This fishery is generally concerned for not only our own livelihoods...but for the Ecosystem that we fought so hard to resurrect in our fight for water post the recent destructive drought.

They go through the list of points that were made at the meeting about the destruction of alternative fishing styles. Fyke nets and crackers were no good. Eighty metres of fencing around the barrages was no good. Seal counts have indicated that seals have certainly increased after they went out to breed in December to January.

My call is that, instead of the government taking all this money from our community without giving too much back, this is the time they should be standing up for our communities, whether it be on issues like land and water management, corellas, or some sort of decent management on seals, which are destroying our native environment and our fishers' livelihoods.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:56):** I rise to speak on the 109<sup>th</sup> to 115<sup>th</sup> reports of the Natural Resources Committee. I listened very closely to the member for Ashford, the Chair of that committee. She is a person I have a great deal of respect for, and in fact I gained a lot of that respect while I was on the committee myself. I appreciate the thoughtful way in which she described the way in which the committee's final decision was arrived at.

Let me make it clear to the house that I certainly made a very brief but direct submission to the committee, asking the committee that it not support any levy increases in excess of CPI. The committee as a whole decided to go in a different direction, and I note that certain members of the committee voted one way and certain members voted another, but at the end of the day majority rules with regard to the committee position.

Let me also say very clearly that I am not an NRM board basher. I do actually value the work of the boards. We have very capable, decent and skilful people as board members and I value, in the overwhelming majority, the work that the staff do as well. What I do not agree with is the fact that they can ask the public for more and more money every year in excess of CPI. The reason is that, as I have said in this place many times before—and when I was on the committee myself I spoke to this effect and voted against levies in excess of CPI. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (11:59):** I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business: Committees and Subordinate Legislation, set down on the *Notice Paper* for today, to take precedence over Government Business for up to one hour.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LEVY PROPOSALS 2016-17**

Debate resumed.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:01):** The reason I do not support the levy increases in excess of CPI is not that I do not value the work that the boards do. Certainly, efficiencies could be found. There is no organisation that could not do its work better, or could not do its work more efficiently, particularly under the broad government umbrella. I am not saying that they could not find ways to use the money more effectively, but that is not my main focus.

My main focus is the fact that the work that these NRM boards are expected to do is, essentially, endless. There is no shortage of projects that could come forward from within government, or from the public asking the board, 'Could you do this work? If you had some extra money, could you do this work, and, yes, it would benefit the community. Could you do this other work, and, yes, it would benefit the community.' It is a never-ending list.

Essentially, you have to cut the take from the taxpayer somewhere and I think that CPI is the appropriate place. I say that because four out of the eight NRM boards in the state share an overlap with my electorate of Stuart. I am engaged with four of these boards all the time in my work as the member for Stuart, and, of course, I also take interest in what the other four are doing. Let me also say that I disagree with the choice that the government has made over the last few years to absorb what were, essentially, fairly independent NRM boards operating around the state back into government control under the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources.

That has been a retrograde step, and I think that most NRM board members (and most NRM board staff) would agree with me in that regard, that they were more effective, more efficient and more linked into their local communities when they had that arm's-length relationship with the government department rather than all being government employees now. That has not been a positive step, and I say that for several reasons.

In the context of this debate, specifically, I say it because what we have seen is that the government contribution to the boards has decreased very, very significantly in the last few years. Particularly, in this request (going from 2015-16 to 2016-17) the actual direct funding contribution from the government via the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources to the NRM boards has dropped dramatically. At the same time, the charges from the government (from the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources) to the boards has increased significantly.

So, bringing the boards back in under government control has not helped the boards at all from a financial perspective.

The reason that the boards overwhelmingly have had to come to the Natural Resources Committee of parliament and ask for these levy increases in excess of CPI is that the state government has said that it was going to contribute less money to them directly and it was actually going to charge these boards more money for their own cost recovery purposes, so the poor old boards are really stuck. It is not because they are wasting their money or being inefficient or that they cannot manage the budgets they have; it is because the state government has charged them extra and provided them less funding than they have over a period of time. I think that is incredibly disappointing.

The state government is saying to the boards, 'We do not value your work highly enough to want to continue supporting you financially; in fact, we place a value on the work that the boards do such that we, as a state government, are going to reduce the funding that we give you.' I think that is a great shame. Also, what the state government is then saying to the boards is, 'Not only are we going to give you less direct funding, charge you more for what we provide to you, we want you to go and get the difference from the taxpayer.'

In short, the government is saying, 'We are going to contribute less but just go and get the difference from the taxpayer,' and that is a very fundamental part of my logic for saying that is unfair. It is not reasonable for the government to force the boards to seek more from the taxpayer, purely because the government does not want to provide the funding itself that it typically has in the past. I think out of all of that, where are you going to find a point to say what is the maximum acceptable increase to the levy? There is not one perfect answer to that question, but in my mind I think then we should just leave it at CPI.

We also have the situation whereby councils, which collect the levy on behalf of the government from the levy payers, essentially the public, are now so frustrated and so angry with this situation that the government has put them in that they have now said that they do not want to collect the levy any longer. They have said that they feel so exposed to the opinions of their own ratepayers by what the government has done that they do not want to collect the levy because they think it reflects badly on the councils.

The government is trying to have everything its own way. It is trying to drag the boards back in under the department so that the boards do not operate at the arms-length relationship that they used to. They want to charge the boards more for their own cost recovery purposes. They want to contribute less money to the boards with regard to a contribution that is essentially on behalf of the taxpayer, and they want the boards then to charge the taxpayer more direct.

That is not a workable solution, that is not fair for the taxpayer, who of course does not get a reduction in any other taxes but is now asked to pay a greater share of tax through the NRM levy. It is not fair to the councils, which have to collect the levy to the government, and it is certainly not fair on behalf of the NRM boards and their staff who are really squeezed in this financial model and cannot get on and do the work they need to do. They are suffering in regard to short-term contracts; many of their staff are working without a contract, just extended month-by-month because they do not have the funding to offer a significant three, four or five-year contract to really quality people doing really good work. It is not fair to the environment either.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:09):** I rise to speak on the 109<sup>th</sup> and 110<sup>th</sup> regional levies reports in the series of reports we are currently dealing with, that is, in respect of the Adelaide and Mount Lofty levy proposal. Firstly, I am very disappointed that we are dealing with the business plans and levy proposals as some sort of bulk group. We are restricted to 10 minutes to deal with these because they are now all being dealt with in bulk. We only get 10 minutes to deal with any of them that traverse our electorates, so I am going to address my attention, in what limited time I have, to the levy proposal in respect of the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board levy proposal.

In short, members of the committee, the Hon. John Dawkins, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire and our very own member for Flinders, voted against the non-support or not opposed the non-support or something like that—it is rather a double negative arrangement—which has the effect, though, as

a majority filled by the government, of providing a 6 per cent increase in respect of the land levy, as it is colloquially known, that is, a division 1 levy, and no increase in the water levy.

In reading this report, everything that has been received from the department has been taken as gospel and on the information found in the report. Because the chief executive, Ms Pitcher, had provided evidence that there was in the order of \$40 million for the cost of dealing with water planning and management, that has been taken as gospel. It is written here. It is not identified as being challenged by other members who gave evidence, including me, and it is not supported by any documentation.

I am appalled at that, not because I am suggesting Ms Pitcher is not telling the truth but because the committee is not actually scrutinising the material that is coming before them and requiring, as they should have, evidence on the breakdown of this alleged expenditure. It has just been taken en bloc and then accepted as one of the bases upon which there should be an increase much greater than CPI in the land levy for the area, part of which I represent.

Secondly, there is the claim of evidence by the minister, the Hon. Ian Hunter, to the estimates committee on 22 July 2015 in which he repeated what I say is a completely unsubstantiated claim—that is, that the boards should be responsible for the recovery of costs for water, usage and planning under some national agreement, when again the validity of that statement has been seriously challenged. It is not his claim that it should be recovered and that it was consistent with the National Water Initiative agreements, but that in fact this aspect should be recovered without there being any adequate evidence to support the prerequisites upon which the National Water Initiative agreements were signed.

I find it incomprehensible that members of the committee, other than the three I mentioned, should take this information, swallow it and then be forced to impose this incredible obligation on the people within this region. I find it unconscionable and quite inconsistent with what has been a fairly forensic assessment, in my experience with this committee in the past who have done their work diligently. I respect the Chair and the work she does on this. It is a hardworking committee, but this is a dereliction of duty by this committee in accepting and swallowing this information without even any commentary here on the challenges that were made.

They claim that it is necessary to beat budget requirements. When was this committee under an obligation to require representatives within these regions to have to pay huge increases in their levies because the government is under budget requirements, for goodness sake? Cabinet have a responsibility, along with minister Hunter, to get their books in order and to keep their books balanced, not cannibalise other sources of income which they see as an opportunity for them to prop up their disgracefully bereft budget responsibilities.

They have claimed that, to meet these budget requirements, modest annual increases are needed—that is the 6 per cent, and it is hardly modest. Let me go to table 6, the reprioritising of work. Table 6 shows a \$1.3 million slashing of project works to be undertaken within this region. I am absolutely appalled at that. Inevitably, this was going to happen when there was a cost recovery for this alleged expenditure.

We have two things as a consequence. The people within the Adelaide and Mount Lofty area, firstly, not only have to have a massive increase in levy but, secondly, they have had a huge slashing, in table 6, to the extent of \$1.3 million from the budgeted expenditure, \$23½ million down to \$22.2 million in land management and change—whatever that is, but it is suggested to be capital projects in the commentary of this report. There are some minor decreases, huge in the sense of 64 per cent and 62 per cent respectively in economic impacts, and planning and improvement. In fairness, they are only fairly small, modest payments originally budgeted for those two items anyway.

I make the point that it is not acceptable that we have this massive reduction in the provision for works, which is the actual work on the ground in these regions for the management of the natural resources. I am very concerned about this. I ask the committee this: what are you going to do in the next 22 days, between now and the end of June, if minister Hunter imposes another ministerial direction on these NRM boards for next year? We do not know that yet. Remember, the state budget has been adjourned to next financial year, to 7 July I think, instead of happening in June.

We will not even know until we are into next financial year whether minister Hunter needs to prop up some more deficiencies, such as the massive cost in moving the whole of the department from down at Keswick next to the railway station—a beautiful building. They are going to move the whole lot into the city. We have heard the announcements, we have seen the glossy new pictures of this beautiful new suite they are going to have in Adelaide. I hate to think how much money they are going to waste on lost rent in the premises they have at other properties for leases that have not expired, including Greenhill Road.

What are we going to do when minister Hunter needs some more money? He has just been in my electorate putting up a sign on the walk between Mount Lofty and Burnside, or Waterfall Gully—a lovely new sign; I hate to think how much it cost—to tell us that we are there recognising the Kaurna people. Well, we have known that in my electorate for a long time. We do not need a sign to tell us. I want there to be a prioritising of this money for natural resources protection and advancement within these regions.

I do not want my people robbed every year just because the minister needs more money to prop up this department, which in some areas has been disgracefully wasteful in expenditure. We have no protection whatsoever in knowing even now whether the minister is going to drop out some more ministerial statements, impose this on our boards and come back next year again begging this committee for an increase in those payments above CPI because they have no other choice other than, as they have done this time, say, 'We want a 6 per cent increase and we are going to slash over here our budgeted expenditure for capital works and project works in our region.'

I have been waiting for four years for somebody to do something about foxes in the Adelaide Hills, on which there was an excellent report from the Natural Resources Committee. I am still waiting. I regularly go down there to the meeting and ask 'What is happening with the foxes?' As usual, other regional NRMs seem to be doing some great work on this issue and I follow what they are doing and commend them.

I do not know whether there are foxes in the member for Stuart's area, but he has lots of other feral things up there. He has wheel cactus and all sorts of problems in his area, but his group does a great job fixing them. My group has no chance if they are going to have to keep on increasing the levies and then smash the projects for which they have already budgeted. I hate to think what is going to happen with rabbits next year.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (12:19):** May I start off in the same vein that the previous speaker, the member for Bragg, has finished on.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** She still had 10 seconds.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I am very concerned about the failure of this committee to uphold the needs and desires of this chamber. This committee is a committee of this chamber. It is a committee of the parliament. It is not a committee of the executive arm of the government. What this committee seems to have done is roll over for the executive arm of government, and it has let down the parliament. Thank God committee members no longer get paid for sitting on the committee because that would be an even greater travesty.

The reality is that this committee has failed in its duty. The committee is aware—and I know it is aware because I have given evidence to this committee on a not dissimilar matter—of the obligations on the minister and the government under the National Water Initiative. There are a number of obligations, all of which the minister has failed to meet. I was fairly confident that this committee would seek the relevant information and hold the minister to account. The reality is that the committee has failed to do that.

The committee has failed to have the minister publish the numbers on which he bases these claims for this additional money. That is one of the obligations under the National Water Initiative. Having failed to do that and having failed to meet all of the obligations under the National Water Initiative, he has failed to table the reasons he has not done that, which again is an obligation under the National Water Initiative. I would have thought that a committee of this house, a committee of this parliament, would have held the minister to account. I have to tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am very, very disappointed.

I speak principally to the committee report with regard to the South-East Natural Resources Management Board Levy Proposal 2016-17, the 115<sup>th</sup> report of the Natural Resources Committee. The committee, in its paragraph on Background, states:

In the 2015-16 state budget, the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources...announced its intention to begin partial recovery of water planning and management...costs, which had been set initially in the 2010-11 budget, in line with the National Water Initiative...

It is the only time this minister has agreed with the National Water Initiative. It goes on to say:

... Chief Executive Sandy Pitcher provided evidence to the committee that DEWNR annually incurred [water planning and management] costs on the order of \$40 million. She said that DEWNR intended to recover only part of this amount from the NRM regions, via their levies: \$3.5 million in 2015-16...rising to \$6.8 million in 2016-17.

Why did the chief executive not tell the committee that almost \$20 million of that \$40 million was already being recovered from SA Water? Why? Because when I was talking to the committee one of the committee members said to me, 'Just be careful because these costs total \$40 million. The minister might want to collect it all.' The reality is that SA Water already contributes substantially towards this.

I have here a copy of Direction to the South Australian Water Corporation Pursuant to Section 6 of the Public Corporations Act 1993. It is dated 9 May 2013 and signed by whom? The Hon. Ian Hunter MLC, Minister for Water and the River Murray. Under the heading of Water Planning and Management Charges, it states:

SA Water must make the following contributions to the Department for the Environment, Water and Natural Resources in each financial year of the initial regulatory period in order to support water planning and management activities.

In 2013-14, it was \$16.7 million; in 2014-15, it was \$17 million; and in 2015-16 it was \$17.5 million. I understand that currently the amount is even more than that; it is more like \$19 million. Notwithstanding that, why did the CEO of the department tell the Natural Resources Committee that there is \$40 million and, 'How good are we? We're only asking for a small amount of it'?

Further, the committee's report says:

Both these amounts were lower than the cost recovery target of \$9.6 million first set in the 2010-11 budget...

I hope the Chair of the committee, in summing up this debate, can point me to exactly where that is highlighted in the 2010-11 budget, because I cannot find it. Let me read from the 2010-11 Budget Statement, Budget Paper 3, Chapter 3—Revenue, on page 3.10:

In 2009-10, revenue from NRM levies is expected to be \$3 million higher than originally estimated. Revenue from NRM levies is forecast to increase in 2010-11 primarily due to an increase in the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM levy following a review by the Adelaide and Mount Lofty NRM Board of its programs. In 2011-12, revenue from NRM levies is affected by the cessation of NRM levy relief for drought affected levy payers in the River Murray area. Thereafter, revenue from NRM levies is forecast to remain relatively flat.

I do not know where the CEO of the department got that figure of \$9.6 million from. I can tell you I cannot find it, and I would ask that the Chair of this committee, in summing up, point both the house and me to where, in that original document—the 2010-11 budget papers—this matter is highlighted, because I do not believe it is there. I have also dug out the Budget Improvement Measures: Restoring Sustainable State Finances, second report of the Sustainable Budget Commission, August 2010. This is the document on which these changes are predicated. Let me read from the Savings Proposal Summary:

The principal budget improvement measure proposed is the phased recovery of water planning and management costs from SA Water and, ultimately, consumers.

It goes on to say:

In relation to NRM Boards, measures are proposed which shift NRM Boards to increased cost recovery, relying more on the levy revenues from local handholders who benefit from local NRM activities, and removal of government operating grants and agency support services (or cost recovery of services).

Savings in relation to NRM Boards will be achieved by reducing state grant funding, discontinuing payroll tax subsidies, reducing grants under the state complementary NRM program, and a combination of rationalising agency NRM support services and recovering the remainder of those costs from NRM Boards.



It goes on to show that the figure would be \$2.5 million a year. Again, I do not know where the figure of \$9.6 million comes from. What I can tell you with regard to the NRM board in the South-East, in my electorate, is that Primary Producers SA were able to glean some information from the minister—the minister promising to open the books. I know the PPSA still has a number of questions of the minister and his agency, but they did get some information. I have a table here that reads 'Attachment 2: DEWNR water planning and management costs – by NRM region'. I can tell the house that the total cost in the South-East is \$2.303 million—that is the total. It does not have a date on it. I assume this is the current year.

Before these increases were advocated by the minister, imposed by the minister, accepted by the local NRM board and now accepted by the committee, the South East NRM Board was already collecting \$3.291 million from water levies in the South-East. As a result of this committee accepting the proposal from the South East NRM Board, that will increase to \$3.7 million.

So, how lucky are water users in the South-East? They are going out and working their butts off to produce and keep the economy of this state going, and they are being hit up for \$3.7 million to recover costs where the costs are only \$2.3 million. All I can say to the house is the committee has been derelict in its duty.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:29):** I echo the words of the member for MacKillop and it was a very good contribution to the house. I want to speak briefly about the disconnect that many landholders feel with the government and the NRM levy, and I guess the disconnect comes from the difference between what they pay and the services that they are perceived to receive in return. The NRM levy has been a main topic of conversation at many council meetings. I certainly know the Limestone Coast Local Government Association has it on its agenda almost as a standing item now.

One of the points that I would get this committee to look at is that the government is always interested in inputs, how much money is going in, but it never looks at outputs, how can the same or an improved service be done more efficiently with existing resources in a cost-effective manner, and perhaps working with local councils to improve the service delivery on aspects that can be done. There is no doubt that one of the biggest issues is the contribution to DEWNR's workforce through, basically, a corporate tax on landowners.

We are seeing a time down in the South-East when dairy farmers are under increasing pressure. I had some worrying forward projections on cattle prices and the increase in supply of beef cattle out of Europe and Russia, and with some of the forward projections, we may be seeing a similar effect to the dairy crisis in about 18 months' time due to the large upswell of farms in those European countries producing far more beef than they have ever produced before, obviously backed with certain subsidies. We have a situation in Australia where our farmers, our landholders, are taxed, levied, fees applied, just for carrying out normal business and in a global sense trying to compete with farmers in other countries who are highly subsidised and assisted. That does not bode well for the future of our primary industries.

I want to talk now about the South East Natural Resources Management Board. It has been resolved that \$4.64 million will be raised from land levies and \$3.96 million from water levies. The problem with the South-East is that we do not have the population density to absorb those massive increases like some other areas perhaps do, and I am thinking of Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges, which again will be doing it tough, but the levy increase will be spread over a greater population base and therefore the impact will be a lot less.

The South-East of South Australia contributes 33 per cent of the overall levy but, again, with a very diminished population base. If you take that down to a local level, and I am talking about the Grant district council here, their indication to me is that will be about \$700,000 extra that will need to be raised from the residents of the Grant district council, and at about 10,000 people in total you can see a disproportionate impact on those ratepayers. To say that I was disappointed with the committee's recommendation to raise the rate above the 1.2 per cent CPI would be an understatement. I think where the work really needs to be done is looking at what services are provided, and opportunities for them to be provided in a more cost-effective manner.

I have had reports that 70 per cent of the levy raised is actually taken up in bureaucratic operations and 30 per cent is for on-ground. That type of differential really needs to be looked at.

Why do we have people shuffling papers, yet the one sector of our economy that has been going okay, even though we have had droughts and downturns in dairy prices—this seems to be an unfair burden on that sector of the community and the industry.

I note that Primary Industries and Regions SA obviously opposed the rises and have called for an independent review into water planning and management costs. I will conclude my comments by saying that if anything good is to come out of this, it would be an independent review into water planning and management costs.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:36):** I rise today to speak to the 109<sup>th</sup> report of the Natural Resources Committee—a committee which I sit on. I, along with the other committee members, had great deliberations over the proposals from the NRM boards across the state to increase their levy requirements.

Deputy Speaker, you have heard from members on this side of the house, at least, on the great concern and anxiety that these increases hold, not just for the members on this side but also for their constituents. These constituents are primarily landowning primary producers who will be asked for a significantly higher increase this coming year. One of the statutory obligations of the Natural Resources Committee is to consider and make recommendations on any annual levy proposed by a natural resources management board where the levy increase exceeds the annual rise by the consumer price index for Adelaide.

I will just run through half a dozen or so of the proposed increases. In the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board, the proposed amendments included a 6 per cent increase in division 1, which is the land levy, and the division 2 (or water) levy was to remain unchanged for 2015-16. With all due respect, Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges residents got off rather lightly compared to some of the others. In the Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board, the proposed amendment included a 25 per cent increase in division 1 (land) levy and a 93 per cent increase in division 2 (water) levy.

In the South East Natural Resources Management Board, the proposal was for a whopping 169 per cent increase in the division 1 (land) levy, and a 13 per cent increase in the division 2 (water) levy. Of course, both are well above CPI. The penultimate consideration was the South Australian Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board, which is proposing a 48 per cent increase in the division 1 (land) levy and a 118 per cent increase in the division 2 (water) levy.

In my own neck of the woods, the Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board proposal was that there be a 24 per cent increase in the division 1 (land) levy and a 7 per cent increase in the division 2 (water) levy. All of these proposed increases are the result of a government directive to our NRM boards to assist in payment of water management planning. As I said, it caused great concern. I believe it is yet another impost on the landowners and producers particularly across the agricultural regions of this state. It comes on the back of yet another increase of the emergency services levy, which is in fact the next item of committee business on the agenda today. No doubt, there will be similar concerns around that from members of the parliament who represent regional areas.

This year, all of the six NRM regions are proposing increases for 2016-17, and the reason behind these high NRM levy increases is the imposition of partial cost recovery of water planning and management charges. We have heard from members of this side what they think about this recuperation of costs. This has attracted unprecedented interest from community members. Many of the community members wrote to us and many of the members of this place actually presented in person to the committee raising their concerns.

Some of those concerns have been put into our annual report. As a member of the committee, I can assure this house and the parliament that we undertook our responsibilities very seriously. The boards' success in natural resources management depends on maintaining good relationships with their communities, and the committee acknowledges their important work. One of our concerns was that this significant increase in levy payments will undermine some of that good relationship and good will. The additional expenses imposed on the boards this year are a heavy burden and, as I said, the committee has detailed its concerns in the recommendations to the minister.

By way of background, I will read from the Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board on page 4. The background and the lead-up to us arriving at this point is that in the 2015-16 state budget the Department of Environment Water and Natural Resources announced its intention to begin partial recovery of water planning and management costs, which had initially been set in the 2010-11 budget, in line with the National Water Initiative.

The member for MacKillop raised the point that he was not actually able to find that budget line. I do not think that he was saying that it necessarily does not exist, but he simply was not able to find it. I have no doubt he is up in his office at the moment looking even more forensically at those 2010-11 budget papers.

DEWNR chief executive, Sandy Pitcher, provided evidence to the committee that DEWNR annually incurred water planning and management costs in the order of \$40 million. She said that DEWNR intended to recover only part of this amount from the NRM regions via their levies: \$3.5 million in 2015-16, with the amount rising to \$6.8 million in 2016-17, which of course means that this time next year our committee will once again be considering an increase in proposed levies. I cannot pre-empt how the committee might deal with that, nor can I pre-empt the reaction of the levy payers, because I suspect that their response will be not inconsequential. It will be yet another increased levy impost on the producers of this state.

Both those amounts were lower than the cost recovery target of \$9.6 million first set in the 2010-11 budget. In estimates, the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, the Hon. Ian Hunter in the other place, said the NRM boards were responsible for recovering fees associated with water usage, as required under the National Water Initiative. The minister said that, very kindly, DEWNR had delayed this cost recovery since about 2011.

The minister said the regions had been asked to determine the fairest way forward and to provide advice to him. 'Those people who receive a benefit should be paying for the government resources that are utilised in delivering that benefit,' he said. This is a significant change in the way government operates. To take on board what the member for Stuart contributed, how important does this government truly consider natural resources management?

I was a member of the original Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board. I was appointed way back in 2005 and we took our task very seriously, but it is a different beast these days. Once again, we have conscientious community members who make an application, sit on the board and make considerations about what projects might be best delivered to the various regions throughout the state, and they take that position very responsibly. However, more and more they are being hamstrung by the constraints put on them by government.

The committee heard from Ms Pitcher that the regions did not have a choice in having these costs imposed on them, and that certainly came out in the evidence given by all the boards, who presented very professionally and very responsibly to the committee. Ultimately, they backed up exactly what Ms Pitcher said, that they really had not had any choice in this, that it was a directive from above, a directive from government via the minister, that they needed to raise these extra funds. Ms Pitcher went on to say:

It was certainly not a decision that presiding members had the power to agree or not agree...It is not a question of the boards deciding to lift the levy above CPI. They are the recipients of a government decision to take \$6.8 million indexed over the forwards.

So, there you have it. She continues:

In addition to that DEWNR intended to begin full cost recovery for corporate services of \$21,699 per full-time equivalent from all regions, commencing in 2016-17.

As I said, this is about to come back and bite us again. I can only imagine the reaction that might be had out in the regions on this, all for the want of a little bit of government support for natural resources management.

I have said in this place many times, and I continue to say: natural resources management is vitally important. Our producers right across the state, both land and sea food producers, rely on a healthy and productive environment. There are so many of us now on this planet, let alone in this

state, demanding much of our environment that we can no longer not plan and manage that environment: it is how best we do it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

#### **ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2016-17**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (12:46):** I move:

That the 90<sup>th</sup> report of the Economic and Finance Committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2016-17, be noted.

The Economic and Finance Committee has an annual statutory duty to inquire into, to consider and report on the Treasurer's determinations in relation to the emergency services levy. The committee has 21 days in which to report on the written determinations after it is referred to the committee. This year the committee received the Treasurer's statement on 20 May and, as required by the Emergency Services Funding Act, the statement included determinations in respect of:

- (a) the amount in the minister's opinion that needs to be raised by means of the levy to fund the emergency services;
- (b) the amounts to be expended for various kinds of emergency services; and
- (c) as far as practicable, the extent to which the various parts of the state will benefit from the application of that amount.

On 30 May, the Economic and Finance Committee held a public hearing and invited representatives from the Department of Treasury and Finance, SAFECOM, the Metropolitan Fire Service, the Country Fire Service and the State Emergency Services.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** Cast of thousands.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** There was a cast of thousands, and the witnesses provided the committee with details on the proposed levy for the 2016-17 year. I take the opportunity to thank the member for Colton for his excellent stewardship in my absence.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** Do I get higher duties?

**Mr ODENWALDER:** You do not get higher duties, but you get my moral support for the next 24 hours. So, on 7 June the committee tabled its report to meet the 21-day requirement. I take this opportunity to put on the record what a courageous job our volunteers and paid firefighters do, which the member for Colton again knows well—we are extremely grateful. The 2015 Pinery bushfire, which tore through Pinery and the surrounding areas with frightening speed and ferocity, was a recent reminder of the dangerous and selfless work that these firefighters undertake.

In light of that, the committee notes that the total expenditure on emergency services for the 2015-16 financial year is estimated to reach \$282.2 million, which is \$4 million more than was originally projected, largely due to costs incurred in the response to the 2015 Pinery bushfire. The committee notes that the total expenditure on emergency services is projected to be \$289.6 million in the 2016-17 financial year. This will be funded by the emergency services levy component of \$287.7 million, and other minor revenues to the fund. This target expenditure is \$7.3 million higher than the 2015-16 estimation. The committee was told that this reflects costs of retrofitting safety systems to fire trucks, replacing CFS fire trucks, enhancing South Australia's flood response and incident management capabilities for the SES, and increased training for CFS and SES volunteers.

The total funding target for the emergency services levy has been set at \$292.4 million in the 2016-17 financial year, which includes the projected expenditure on emergency services and \$2.8 million to the Community Emergency Services Fund to recover costs associated with the 2015 Pinery bushfire. The committee notes that there will be a decrease in the prescribed levy rate for owners of fixed property in the 2016-17 financial year and that the effective levy rate remains unchanged for eligible concession holders. The committee also notes that cash balances in the Community Emergency Services Fund are expected to be \$13.7 million by 30 June 2016.

The committee has fulfilled its obligations under the Emergency Services Funding Act. I take this opportunity to thank again the member for Colton for chairing the hearing, all the other current

members of the Economic and Finance Committee, and the departmental representatives and the chief officers of the MFS, CFS and SES who assisted the committee. I want to thank our staff—our outgoing executive officer, Kendall Crowe; our research officer, Gordon Elsey; and our current executive officer, Lisa Baxter—for all their assistance. Therefore, pursuant to section 6 of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Economic and Finance Committee recommends to parliament that it note this report.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:51):** Can I firstly in rising put on record my thanks to the CFS, MFS and SES, the police, community groups and anyone who had any involvement over the past three years, in the past three fire seasons, in the Barossa Valley, Lower Mid North and Adelaide Plains sections of our state. I have been a member of parliament now for just over two years and it is pretty sad that we have seen three very significant fires tackle different parts of my electorate.

We started off, before I was even elected, in early 2014 with the Eden Valley fires, but we also had the Rockleigh fire and the Krondorf fire. In fact, the Krondorf fire was a small fire, we think as a result of a lightning strike on the hillside at Krondorf, not long before the Eden Valley fires started. That was a bit of a wake-up call for everybody to get ready for the pending fire season. Post that, we saw days of grass fires tackling huge areas and affecting quite a number of properties, especially down the Jutland Road-Rhine Park Road end of Eden Valley.

We then move on to 2015, when we saw the Sampson Flat bushfire rage for many days and wreak havoc. I think about 30 or 40 houses were lost. Luckily enough, in that instance no loss of life occurred. It wreaked huge havoc on the southern part of my electorate and indeed threatened the homes of my uncle and my grandfather, who were able to tell me firsthand some of the experiences that I would be hearing from other members of my electorate. It was the good work of the agencies that helped to save both of their properties.

Then we move on to 25 November 2015, when catastrophic fire conditions turned into a fire that has since been found to have broken every single fire map model that has ever existed. Fires are not supposed to be able to move that quickly, but they did. The Pinery fire was really only the one afternoon from about lunchtime. It really hit my end of the electorate at about 3 o'clock in the afternoon and by about 8 o'clock the forward advance of the fire front had stopped.

Having now lived, especially as an MP, through these three major fire events, to see how the services have grown and improved the way that they operate is extremely commendable, especially in relation to communication, or attempted communication. When the mobile phone tower is shut down, I am not sure what it is we are supposed to do in terms of communication—I suppose rely on the Government Radio Network, but certainly that creates difficulties for members of the public. We really did see an improvement also in traffic management and access to people's properties.

I want to put on the record my thanks to the three services, especially, as well as the police and everyone else involved for the way they dealt with it. It certainly did provide better outcomes for people, even after we take into account the tragedy of the loss of the lives of two people and also the 80 to 90 houses that were lost. I also want to place on the record my thanks to Greg Crossman, Mr Nettleton and Mr Beattie from their respective services for their work.

On this side of the house, we realise that, when governments waste money—and I know this is a bugbear of mine—there is less to spend on front-line services. That means that, potentially, less money is spent on equipping our SES, CFS and MFS to do the work they do which is so valuable and which has genuinely saved houses and lives in my community. I found some of the things that came out at the hearing on the ESL a couple of weeks ago extremely frustrating.

The first thing that frustrates me is the fact that the government came out trying to tell us that the increase to the emergency services levy was only 1½ per cent this year. Technically, they are correct but, in actuality, they have taken the \$7½ million one-off Sampson Flat fire cost recovery from last year and, essentially, annualised it. Instead of taking off that \$7½ million to create the new baseline and work up from there, they basically absorbed that \$7½ million, which was supposed to be a one-off, turned it into the new baseline, then set the increase from there and asked for their \$2.8 million for the Pinery bushfire on top of that.

If there is a significant fire event in this state, the state government will charge people—and rightly so—for that fire the following year to recoup that money, but what South Australians do not realise and need to realise is that they will continue to pay for that fire every single year after that. You do not just pay it once. You pay for it in the first year after the fire event. Then you pay for it every single year after that and it is used as a new baseline from which fees will continue to go up and up. So, it is not a 1½ per cent increase: it is a 4 per cent increase, and South Australians should be very aware of that.

I think that if all that money went to front-line services, the people of South Australia would be happy with that. Indeed, I think that is what they think happens, but it does not. The money goes towards bureaucracy and those types of things and also towards failed reform processes which end up costing money which comes out of the ESL. The bill for this reform process continues to rise. In last year's hearing, we heard about the \$550,000 in staff. Earlier this year, we heard about a \$300,000 redundancy payment to the MFS chief, Grant Lupton, who was promptly replaced two weeks later. In this year's hearing, we hear that Mr Crossman was made permanent in September and I think it is a great appointment. Certainly, there is nothing wrong with that.

We also hear that the initial review by Ernst & Young comes and goes and is rejected. Because of this botched reform process, we have to have another report to review the review, costing \$120,000. Then, for the month of June last year, a reform unit sat there doing nothing. That office costs \$535,000 a year and sitting there for a month cost \$44,000 while the government had to decide what it wanted to continue to do in the area of emergency services reform.

Now, the 2021-25 strategy is going ahead. I hope that it actually achieves some results, although we understand that quantifying the savings of the virtually co-located agencies—well, we will wait and see what that says. Interestingly, when Mr Jackman was asked by Mr Speirs, 'So, it's safer to leave the staff there?'—and by 'there' he meant by keeping them in agencies—in trying to defend the bureaucracy, Mr Jackman's answer was:

I don't think you need to be that clever to work out that bodies inside government that are predominantly administrative by nature are under a lot more financial and fiscal examination than organisations where people wear a uniform and have high degrees of public visibility and are seen by the public as absolutely delivering what they want. I suspect the three gentlemen on my left in their uniforms are far safer than a black-suited bureaucrat.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00*

#### *Petitions*

### **PORT AUGUSTA WIND FARM**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart):** Presented a petition signed by 104 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to refuse DP Energy's proposed Port Augusta Wind Farm selected location to protect the natural beauty and resident's well-being. Furthermore we request that you support DP Energy in selecting a location that will improve the local economy without damaging the tourist industry and protect residents from health problems.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome today students from Adelaide TAFE, who are guests of the member for Adelaide, and students from Navigator College, Port Lincoln, who are guests of the member for Flinders.

*Ministerial Statement*

### **ASBESTOS CONTAINING MATERIALS**

**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) (14:00):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** SafeWork SA is undertaking an investigation into the importation of building products from China by an Adelaide-based company that provides infrastructure and facilities to the mining and construction sectors. It is understood that the product has been used for facilities at the company worksite and in the production of portable structures.

Workers and former workers have been informed of the situation and have been provided with counselling and health assessments. SafeWork SA has been on site to inform workers about asbestos health risks and about exposure. I am advised that there is no current immediate risk of exposure from the asbestos containing sheeting in portable buildings manufactured by the company. I repeat that: I am advised there is no current immediate risk of exposure from the portable buildings manufactured by the company.

However, SafeWork SA is working with the Environment Protection Agency, the relevant local council and the federal Department of Immigration and Border Protection. SafeWork SA has issued statutory notices to ensure that the company develops a removal strategy, reviews procedures regarding the import of materials, engages a competent person for the clean down of the work area and develops appropriate risk assessments.

The EPA has issued an environmental order in relation to the ACM on the site. The Australian Border Force is investigating whether there have been breaches of the Customs Act 1901. SafeWork SA's investigation team and Border Force will work collaboratively together where possible. This is the second instance of a South Australian company importing asbestos containing building products into the country. I have written to the federal Minister for Employment to alert her to this incident and to seek a commitment to increase monitoring—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —and enforcement of the ban on the importation of asbestos containing materials at the point of entry.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader and deputy leader are both called to order. The minister was given leave.

#### **NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE HOUSING**

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:03):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** Throughout 2015-16, negotiations have been underway between state governments and the commonwealth for a new National Partnership Agreement on Remote Housing. The South Australian government has now agreed to sign the new agreement, which will replace the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing (NPARIH) from 1 July 2016.

The capital funding and services delivered through these agreements are vital to improving quality of life for Aboriginal people in remote communities. Since the NPARIH commenced in 2009, 206 new homes have been constructed in remote Aboriginal communities in South Australia and 252 existing homes have been upgraded.

The capital works program serves two important purposes: firstly, to address housing shortages, restore the condition of dwellings and reduce overcrowding; and, secondly, to provide an opportunity for local residents to gain employment. Contractors will be required to provide an initial minimum 25 per cent of employment opportunities to local Aboriginal people, rising to 30 per cent in 2017-18. Employment targets will again be central to the new agreement. Over its two-year term, from 2016-18, \$26.8 million will be delivered to South Australia through the new agreement, with payments released based upon delivery of agreed milestones and targets.

The new agreement will deliver \$3.2 million less funding to South Australia than the former NPARIH, with the commonwealth government redirecting funds from all participating jurisdictions into their remote Work for the Dole program. This reduction in funding will place restrictions on remote housing service delivery and, unfortunately, indicates additional problems beyond the expiry of the agreement in 2018. This house should be aware that, without a meaningful and ongoing commonwealth government funding commitment, there will be a significant impact on South Australia's ability to deliver basic housing services to remote communities after the expiry of this agreement.

The gap between what it costs to deliver property and tenancy management services in remote Aboriginal communities and the income received through tenant rent has been estimated at \$8.9 million per annum from June 2018. In the absence of capital funding, maintenance costs are likely to escalate further as properties deteriorate with age, and all the gains that have been made since 2009, to reduce overcrowding and restore the condition of dwellings, may be lost.

The end of the agreement will also end funding for the Employment Related Accommodation program. This will limit our ability to provide affordable accommodation for Aboriginal people seeking to relocate to metro areas in order to access greater employment and education opportunities for themselves and their families. The state government will continue to negotiate essential long-term funding with the commonwealth in order to continue to provide remote communities with quality housing services.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:07):** I bring up the 25<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time*

**CHEMOTHERAPY TREATMENT ERROR**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Premier. Are the offers made to the victims of the chemotherapy dosing errors subject to negotiation or are they 'take it or leave it' ultimatums?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:08):** Of course they are offers made in good faith. As I understand it, these are matters for the relevant institution of government, which in this case is the South Australian government insurer, to conduct those negotiations with each of the individuals.

The proper limit of the involvement of ministers and of premiers is to ensure the policy environment is the correct one, and the correct policy environment is that these matters should be handled as the state acting as a model litigant. What that means is that the state should conduct itself not as an aggressive litigator, taking sharp legal points, or playing hardball, if you like, with a litigant but, rather, conducting themselves properly having regard to protecting, obviously, the state's interests. The state obviously doesn't want to waste taxpayers' money—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —but it also needs to accept its responsibilities. Sorry, does somebody over there think they know the answer?

**Ms Chapman:** We would like an answer.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the deputy leader. The member for Hartley was the cause of all the trouble and I call him to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. So, of course, it then becomes a matter for the individual agency to conduct itself in a negotiation, a proper and respectful negotiation. There have been no 'take it or leave it' offers made. There has been simply a substantial offer, as I understand it, made to each of the litigants in this matter, and it is a matter for them to take their legal



advice. I think we have assisted them in their legal advice by offering to pay for that legal advice. It is—

**An honourable member:** When did you offer?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Right from the start, in fact. Given that the member interjects, it is worthwhile clarifying something that was erroneously put against us on the public record, that we had made a suggestion that these people should 'lawyer up' and that that was somehow an aggressive stance taken by the government. In fact, that is entirely appropriate, that we advise people to obtain legal advice. If you consider the alternative, that we make propositions or offers in the absence of that, then people wouldn't have the proper advice to assess whether or not these were matters that should be accepted by them.

So, we made a proper suggestion that people obtain legal advice. It was always our intention to pay for that legal advice. That would be part of the settlement that would be reached in relation to this matter, and that is certainly the approach we have taken. I think what also needs to be said about these matters is that each case needs to be considered on its own merits. While they arise out of similar factual circumstances in terms of liability, the effect this may have on each individual is a matter for each individual to assess. Their loss may be different. They should take proper legal advice about that. That's a matter that is now being addressed through the proper processes.

Our intervention, the minister's and my intervention, was simply to say, when we heard the complaints about delay, that an offer should be made urgently because we were talking about people who were facing life-threatening conditions. They shouldn't be dealing with the burden of worrying about whether they were running out of time—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —and addressing these legal questions. That now has happened, and I think—

**An honourable member:** It took too long.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —it is important now that those matters be brought to a close as soon as possible.

**The SPEAKER:** For repeated breaches of standing orders 131 and 142, I call to order the members for Schubert, Morialta and Hammond, and I warn for the first time the leader and the members for Schubert, Hammond and Hartley.

#### INDUSTRY PARTICIPATION POLICY

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:12):** My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Can the minister advise the house if it is true that hundreds of millions of dollars in government work are heading to interstate companies?

**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) (14:12):** I thank the member for Torrens for the opportunity to clarify the facts because there was a claim made by the opposition, and reported in the newspaper last week, that over \$421 million in government work had been sent to companies outside of South Australia since January 2015. The claim misleads and shows a complete lack of understanding of how the state's Industry Participation Policy works.

The state government established the role of the Industry Participation Advocate in February 2013 to provide the government with independent advice on maximising the economic benefit to the state from government expenditure. The Industry Participation Advocate has provided more than 40 recommendations, all of which have been approved by the state government. One of those recommendations was to stop measuring economic benefit to the state by the location of the business or its registered office. Instead, we measure those things that matter, and that is the jobs or the labour associated with the contract, the capital being spent in this state, the supply inputs and where they are being sourced.

We have seen a significant improvement since the Industry Participation Policy was established. From the state's estimated \$4 billion of expenditure on goods and services, the value of contracts let to locally based suppliers which employ South Australians has risen to 90.2 per cent from just 51 per cent in 2012-13—an extraordinary increase, almost a doubling. This is in addition to major projects awarded under the revised Industry Participation Policy, which has shown extremely strong results, with over 90 per cent of subcontracts awarded to contractors where the majority of the dollars spent is here at home in South Australia. This state now has the most sophisticated yet simple appraisal of economic contribution of any comparable jurisdiction. The primary focus is to procure from locally based suppliers and suppliers whose source inputs locally.

The South Australian Industry Participation weighting system balances the economic benefit to the state as part of an holistic value for money assessment. This point seems to have been lost, with contract examples provided to *The Advertiser* which claimed that \$421 million has been sent to companies outside our borders. This needs checking. A standout of how misleading this information can be was the inclusion of the across-government contract for supply fuels and lubricants, card fuels—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: standing order 98 specifically requires that a minister reply to the substance of a question and not debate, which the minister is now beginning to do.

**The SPEAKER:** No, the minister is entirely germane. Proceed.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** That's exactly what I am doing. Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am referring to card fuels or the supply of fuels and lubricants to state government agencies, which has a contract value of \$123.9 million. The three-year contract covers fuel card purchases at Shell, Liberty, Caltex and BP, including On The Run. This means government fuel card access to hundreds of fuel sites across the state.

With the fuel card you obviously don't fill up your car at the head office, which might be in Melbourne or Sydney. It shows how completely irrelevant it is where the registered office of the company is considered to be the billing address. In this case, the focus should have been on the hundreds of service station businesses across the state, the hundreds of staff that are employed in the supply chain, truck drivers, etc.

I am advised that 94 per cent of the spend under this contract is at SA-based petrol stations; only 6 per cent elsewhere related to emergency services. This is a perfect example of why the state government moved away from relying on the location of businesses to measure economic impact. We deal in facts; others prefer to trade in misinformation. I offer the opposition spokesperson a briefing with the industry advocate. If you want to know how government works and how these matters are dealt with, ask for a briefing and you will get it, but don't go out with misinformation and upset people with false info.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the members for Davenport and Chaffey, and I warn the member for Hartley for the second and the final time. The leader.

#### CHEMOTHERAPY TREATMENT ERROR

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier provide some clarity on his comments that the victims of the chemotherapy dosing error were always going to have their legal costs paid for by the government, given that the government insurers made no offers to victims to cover their legal costs when providing advice in April this year? When was this offer for legal compensation made, and can the Premier provide any hard evidence of this offer to cover the legal costs?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:17):** That's my advice, and I will bring back some further details for the house from the people that provided me that advice.

**Mr Gardner:** Oh, dear!

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is warned. The member for Little Para.

**LOCAL INVESTMENT**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:17):** My question is to the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Planning. Minister, how has the government encouraged investment in the City of Adelaide?

**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) (14:18):** Am I called?

**The SPEAKER:** We look forward to another drear answer.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and can I thank the honourable member for his question. The City of Adelaide is one of this government's success stories. In fact, so much so—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier's provocative silence is leading to disorder.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It appears to be, yes. In any event, so much so, indeed, that the Prime Minister, no less a person than the present Prime Minister, in his recent visit to Adelaide, recognised Adelaide's success when he said, and I quote:

South Australia already has enormous competitive advantages, including world-class universities, a substantial industry base...an abundance of mineral and energy resources, rich agricultural lands and some of the finest food and wine in the world...

And significantly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** And this is the bit I think they don't want to hear because it comes from the Prime Minister. He goes on to say, and this is a direct quote:

...a capital city bursting with vibrancy and relative to many other Australian cities, more affordable housing.

Of course, good planning has an important role to play in unlocking these opportunities and shaping how Adelaide grows, but when good planning comes together with a range of strategic initiatives, that's when real change happens. That's when it really happens.

This city is one of the best examples of how policy, legislation, public investment and place-making have worked together to see significant improvement. Key levers that have been pulled together to unlock the city have included, in no particular order because they are all good: rezoning of the City of Adelaide to provide new investment opportunities—

**The SPEAKER:** I presume we have moved on from the prime ministerial quote?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, we have moved on from the Prime Minister, although these are things he wanted to say had he been given long enough. In fact, let's just treat it as if he's saying this. Rezoning of the City of Adelaide—self-praise is no recommendation after all—to provide new investment opportunities, and we are seeing that mushrooming around us all over the city; the introduction of the small venue licence, which, as you would recall, met with some opposition at the time, in April 2013, which has seen 68 new businesses opening, equating to over \$65 million in capital investment and over 800 new jobs; encouraging private and public sector investment in the Riverbank Precinct, such as the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Adelaide Oval, the Convention Centre, the SAHMRI Institute, the forthcoming development here on the plaza, and so on. The list goes on.

The policies were supported by the introduction of a pre-lodgement and design review process for development in the city for any project valued at over \$10 million to be assessed by the Development Assessment Commission. This process is a true collaboration to achieve the best planning and design outcomes for projects in the city and to provide progressive certainty to proponents. Design panels are a critical part of the process and are led by the Government Architect, but, alas, I may not be able to speak much more about them until next time.

**The SPEAKER:** No, you won't, that's right. Your time has expired. I call to order the members for Stuart, Unley, Adelaide and Newland.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** Thank you, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** It's my pleasure. I warn the member for Adelaide for the first time and I warn for the second and final time the members for Schubert, Morialta, Adelaide, the deputy leader and the member for Hammond.

### BREASTSCREEN SA

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** My question is to the Premier. Now that the government has had 24 hours to check, can the Premier advise us how many victims from the BreastScreen SA errors are still waiting for compensation, how many settlements have been made to date, and will victims receive offers of compensation or will they be required to lawyer up?

*The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:23):** I have received advice from SAICORP. I am not going to go into numbers, but I can say that all those who have made claims, essentially all those who have made claims, have been made an offer of compensation where that's been possible.

**Mr Marshall:** When?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader and the deputy leader are both on two warnings.

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** No. The member for Morialta is uncharacteristically right. The member for Napier.

### CLIPSAL 500

**Mr GEE (Napier) (14:23):** My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What were the economic benefits of the 2016 Clipsal 500?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:24):** They hate good news over that side, sir. I thank the member for Napier for the question and acknowledge the time that he spent working out at Holden. Of course, this year's winner of the Clipsal 500, Nick Percat, is a third-generation Holden worker as well, so great to see him out there triumphing on the Sunday of the big race.

The economic figures have just come in for the Clipsal 500 this year. It's tremendous to see a record figure of \$65.6 million of economic benefit into the South Australian visitor economy. We must remember that that money trickles through the taxis, through the hotels and through our retail shops and restaurants, and it's very important in terms of creating jobs and sustaining jobs.

In this year's state budget, we put an extra \$35 million in to make sure that we really market South Australia, we get more events to South Australia and we tell the story about the events that we already have. This is the best economic impact that we have ever had. This year, we brought the race in under the Tourism Commission, and we actually had the people who run the biggest bike race outside of Europe running the biggest domestic car race in Australia.

We were out there selling the race for the very first time to a New Zealand market because, of course, we have New Zealand drivers who compete in the V8 Supercars, so we had those over. We saw the numbers up there. We had Air New Zealand putting on bigger planes to make sure that they could get people over, and we want to continue to grow on that.

We think that, while the race is being promoted around Australia, there are some very good ties that we can have not only in New Zealand but in South-East Asia as well. We had people down from Malaysia and Singapore at the event. We had people from tourism companies from around South-East Asia and New Zealand as well, so we really want to grow on that. The \$65.6 million is up almost \$5 million on the previous year, but we want to see that grow even further.

We had 13,500 visitors come for the three or four days of the race and, of course, it fills nearly every hotel room in Adelaide. We talked to Ian Horne at the AHA and, even with the four new hotels that have come on board with the extra 660 rooms in the past couple of years, the rooms are still being filled, which is tremendous news. Of course, we have six new hotels on the drawing board. They will come online between now and 2018.

I was at a function last night that Airbnb held, talking to some of those people who host visitors to South Australia in their homes. Many of them had visitors stay with them during the Clipsal 500. What we are asking them to do is really upsell and onsell the state so that, if they have people coming from interstate or overseas, they make sure they are across the great attributes of the state, make sure they can tell the story that we have 7 per cent of Australia's population but 80 per cent of Australia's premium wine, and make sure those people get out into our wonderful wine regions that surround our beautiful city.

We want them to onsell the state, to tell people that, if they take a 30-minute flight, they will be in Port Lincoln, which is one of only two or three places in the world where you can get in a cage and come face to face with a great white shark. I think the Airbnb people are here to stay. South Australians are embracing it not only when they travel but when we welcome people to South Australia.

We have 1,000 people in Adelaide who are hosting visitors in their homes. We have 3,000 right throughout South Australia, so it's good to see them setting up in the regional areas as well and really giving people a very, very warm South Australian welcome and giving them an experience not just of staying somewhere but living somewhere as beautiful as South Australia.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:28):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Minister, will you accept the advice of Belinda Valentine, the grandmother of Chloe Valentine, and initiate an immediate investigation into the interaction of Families SA with the victims of the Hillier tragedy?

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

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

**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) (14:28):** It is unfortunate, I think, that the temptation of drawing attention to oneself off the back of what is an unspeakable tragedy is preventing people from accepting the reasonable request that people just allow circumstances to pan out, as has been requested by the Commissioner of Police, in their own time. But if it is of any assistance to the member for Adelaide and others, and will enable them to just calm down and allow things to unfold, I can advise the parliament that I spoke personally on Wednesday 1 June, in the afternoon, with Commissioner Nyland. I informed her that we had available to her for her consideration any and all documents held by Families SA pertinent to this particular matter—

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** As best I can recall, yesterday was not 1 June.

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

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** So far as I am concerned, given that we have an independent royal commissioner looking into matters similar to this, and given the fact that as of last week materials relevant to this had been made available to her, it is a matter for her exactly how she decides to deal with those matters. I am confident that she can make those decisions without the unsolicited advice of various commentators who pop up pretty much every day since. I think it is also undoubtedly the case that the internal procedures in relation to the addressing of matters within the department, within Families, will of course take place in their ordinary course, and they would—

**Dr McFetridge:** Why didn't you say that yesterday?

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

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I would ask people finally to stop not treating this tragedy with the respect it deserves, to accept that the police have a job to do—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —the police have a job to do—

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned for the second and final time and the member for Finniss is called to order.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —and I think we can say that the commissioner is well placed to do whatever she chooses to do, safe in the knowledge that she has access to all relevant material and the powers to do whatever she wants with it.

#### **NORTHERN CONNECTOR**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house how local South Australian companies will benefit from the recently awarded Northern Connector contract?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:32):** Can I thank the member for Little Para for his question. Can I also thank him for his efforts in leading the Northern Connector Jobs Taskforce. He is working hard to ensure employment opportunities flowing from this project are being maximised for people in the northern suburbs, particularly, I should say, given the establishment of what is called the NorthHub, which the member for Little Para and I had the pleasure of announcing last week, along with the announcement of the successful tenderer for the delivery of the Northern Connector project, Lendlease.

Members might remember—and certainly the member for Mawson, the Minister for Tourism, would remember—that Lendlease was the company which delivered the duplication of the Southern Expressway between 2010 and 2014. At that time, they put a tremendous amount of effort into ensuring that workers from the southern suburbs for that project were engaged on that project, and that is certainly the approach that they are taking with the Northern Connector, making sure the people in the northern suburbs are getting every opportunity that their—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I enjoy the member for Chaffey's interjections, Mr Speaker, like the subtly annoying and irrelevant spoken word contributions at the beginning of so many tracks of the *Dark Side of the Moon* album.

In order to maximise the local content and employment of the major works contract, Lendlease has subcontracted several civil construction packages to South Australian companies that specialise in civil infrastructure projects. The SEM Group, or some people old enough would remember that they used to be called the Salisbury earthmovers company, located in Salisbury Plains, will undertake approximately one kilometre of the works, which entails the Port Wakefield Road-Bolivar Road intersection upgrade. It is expected that the works that the SEM Group will undertake will support approximately 40 jobs on average for the duration of this section of the project, with approximately 85 per cent of their workforce living in the northern suburbs.

Another local company, Civil & Allied Technical Construction Pty Ltd, based in Angle Park, will undertake approximately 4.7 kilometres of works, including the Bolivar interchange. These works

are expected to support approximately 70 jobs on average throughout the duration of the project, with 80 per cent of their workforce living in the northern suburbs.

Well-known South Australian company, McMahon Services based in Dry Creek, will also undertake 2.4 kilometres of works, including the northern interchange and the Port River Expressway Bridge demolition, which will support approximately 70 jobs on average throughout the duration of the project. Fifty per cent of McMahon's workforce working on this section of the Northern Connector project again live in the northern suburbs. Another company, this time based in Roseworthy, LR&M Constructions, will undertake about 2.3 kilometres of works, including the Waterloo Corner Road intersection. This work will support approximately 65 jobs on average for the duration of the project, with about 90 per cent of their workforce again living in the northern suburbs.

These local South Australian companies will work with Lendlease and the NorthHub in order to ensure northern jobseekers, particularly displaced automotive workers, are given the best chance to gain employment. We have worked incredibly hard, not just with Lendlease but also with the Industry Participation Advocate, to maximise the employment opportunities for people in the northern suburbs on the Northern Connector project. That is why both the Premier and I worked so hard with the former prime minister and the former assistant minister in the Coalition government to secure funding for this Northern Connector project. I am glad we did it, despite the intentions of the deputy leader, without a toll on the Northern Connector project.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is warned and so is the member for Stuart. The deputy leader.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36):** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Why has the government referred the Hillier deaths and a review of the government's involvement in it to the Margaret Nyland royal commission, when yesterday he told the parliament it would be inappropriate for anyone to review and investigate this matter while the police investigation was continuing?

**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) (14:37):** I don't think I said that yesterday. What I was saying yesterday was that the unhelpful public utterances from various people, in particular members of the opposition, about what may or may not have taken place in this tragic circumstance were not of any value and were not in the public interest and, in the public interest, people should keep their powder dry until they had found out exactly what was going on.

**Ms Chapman:** Tell us the answers.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Excuse me.

**Ms Chapman:** Give us some answers.

**The SPEAKER:** I am satiated with the deputy leader's interjections. They will cease or she will be leaving us.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I had a fairly shrill request to provide the answers just then, and I can say that if I was in possession of a TARDIS, I would get into it, proceed forward about eight months or something and find out what the police brief says at the time of presumably a charge, but we will all have to wait for that. But in the meantime we have a royal commission going on.

The royal commission has been going on for quite a while and the royal commission has been looking at issues surrounding child safety, issues surrounding the performance of the staff at Families SA, issues about the structures, the management, the policies and pretty much everything that is going on in Families SA. So it seemed to me, without making any fuss and without having a *Kath & Kim* 'Look at me' moment, I would quietly pick up the telephone, have a word to the commissioner and say, 'Commissioner, we have information here about another matter which we

think may or may not be of interest to you. It's up to you, but we would like you to have access to this stuff,' and it has been provided to her.

What she does with that is a matter for her. That's entirely a matter for her, but in so doing the government has not been running around drawing attention to itself. In fact, I didn't think it was necessary for me to immediately burst into the media and make the announcement that I had had a chat with Margaret on the phone. I didn't think that was necessary. We are letting the police get on with what they are doing and, inasmuch as there are records held by Families SA which might be of relevance to the royal commission, the royal commission now has access to those materials.

The idea that we should be getting yet another body or another person involved in some sort of investigation of this matter when we have the police doing their job—and I quoted yesterday from the police commissioner being asked that they please be allowed to get on with their job without people guessing or second-guessing what the situation is in this case; let the police do their job—and when we have a royal commission which is looking into issues surrounding this particular part of government's function—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is on two warnings.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** This royal commission now has access to all the relevant material. They didn't have to ask us: we offered it to them. Let them just get on with what they are doing. I don't think anybody could reasonably say a matter being in the hands simultaneously of an investigation by SAPOL and an ongoing investigation by a royal commission is an inadequate reaction or response.

#### REGIONAL SUMMIT

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:40):** My question is directed to the Minister for Higher Education and Skills. Minister, can you inform the house about your recent attendance at the 2016 Regional Summit?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:41):** I thank the member for her question. I was delighted to attend the Regional Summit, held in Mount Gambier last Friday, alongside the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, who is in the other place, of course, and most particularly the Minister for Regional Development, who was the inspiration for having the summit happen at all and happen so well.

It was sponsored by the three universities that we have in South Australia—three excellent world-class universities—and they each provided a presenter for the day. While they were of course very interesting and very useful, what was particularly heartening to me was to listen to the presentations made by small business people from regional South Australia talking to other people from regional South Australia about the challenges, the opportunities and the highs and lows of creating not only wealth and income for themselves but employment for others.

It was in fact, in some ways, a tour of some of my favourite products. I enjoyed very much hearing from the people who make these extraordinarily high-quality South Australian products. For example, Kangaroo Island Spirits run by Jon and Sarah Lark produces incredibly high quality liqueurs, gins and spirits.

**Mr Pengilly:** Rocket fuel.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Much nicer than rocket fuel—I am sorry to hear the local member imply that. They are extraordinarily high quality, winning international medals and international competitions and started just by a couple who felt that they had the enterprise and the capacity to do that. They are now employing others and becoming larger and larger. Hood's Earth Produce is a company that sells free-range eggs. It is a brilliant company, finding a niche that is an increasingly large niche.

McLaren Vale Wines is another good one to hear from, as is Fleurieu Milk. It is a particularly useful time for us to hear from a small milk producer able to create a niche market. There was even a man called Ben Hood, who has written a series of books about George the farmer, which are about



trying to get young kids to understand where their produce comes from and also to be interested themselves in engaging in primary production.

This Regional Summit had the academic settings for innovation, for collaboration, but it also had some down-to-earth real-life stories. It was, as I say, supported by the universities, organised by Brand SA, and several ministers attended in order to give it support, as did members of local government. It was the sort of thing that we ought to see in regions. It is the sort of thing that regions have come to expect—that people from Adelaide and across South Australia will be supportive of each other. It is through that kind of collaboration and through that pulling together that we will make it through these difficult times and continue to grow and prosper.

#### **CARTLEDGE, MR A.**

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:44):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney remove Aaron Cartledge from all government boards, including the Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board? In May, Aaron Cartledge of the CFMEU was convicted of making threats against management at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital site. Under the terms of the Construction Industry Long Service Leave Act, a board member may be removed if he is found to be guilty of neglect of duty or dishonourable conduct.

**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) (14:44):** I thank the honourable member for his question. As he raises an important matter, I am not aware as to what the present state of that matter is. For example, assuming his facts to be correct—and I know he does google quite a lot of things, so it is possible he is correct—this may or may not be a matter which is the subject of ongoing proceedings in the court. It might be that there is an appeal; I don't know. I will make the appropriate investigations and get back to the member for Schubert.

#### **GRANTS SA**

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:45):** My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Volunteers. Minister, how will the government's recent changes to grant applications assist community organisations?

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:45):** I thank the member for her question and note her great advocacy for local community groups in her electorate. I am pleased to advise the house with additional information regarding Grants SA. I launched it last week, and it brings together a number of one-off grant programs and targets four priority areas, which are disadvantaged individuals and communities, culturally and linguistically diverse groups and communities, young people experiencing disadvantage, and volunteers.

Over the past couple of years in my role as Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, many of our community and multicultural groups have raised concerns with me with regard to where to apply for grants, what kind of grants are available and, to support the project, when the next round of grants will be opening. The complexity of finding as well as applying for grants is also a common concern raised with many members of this house. That is why I am pleased that, from the beginning of this month, the application process for community one-off grants will be improved by having a one-stop shop and a single application process through Grants SA.

A total of \$3 million in one-off grants will be distributed to not-for-profit community organisations annually through Grants SA. This funding includes money pooled together from the Charitable and Social Welfare Fund, Multicultural SA, Celebrating Diversity one-off grants, volunteer training grants and the Volunteer Support Fund. The application process is now much more simple for community and multicultural groups as they will not need to seek out when a round is open or which area of the department they need to go to, as they have all been rolled into one simple application process from a single portal: Grants SA.

Minor grants of up to \$5,000 will be open all year round and assessed at the end of each month, with rounds for larger grants happening less frequently. Grants SA assessment panels have been established, comprising representatives from the department, members from the Charitable and Social Welfare Fund Assessor Panel, and the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. I encourage all members of this house to communicate with their local communities about these improvements.

In recent visits to our regional areas, I have been approached by several groups. What I can now say is that every month you can apply for the minor round, which is up to \$5,000. When I was in Murray Bridge talking to the Filipino community, they talked to me about some of the social isolation that their community members experience. They would like to have a grant to enable that community to come together. They will be able to apply for that minor round.

When I was in Port Lincoln last week, it was great to see the member for Flinders, and I experienced the fantastic social enterprise by the youth there, called Youthoria. They run the cinema, and with the money they collect from tickets and popcorn sales they fund their own social enterprise there. They employ people and give young people the opportunity for work experience. What they talked to me about are some other ideas they've got, and these rounds will enable them to apply, whether it be a minor, medium or major round, to establish that social enterprise. Of course, we all know that on Sunday—the very cold, wet day it was—I was in Nuriootpa, and it means that people like—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** Nuriootpa.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** I'm sorry—elocution next time! I also visited Lyndoch and Angaston; but the Barossa Bushgardens can apply for this round because they are doing a great job encouraging volunteers to plant native plants that we give back to the Pinery fire-affected victims.

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader.

#### FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:50):** My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Did the minister read the development agreement with the Walker Corporation regarding the plaza development before he signed it and, if so, can he inform the house of what variations there were in the key commercial terms to those announced by the Premier on 13 March 2015?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:50):** This is nearly identical to the question that the deputy leader asked yesterday when she was seeking some information about the agreements which the government has entered into—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned. The deputy leader is still on two warnings.

**The Hon. J.M. Rankine:** That's the third time you've told her, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Wright appears to be committing contempt in the face of the parliament, for which I call her to order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I was saying, yesterday the deputy leader asked nearly an identical question. She has made it clear that she would like a briefing on the development agreement. She has also made it clear—

**An honourable member:** Who's 'she'?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The deputy leader; were you not listening?

**The SPEAKER:** We are allowed to use pronouns in the parliament.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, 'you' do a good job.

**An honourable member:** What is that?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I was just trying to work in a pronoun.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am no 'pronouner', alright? As I said yesterday, the deputy leader has sought a briefing on this. She has also made it clear she would like a briefing before we debate the ASER bill, which has been introduced into the parliament. We have acceded to both of those requests, and she will have all the information that she seeks.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I heard the question.

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader will depart under the standing orders for the next 15 minutes for repeatedly defying the Chair's authority.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR FOREST PRODUCTS INNOVATION

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Following the federal government's announcement that it will establish the national institute for forest products innovation with a hub to be located in Mount Gambier, can the minister explain why he has refused to commit state government funding to this scheme?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:53):** I thank the member for the question. The simple answer is that we weren't asked beforehand, and that's a really sort of polite way to go about business—whether it's politics or anything you do in life. If you want to go halves with someone in a gift for a friend, you don't turn up to them with a \$2 million bill without actually discussing what it is that you want to buy.

I was in Mount Gambier last week, and Tony Pasin, who is the federal member down there (who people are saying makes Patrick Secker look like a very hard worker), was doing what he does best: a publicity stunt. When I was down there last year, he wouldn't meet with me at all but he walked around with 130 balloons—he walked around with 130 balloons!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Excuse me, but I don't want the member for Chaffey coming to Tony Pasin's defence because I know what you say about him behind his back.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Bedad, a point of order from the member for Morialta!

**Mr GARDNER:** It is 127—that it is a clear personal reflection on a member of this house. The idea that anyone would be talking behind people's backs—

**The SPEAKER:** Not of the kind the standing orders prohibit. Minister.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Mr Pasin held a press conference last week in the South-East while I was down there with four ministers from this government, including the regional development minister, the Minister for Education, and the minister for advanced manufacturing. We were all down there having a very good forum with people from throughout regional South Australia. It was a summit organised by the Minister for Regional Development—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, the local member was invited. The local member and I had a meeting down there with some dairy farmers as well, and it was great to have the member for Mount Gambier along there. The member for Mount Gambier is very good at working with other sides

in politics and with different levels of politics, and I want to congratulate the member for Mount Gambier for the way he goes about that—I reckon your mate Tony Pasin could probably learn a little bit from how you go about your business.

If they sat down with us and said, 'Look, we've got this pot of money and we would love you to put in \$2 million dollars,' we would have a look at it. We love the idea of the hub. We spend \$500,000 a year in the South-East on forestry research, so we have been backing that end with our dollars for a long time now. We like the idea of research, we like the idea of the hub, but we are in a budget process of our own, and when all your money is committed to different things, you cannot have someone just coming out and standing in the middle of, I think it was at Glencoe, my old home town, I think he was down there near the nursery doing a press conference (I didn't get an invite to it).

It would have been polite if, a few weeks ago, he or my good friend Senator Anne Ruston—and we get on very well, Anne does a good job—if someone had just picked up the phone and said, 'Look, we want to put \$2 million in. Have you got \$2 million?' We don't think we have, but maybe we could have reprioritised something. Now we don't have \$2 million—

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —because we have put all the money that we want to put into the areas into the areas. We did not know this opportunity was out there. So, member for Mount Gambier, the reason we do not is because we were not asked. We were told about it at a press conference in a publicity stunt by the guy who has gone down in history as the greatest Poindexter in Australian politics.

#### ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE BLIND

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Disabilities. How are disability services expanding in the southern suburbs?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:57):** I thank the honourable member for her question; I know she is a passionate advocate for community facilities in the south. I had the pleasure of joining the member for Reynell last Wednesday, in fact, when we opened the Royal Society for the Blind's new southern office at Noarlunga Downs. It is also located between the electorates of the members for Kaurana and Mawson, right on the boundary.

As members would be aware, the Royal Society for the Blind—also known as the RSB—provides invaluable resources for many South Australians who are either blind or have a vision impairment, and that is very many South Australians indeed. In 2015-16 the South Australian government will provide \$2.9 million to RSB for specialist disability services.

We know that there has been significant population growth in the southern suburbs over many years, and more South Australians are moving to this delightful part of Adelaide. This has led to an increasing demand for disability services, which the RSB is moving to address with community services such as we launched last week. The RSB's new purpose-built offices in the southern suburbs were made possible by a very generous bequest by the late Mr Leo Schleim, a migrant to this country who made a remarkable contribution as a small business person and as a passionate advocate for people in this space.

RSB provides many different things in the southern suburbs, and I was very pleased to see new provision of accessible services to South Australians in this sector. I had the pleasure of being given a tour of the new facility by Robert Depold, the assistant executive director, and Travis Little, who is the Southern RSB Coordinator. It was great to see the RSB embracing new technologies, and assistive technologies are making profound differences in South Australian's lives as we move forward. Devices that were available at the new office included smart phone accessories to help users read text, and new braille technologies that are emerging to improve people's access to computers and reading. I am also advised that in the near future there will hopefully be the start of technologies that provide tablets, as a major form of braille functionality, to be built into machines.

It is clear from the almost 100 guests at the launch that this is a very important site in the southern suburbs and that it will be of great value to them and people living in the south. I would like to thank personally the RSB southern office team, who made me feel so welcome last week. I am sure that their passionate volunteers will continue to expand services in the south.

### HOMELESSNESS

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. Besides the government's road map for homelessness, does the government have a long-term strategic plan to deal with homelessness and housing? If so, when was this written and is it publicly available? Figures revealed today by the Hutt St Centre show a record of 178 new clients in the past two months, a 44 per cent increase on the same time as last year, while the Anglicare CE states that 50 people are sleeping rough in the city and the Parklands, double that of last month.

**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) (15:00):** I thank the member for Adelaide for her question. In South Australia, we spend about \$58 million a year—that is, both commonwealth and state money—in regard to homelessness. The vast majority is around specialist homelessness services, of which we have about 400 beds in the city.

One of the things that we have going forward is that we know that the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness only continues to the end of June 2017. I have been very concerned about this because this is matched funding between the feds and the state. So, when I attended the commonwealth state and territory Housing and Homelessness Ministers Meeting in March, I took a paper to that meeting to raise our concerns. One of the key issues, when we were leading up to the cessation of that national partnership previously, was discussed at the round tables I held with the homelessness sector.

Their concern is this short-term funding that we have going ahead and how that is going to impact us because people can only get one-year or two-year contracts, and it's very difficult for them to deliver their services. An agreement was reached at that national meeting to commission a report on future policy reforms and future options for homelessness beyond June 2017. Most importantly, what I have really sought is stability for this industry. I think we share a common interest in supporting people who find themselves experiencing homelessness and how we as a state and as a nation support people when they are most vulnerable.

What I am seeking, as the Minister for Social Housing in South Australia, is a five-year agreement, an agreement that is indexed to support people who find themselves in this situation. We have a sleeping rough report that we have had for more than six years in Adelaide; it's a rough sleep account. This enables us to look at the people who are using our services in the CBD. We have seen fluctuations. We know it was a high of about 107 when we started the count. We know that when winter approaches and it is wet and cold we have increases in numbers.

I will continue to work with homelessness sector not only about this future funding, but also how we can prevent homelessness, how we can support people who are at risk of homelessness to keep the homes that they are in. I have talked about this many times since I have been the minister, and I will continue to look at the continuum of housing in this state.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland.

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

### HEALTH INDUSTRY INVESTMENT

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:04):** Sorry, sir, I was being distracted by the member for Reynell.

**The SPEAKER:** I call her to order—

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Thank you, sir. She's been doing it all day actually.

**The SPEAKER:** —because I do welcome dibber-dobbing in the chamber.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Thank you, sir, very good. My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister update the house about recent events that have promoted Adelaide as a destination for investment and health industries?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:04):** I thank the member for Newland for his very important question. I know he is very interested and excited about what is happening in Adelaide BioMed City, as it has come to be known, and the enormous opportunities from this development.

Last Friday, I was able to talk with representatives from industry, education and research at the Adelaide BioMed City showcase event breakfast held to promote our health and biomedical precinct, which is positioning Adelaide as a destination of choice for life sciences investment. With the global economy and our local economy both changing rapidly, the South Australian government has an economic diversification strategy. Through it, we identify the innovative, high growth, knowledge-intensive industries of the future and help develop them in our state.

One of our highest priorities is health industries, which are defined by cutting-edge innovation and growing demand for access to health care. We have shown our dedication to health industries through the \$3.6 billion investment in Adelaide BioMed City on Adelaide's Riverbank. It is one of the largest health and biomedical research precincts in the world. At its completion, it will cover the entire area from the new Royal Adelaide Hospital in the west to the Convention Centre in the east and will include SAHMRI and three universities.

It encompasses the entire pipeline from education to clinical research to patient therapy, translation and commercialisation. We are seeing more and more investment and strategic focus in the advancement of health research and practice. A lot of this is because of Adelaide BioMed City, which is elevating Adelaide to the exclusive club of cities that attract these investments. Since its formation, Health Industries South Australia has been using the precinct and our state's many unique and attractive features to target investment, continuing to build the pharmaceutical and life sciences sectors here in South Australia.

Health Industries is a single point of contact for health and life sciences companies investing in Adelaide. It has already attracted four companies, including a \$21 million investment from Pfizer. These investments are creating high-value jobs and they are making an increasing contribution to the state's economy. Some of these companies have links to automotive and defence sectors and are using the well-developed skills and supply chains in those areas to excel in the manufacture of medical devices and technologies.

By providing direct access to high-level decision-makers and actively case managing investment propositions, the state government embraces the role it has to play in strengthening the bonds between industry, investors and research. Adelaide BioMed City is also a product of those partnerships between different levels of government, industry, education and the scientific research community. We have a health and biomedical cluster that will help to increase the quality of our scientific research and teaching, patient therapy, translation and commercialisation, and continue to drive investment in health industries.

I would like to congratulate the Adelaide Convention Bureau and SAHMRI on the work they did to promote our precinct by bringing together researchers and industry and education professionals, many of whom were from interstate or overseas.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Adelaide. I'm sorry, I'm distracted by the Leader of the Opposition.

### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:08):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. What is the current status of the Families SA staff recruitment campaign, which commenced in March 2015 in line with recommendation 22.16 of the Chloe Valentine inquest, to allocate dedicated workers to ensure the continuity of care and management of children at risk?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:08):** Ongoing.

*Grievance Debate*

### **YORKEYS CROSSING**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:08):** I rise to speak about Yorkeys Crossing again, as I have done many times in this house. I have written many letters to a succession of transport ministers about this very important piece of infrastructure which goes around the outside of the regional centre of Port Augusta. It is a dirt road, and it is used as a bypass when the main road through town is unavailable for one reason or another. That happens very regularly. In fact, on 24 May, we had a three-car accident on the bridge over the gulf, the Joy Baluch AM Bridge, which put the entire National Highway 1 through the centre of Port Augusta out of action.

Mr Speaker, National Highway 1, as you would know, is our national road that services heavy transport for the entire nation. It goes across a bridge that has one lane in each direction over the gulf in Port Augusta. When that bridge is out of action, our national freight route is out of action, and we are left with, as a backup, Yorkeys Crossing, which is a serviceable road for passenger vehicles at low speeds but not nearly good enough as a backup for our national transport task. When you have six millimetres of rain or more in Port Augusta, it becomes unusable.

We have had the bridge in Port Augusta out of action many times—I would estimate 10 times in the six years that I have been a member of parliament—and we are, unfortunately, incredibly close to a very serious problem with regard to our nation's freight efficiency. If we have an accident on the bridge in Port Augusta that knocks it out even just for 24 hours, can you imagine all of the freight travelling between Adelaide and Darwin, and between Sydney and Perth, unable to use Highway 1 and having to use Yorkeys Crossing, which goes around the outside of Port Augusta? Can you imagine further, if it happened to be raining at the time?

It would have an extraordinarily negative impact upon our nation's efficiency, and the problem gets worse and worse. Traffic within Port Augusta grows every year. Traffic around Port Augusta—intrastate traffic—grows every year, and our nation's freight task is estimated to double over the next 10 years, so we are unfortunately risking an extraordinarily perilous situation, economically at the moment, and potentially even worse because, Mr Speaker, you would know that, if an accident included, tragically, a death, then the road would be shut for a very long time while investigations took place.

You juxtapose that risk against the cost of sealing Yorkeys Crossing. I do not advocate for a complete bypass of the city of Port Augusta; that would be a mistake. The long-term solution we need is to have two lanes of traffic all the way through Port Augusta, and that would require upgrades to two bridges: the one over the gulf and the one over the railway line, further east within Port Augusta. The cost of upgrading Yorkeys Crossing so that it is an all-weather, viable, alternative route around Port Augusta is in the low tens of millions of dollars. Every time I approach this government about this issue and ask them to pursue it, the answer I repeatedly get is that the government has done a cost-benefit analysis and just does not see it as worthwhile.

There are two parts to that. I believe very genuinely that the government overestimates the cost of sealing Yorkeys Crossing, and that is evidenced by the costing estimates that were given to me by the Institution of Engineers Australia, which I passed on to the government a few years ago, which are significantly lower than the government's estimate of the upgrade of Yorkeys Crossing. Also, that cost-benefit analysis is flawed because it does not include in the cost side the risk to Port Augusta, to South Australia and to our nation if the bridge happens to be knocked out for a significant amount of time. If that bridge is knocked out for even just 30 minutes, we can have traffic backed up for over a kilometre in both directions on National Highway 1. Imagine if it was actually 24 hours.

This is also a health and safety issue for the people of Port Augusta because all of the emergency services are on one side of the bridge and large residential development areas are on the other. It is an incredibly important issue with regard to our nation's transport task. It is a very important issue for Port Augusta, for our state and for our nation.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton will not pursue his complaint about the federal government and the member for Grey, Rowan Ramsey, failing to fund Yorkeys Crossing. The member for Florey.

### **TRIPP, MRS MARJORIE**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:14):** The Premier and the state government expressed their sympathy via minister Kyam Maher and extend condolences to the family of the much-loved and respected Ramindjeri elder, Marjorie Tripp AO, who passed away on Monday 16 May at the age of 70. I thank her family for permission to put this tribute on record and son Farin Wanganeen and brother-in-law Edmund Wanganeen who first advised me of her death.

Marjorie Tripp was born on 13 January 1946 to Cissy Lois Sumner (now deceased) and became the dearly loved daughter of Ephriam Tripp and Beryl Kropinyeri (nee Sumner), both of whom are deceased. She was the loved elder sister to all her brothers and a treasured big sister to Victoria. I do not have much information on her early life, but I do know she loved the songs *One Day at a Time* and *Will the Circle Be Unbroken*, and both were sung by the very large group of mourners who were gathered at the Torrens Parade Ground on Friday 27 May for her funeral.

South Australia's commissioners for Aboriginal Engagement, Frank Lampard and Ina Scales, also expressed their sympathy and condolences to Marj's beloved family. Commissioner Frank Lampard said that Marjorie would be greatly missed and remembered always as a pioneer ahead of her time, a highly respected community leader and a distinguished Australian servicewoman. He said:

She had a fighting spirit—always pushing for greater recognition and support for South Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

Mrs Tripp's service to her country and community is remarkable. At 17, she became the first Aboriginal member of the Women's Royal Australian Naval Service in an era when Aboriginal people were not yet recognised as Australian citizens. Marjorie Anne Tripp, service No. R85750, enlisted in the Royal Australian Navy on 9 September 1963, commencing her basic training on HMAS *Cerberus*, after which she was posted to HMAS *Albatross* until she was discharged on 13 March 1965. Her discharge was an obligatory separation from the Royal Australian Navy due to her marriage to her loving partner, Arthur (Hitty) Wanganeen, who is also now deceased.

Frank Lampard said that since the time of her enlistment she had been a long-serving chairwoman of the RSL's Aboriginal Ex-Service Members and Dependants Project, helping to link Indigenous veterans with government services. He said:

As Chair of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander War Memorial Committee, [Aunty Marj] was instrumental in securing a permanent memorial honouring the tens of thousands of Aboriginal Australians who served their country [in every conflict since the Boer War].

After seven years of lobbying and fundraising, her [perhaps greatest] legacy was seeing lasting recognition for all Aboriginal servicemen, servicewomen and their families.

In 2001, Aunty Marj was awarded a Centenary Medal for her long service to Aboriginal care in South Australia and, of course, nationally as well. Frank Lampard said:

She...cared for the needs of older Aboriginal people—setting up a lot of aged-care facilities throughout the state and providing home care for Aboriginal people and people with disabilities.

In 2014, she was awarded an Officer in the Order of Australia (AO) in the Queen's Birthday Honours for her distinguished service to the Aboriginal community and her promotion of Aboriginal men and women in the armed services. Frank Lampard said:

Marjorie was a strong leader who advocated for the preservation of culture—helping to establish Adelaide's Tandanya National Aboriginal Cultural Institute.

She has also been acknowledged by the RECOGNISE campaign for her dedication and service to ensure the contribution of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to Australia is known by many Australians. Aunty Marj was also last year named the Tea Tree Gully Citizen of the Year and the winner of the Gladys Elphick Award, which was presented during national NAIDOC Week to recognise the outstanding contribution of an Aboriginal woman to her community and country. As Frank Lampard said:



Under the leadership of her mentor Aunty Gladys Elphick, Marjorie was a devoted member of the Council of Aboriginal Women of South Australia—advocating for better conditions for [Aboriginal] people.

The day Marjorie was named the winner of the Gladys Elphick Award was a proud moment for her; as Aunty Glad was very much her inspiration.

I know that Aunty Glad continues to be a great inspiration to many people.

Aunty Marj demonstrated great bravery in her remarkable lifetime, in her achievements and in her dedicated service to all Australians. Our sympathy goes out to all her family, her children, her many grandchildren and great-grandchildren. I know that she will be remembered as a highly respected Ramindjeri elder, an Aboriginal community leader, a distinguished Australian servicewoman, a loved aunty and a treasured relative and friend to many South Australians. Vale, Aunty Marj.

### CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MINING AND ENERGY UNION

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:19):** In recent weeks, we have seen yet again more news of judgements made against the CFMEU and its officials in relation to illegal behaviour on building sites around the country. On Friday 22 April, the Federal Court found the CFMEU guilty and fined 15 CFMEU officials a total of \$937,100, stemming from unlawful conduct on building sites across Adelaide in 2014.

More recently, on 31 May it was reported that the Federal Court found the CFMEU in Adelaide and its secretary, Mr Cartledge, and assistant secretary, Mr McDermott, guilty of making threats against management at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital site. Mr McDermott threatened, saying, 'If you try anything, there will be Armageddon,' while Mr Cartledge threatened, 'All hell will break loose and we will take this national.'

Indeed, as far back as 2014, the Fair Work Building and Construction director, Nigel Hadgkiss, made applications to the Fair Work Commission to revoke Mr Cartledge's right of entry permit after he was found to have breached right of entry laws after he had a physical altercation with a site manager on a Cbus construction site in Flinders Street in March 2014. The response from Mr Cartledge, as reported in the media, was not one of contrition; it was to blame everybody else, including the FWBC director, and claim that there was some conspiracy and bias against unions.

These words that he uttered are not words of somebody who was repentant about the illegal behaviour, the threats, the intimidation and the physical violence that the CFMEU uses as tactics on building sites around South Australia. These are the words of somebody who is likely to continue with the same behaviour that has seen multiple convictions in recent years. What does this mean for our broader economy? FWBC director, Mr Hadgkiss, said it best when he said:

...these are yet more examples of the kind of contempt for the rule of law which exists in Australia's building and construction industry. This kind of coercive behaviour comes at an enormous cost to the industry and national economy.

This behaviour also comes at a cost to every single South Australian, as much of the work is being conducted on sites that have had significant levels of government money expended on them. Specifically, I am talking about the Adelaide Oval and the new Royal Adelaide Hospital which, by the way, is currently \$600 million over budget.

Why is this an issue for the Attorney-General? This is an issue because Mr Cartledge sits on the government's Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board. The board is governed by a state act with the following clause:

The Governor may remove a member of the Board from office if the member...is guilty of neglect of duty or dishonourable conduct...

I put to this house that if this sort of behaviour on worksites and the number of convictions made against the CFMEU and Mr Cartledge in particular do not constitute dishonourable behaviour or dishonourable conduct then I do not know what does. We also see that on this board Mr Cartledge only attended six of the 11 meetings of the board and, when he was not there, he deputised Darren Roberts to attend. Darren has also been found guilty of illegal behaviour on construction sites.

If the Attorney refuses to sack Mr Cartledge and Mr Roberts, then he is saying that their behaviour on worksites is okay. He is saying that this does not constitute dishonourable conduct. If he does not take action then he is tacitly endorsing the added cost and disruption that these behaviours cause and, indeed, is tacitly endorsing the extra hit to the state's budget that comes from the cost blowouts on infrastructure projects as a result.

All South Australians need to abide by the law; this is what makes us a civilised society. All South Australians also have the right to feel safe at work, whether they be employees, employers or management. The government has rightly called out those who do not abide by the law. They have taken action against outlaw motorcycle gangs, they have taken action against the perpetrators of domestic violence and they have taken action against the perpetrators of sexual abuse. It is now time that they call out the illegal behaviour on building sites and take action, lest they be seen merely as hypocrites bowing to their union paymasters.

Whilst in South Australia it seems that the CFMEU donated \$52,000 in 2008 to the state Labor Party, in the last two years alone the CFMEU has donated \$110,000 to the federal Labor Party. We here call on the Attorney-General to do the right thing and take action, lest he be seen as being complicit in the illegal actions of the CFMEU.

### **ELDER ELECTORATE BOWLING CLUBS**

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:24):** Today, I am pleased to rise to speak about two vibrant and energetic clubs in my area, being the Ascot Park Bowling Club and the Edwardstown Bowling Club. Both clubs run on dedication, vision and pure hard work, driven by its volunteers who know that at the heart of all they do is community, building connections and friendships. Their belief and commitment to community is remarkable and I congratulate them.

Ascot Park Bowling Club's story began in 1957 when residents in the Ascot Park area organised the very first meeting with the shared vision of inaugurating a bowling club. A site on Marion Road, where the club is today, was chosen. The opening of the Ascot Park Bowling Club was held in 1960. The club has three greens, all of a very high standard, allowing bowls to be played all year round. The facilities are very modern with an extensive windowed view of the greens from the main dining area.

The club has pennant and night owl teams as well as indoor bowling. While pennant bowls is not played during the winter months, there is still a very vibrant social bowling group on Wednesdays and also on Saturday afternoons. The introduction of indoor bowls saw the club grow rapidly and there had to be a limit of 220 applied to membership, I am told. As the membership reached 135 ladies and 250 men, it was necessary to extend the clubhouse to accommodate everyone. At present, the club has mixed membership, ranging from teenagers through to those in their late 80s. Over the years, the club has been very successful, winning pennants, state titles and championship titles.

I was delighted and privileged just recently to present the annual volunteer of the year award that I sponsor to this year's recipient, Tracy Crane, who, like last year's recipient, Bob Johnston, works above and beyond, doing whatever is required to ensure that the club and fellow members and visitors have an enjoyable time. Tracy has also done all of this while battling personal health issues. It is an amazing personal story of commitment and passion for the club. Well done, Tracy, and well done, Bob, on being the awardees for this year and last year. I always feel very welcome at Ascot Park Bowling Club. It is truly a very friendly, welcoming club.

Secondly, I want to highlight the Edwardstown Bowling Club, which was established more than 50 years ago. Today, it has a membership of around 180 active and committed participants. The club has a remarkable team of hardworking volunteers. Those who are current members make sure they spread the word and put considerable effort into maintaining membership and attracting new local members. The club has a growing night owls competition which, on last count, had around 130 players taking part. Night owls has proven to be a very popular competition and one that is great for fun and camaraderie.

The club is very progressive and always thinking of how to engage with and meet its members' needs and, to this end, not so long ago I was able to assist them with securing eight computers by way of the Smart State PC Donation Program. I was at the club the other day and saw

the bank of computers ready to go, so there will soon be community computer courses on offer. And on this particular occasion, I was visiting the club for another good reason—to award the volunteer of the year award to the chosen club member.

It was a great privilege and pleasure to present to Trevor Gasmier this award, which I also sponsor. Trevor is currently the house manager for the Edwardstown Bowling Club and he was chosen by his fellow members for his ability to assist and do a full range of odd jobs as required around the club—a man of many talents. Congratulations, Trevor! It was really humbling to present him with his award because he was visibly quite overcome and overwhelmed as well as really surprised.

I would like to close by making mention of National Volunteer Week which was celebrated recently. It is in its 27<sup>th</sup> year and it is always a great opportunity to recognise and reflect. It gives us an opportunity to say thanks and to recognise those volunteers within our community who give freely of their time. Thank you to both Ascot Park Bowling Club and Edwardstown Bowling Club and the volunteers who are at the hub and heart of both clubs and, indeed, the community. Thank you for all you do.

### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:29):** I rise to speak about the recent events regarding the Hillier case and the call from the Liberal Party and from Belinda Valentine, the grandmother of Chloe Valentine, for an independent investigation. Yesterday, minister John Rau came into the house and gave a ministerial statement and at no time did he mention, as he did today, that the case has also been referred to the royal commission. I am unsure as to why the secrecy surrounding that and why that was not just mentioned in his ministerial statement.

I also note that the royal commission is only to report on broad terms. It is not actually meant to be a case-specific investigator. I am also concerned, if the government uses the royal commission, which has already been delayed twice, to keep adding and adding individual cases, which was not the intention, about when we will ever get a report back and whether the government will continue to hide behind the royal commission, using it as an excuse not to do anything.

As we know, this government has a history of failure in child protection. We have had the house of horrors, where it was highlighted that different departments do not talk to each other, coming from interstate, that there is no national database and that there is a need for information sharing. We need to know that things have changed after a horrific incident. It is the opportunity to look at the workings, the policies, the procedures and the resourcing to see what could be done differently and what could be done better to make sure the same things do not happen again.

In the case of Jarrad Delroy Roberts, we saw that truancy was an indicator of a child who could be at risk. In this instance, two children died on a school day at 1.30 in the afternoon. Had there been a history of truancy? Was that recorded and was something being done about that? What did we learn from the Jarrad Delroy Roberts case and are we implementing that to make sure it does not happen again?

We had the baby Ebony case, where it was discovered that the father had a previous history of domestic violence. Had the perpetrator in this instance, Steven Graham Peet, had a history of domestic violence? Was he living in the home? Given that he was living in the home with children at risk already who were known to the department, had they investigated the change of risk? Was there further risk? We need to know the answers to these types of questions about what procedures are in place and what is happening.

Were the Coroner's recommendations in the Chloe Valentine case fulfilled? Point 14.6 of the Chloe Valentine recommendations stated that there should be an investigation into the background of parents of the child or of any person in loco parentis to the child. Therefore, if Steven Graham Peet were living in the home, it should have already been done. It was one year ago that that recommendation was made, one year ago that this government accepted the recommendation and one year ago that the people of South Australia believed that the government would be implementing that recommendation. So, was it? We need to know that things have changed.

In the Chloe Valentine case, we know that a drug safety plan was implemented that actually allowed a 16-year-old child to take drugs. That is completely unacceptable. We do not let people take drugs and drive a car, let alone take illicit drugs and raise children. Was the Aboriginal Sobriety Group involved? Was there help available to this mother? What supports were around her and in place? How long had Families SA been dealing with this family and why did they arrive on the day and leave the children in place?

The PSA is stating that Families SA is 200 people understaffed. John Rau, the minister, is disputing that there is any resourcing issue, yet the union is threatening strike action if more people are not employed immediately. We need to know what is happening. We hear announcements. Two years ago, it was announced that there would be 300 extra residential care facility workers after the Shannon McCooles incident so that people external to Families SA would not be employed. Have they been employed? We do not know.

Individual case workers were supposed to be employed and the recruiting was supposed to start last March, and we hear today it is ongoing. That was 15 months ago and it is still ongoing. This government makes announcements, it agrees with findings and we believe that something is being done. I do not think it is, because why does the same thing keep happening? We have lost another three people from our world, including two innocent children, due to a lack of progress in this area.

### NORTHERN CONNECTOR

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:34):** As you will be aware, the Australian and South Australian governments have committed nearly \$1 billion towards the Northern Connector project, which is a road connecting the Northern Expressway and the southern Superway and runs through the member for Taylor's electorate and the member for Port Adelaide's electorate down the bottom there.

To recap, the Northern Connector is a 15.5 kilometre road. It has three lanes in each direction and it is posted the entire length at 110 km/h. There will be four interchanges. The first one, the northern interchange, is at the intersection of Port Wakefield Road and the Northern Expressway; the second is at the corner of Port Wakefield Road and Waterloo Corner Road; the Bolivar interchange is at the intersection of Port Wakefield Road and Bolivar Road; and the southern interchange is at the intersection of the Port River Expressway, the South Road Superway and the connector. I am happy to say that there will also be a shared-use pedestrian and bike path extending its full length, which will also connect with the Northern Expressway's Stuart O'Grady Bikeway.

There are obvious time and productivity savings for commuters and freight. Drivers will save up to seven minutes, based on the current average peak travel time on the current route, from the end of the Northern Expressway, down Port Wakefield Road and along the Salisbury connector highway to the South Road Superway. That will be replaced by travelling the whole time at 110 km/h along the Northern Connector, and it will save up to about eight minutes, based on maximum peak-hour travel time on the same route.

As the minister said in an answer to a question from me today, last week the government did announce that Lendlease had won the tender to build the Northern Connector after an exhaustive tender process and that major works were expected to commence in the third quarter of 2016, with the project scheduled for completion in December 2019. Of course, for me, and for the other local MPs in the north, the main focus will be on the jobs and on the work for local industry, particularly obviously in the northern suburbs.

As the head of the Northern Connector jobs task force, I have been working over the last six months meeting with local government, with jobs providers and training providers. I have also been meeting with people in the industry and in DPTI, working towards this announcement last week and then thinking about feeding local workers, particularly displaced automotive workers, into this new project both in terms of gainful employment and the training opportunities it provides.

The project will support on average 480 full-time equivalent jobs each year. It is my aim, and the stated aim of Lendlease, to make sure that the lion's share of those jobs comes from people in the northern suburbs. The tender process was also conducted in line with the state government's Industry Participation Policy, with the economic benefit to South Australia making up 20 per cent of

the tender evaluation, which also boosts the opportunities for local subcontractors and suppliers to be involved in the project.

I am also pleased that a minimum of 20 per cent of the total labour hours are to be carried out by apprentices and trainees, Aboriginal workers, displaced automotive employees and people facing barriers to employment. I mentioned automotive employees, and they are doubly represented because they largely live in the northern suburbs that we are talking about—although not entirely, of course.

The exciting thing about this project, and what makes me confident that Lendlease will meet its targets, is that, as the minister alluded to, they will establish what they have called the NorthHub. That is an employment, skills and training centre to help northern jobseekers secure employment on the project, particularly, as I said, displaced automotive workers. This NorthHub will be a one-stop shop located at the main site offices, and it will be a place where education, training and other service providers can meet on site with industry partners, subcontractors and workers.

The NorthHub will include a dedicated employment development team which will be established to work closely with me and DPTI and the Northern Connector jobs task force to maximise opportunities for local workers. This team will be made up of the employment development coordinators from all the Lendlease industry partners, including CATCON, McMahon, LR&M and SEM. As has been mentioned earlier, they are all companies with well-entrenched local experience.

With the time left available to me, I want to address another important component of this project. Thanks to the member for Giles and the action that he and the Premier and the government have taken since the last election in changing the participation policy, Lendlease has established a partnership with Arrium to supply reinforcing steel for the project. Approximately 9,000 tonnes of reinforcing steel is required in total, of which approximately 6,500 tonnes will use Whyalla billet. The remainder of reinforcing steel will be sourced from within Australia. Approximately 1,000 tonnes of structural steel is also required for the project, and this is expected to be sourced from within Australia.

### *Bills*

#### **SUMMARY PROCEDURE (ABOLITION OF COMPLAINTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:40):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Summary Procedure Act 1921 and to make related amendments to the Acts Interpretation Act 1915. Read a first time.

##### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:40):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Summary Procedure (Abolition of Complaints) Amendment Bill 2016 will amend the Summary Procedure Act 1921 to provide for a common information format to be used to initiate charges notwithstanding the seriousness of the alleged offence, rather than a separate complaint form for summary offences and information forms for indictable offences. The bill will also amend the act to require affidavit evidence at the preliminary examination of an indictable offence instead of a written statement of evidence verified by declaration. The bill contains other consequential and transitional provisions.

The intention of the bill is to achieve efficiencies in criminal justice procedure by avoiding the need to refile charges and evidence in different documentary formats when charges are upgraded

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

Leave granted.

Criminal offences in this State are classified depending on their seriousness as either:

- summary offences, which are generally punishable by fines or relatively short periods of imprisonment; or
- major or minor indictable offences.

Section 49 of the Act requires a charge of a summary offence to be commenced in the Magistrates Court by the making and filing of a complaint. The practice of the Magistrates Court is that charges of summary offences are generally supported by evidence in affidavit form.

A person is charged with an indictable offence by the laying and filing of an information in the Magistrates Court under section 101 of the Act. The Magistrates Court will conduct a preliminary examination of the charges to determine whether the evidence is sufficient for the person charged with the indictable offence to be committed for trial in the District or Supreme Court (although some minor indictable offences can be tried in the Magistrates Court if the defendant does not elect to be tried in a superior Court).

In relation to the preliminary examination, section 104 of the Act requires the prosecutor to file the prosecution's witness statements in the Court in the form of written statements verified by declaration. Section 104(6) creates an offence for the making of a false or misleading statement filed in Court. The maximum penalty is 2 years imprisonment.

The preparation and filing of complaint and information forms and their accompanying affidavits and declarations is primarily the responsibility of the South Australia Police (SAPOL), in conjunction with advice received from staff of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (ODPP). During the course of criminal proceedings, the offences as initially charged may be changed from indictable to summary or from summary to indictable. This can occur as a result of plea negotiations and discovery of new evidence or advice from ODPP staff as to the chances of conviction. Such a change in charges currently requires SAPOL to prepare and re-file charges and supporting evidence on a different Court format, i.e. a complaint form instead of an information form or vice versa. It also requires victims and witnesses to restate their evidence in a different format, i.e. an affidavit instead of a declaration or vice versa. The need for this double-handling creates an additional workload for SAPOL prosecution staff, unnecessary expense (including in printing costs) and delays in the criminal justice system.

The draft Bill would change all instances in the Act of the words 'complaint', 'complainant' and the 'making' of a complaint to, respectively, an 'information', 'informant' and the 'laying' of an information. Because the 'complaint' language is used in many dozens of other Acts in the State, and so as not to directly amend those dozens of Acts, an amendment is also proposed to s44 of the *Acts Interpretation Act 1915* so that the words 'complaint' and 'complainant' and the 'making' of a complaint in other legislation are to be taken to reflect the changes to language made to the Act by this Bill. Together, these amendments will avoid SAPOL having to refile charges in different formats when charges are upgraded or downgraded.

The forms currently prescribed by the Magistrates Court Rules for complaints and informations are virtually identical. They contain the names and addresses of the defendant and of the complainant or informant, together with information as to the alleged offence charged against the defendant. The two forms can be readily consolidated into a common information form.

The use of a common information format avoids the additional workload, expense and delay that results from changing charges from a summary offence to an indictable offence or vice versa. The proposal primarily benefits SAPOL but the reduction of delay and double-handling also benefits victims and witnesses and the criminal justice sector broadly.

The intention of the amendments is only to avoid the inefficiencies arising from the prosecutor having to file different forms when offences are upgraded or downgraded.

The draft Bill would also amend section 104(3) of the Act so that a statement filed in the Court in relation to a preliminary examination of an indictable offence must, as with summary offences, be in the form of an affidavit. This common evidentiary format will avoid the need for witnesses and victims to state their evidence in a different documentary format should charges be upgraded from summary to indictable or vice versa. A transitional provision will be inserted in the Act to ensure that SAPOL can still file in Court statements verified by declaration that were signed before the amendments come into operation. Some police investigations are protracted and declarations may have been signed a considerable time prior to the commencement of the amendments. A transitional provision will mean that it will not be necessary to require victims and witnesses to be contacted again to swear affidavits in place of those declarations and reflects the policy intent of the Bill that victims and witnesses should not be put to unnecessary inconvenience and stress.

An affidavit is the written equivalent of evidence given orally under oath in the court room. Affidavits can only be sworn before authorised persons, such as solicitors and Justices of the Peace. Under the *Evidence (Affidavits) Act*

1928, an affidavit can also be sworn before a member of the police force proclaimed under Part 5 of the Oaths Act 1936 (a 'Proclaimed Police Officer'). SAPOL proposes to require all police officers to undertake relevant training and to seek their appointment by the Governor as Proclaimed Police Officers under the *Oaths Act 1936*. This will eventually enable all police officers to administer oaths and ought to improve the quality of sworn affidavits filed by SAPOL.

It is likely that there will need to be minor business process changes in Government and the community to implement the affidavit changes, particularly identifying persons who are authorised to administer oaths. This should not pose any significant difficulty given that solicitors, Justices of the Peace and Proclaimed Police Officers, amongst others, can administer an oath. Those persons who must swear an affidavit interstate or overseas should have ample recourse to persons before whom such affidavits can be sworn (as permitted by section 66 of the *Evidence Act 1929*).

Using affidavits rather than declarations at preliminary examinations also provides a greater deterrent against the giving of false evidence. Perjury in an affidavit attracts a larger penalty than the penalty under section 104(6) of the Act for false evidence given in a declaration. The giving of false evidence in an affidavit sworn before a Proclaimed Police Officer and other authorised persons would constitute the criminal offence of perjury, which is punishable by imprisonment of up to seven years. Section 104(6) of the Act would be repealed by the Bill to ensure that there is no doubt that a false statement in an affidavit would constitute the offence of perjury. Also, an offence under section 104(6) occurs only when the declaration is filed in Court. SAPOL has suggested that this had led to some witnesses providing false alibi evidence in a declaration which, if discovered prior to filing in the Court, could only be prosecuted as an attempt to pervert the course of justice or other similar offences which are generally difficult to prove.

The proposal for a common information form is consistent with the practice in New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia. Also, most interstate jurisdictions do not differentiate between sworn and unsworn written evidence for different levels of offending and require only a single written format for evidence.

The benefits of the amendments apply whether the person filing the charge forms is a police officer, private citizen or a representative of Government or non-Government agencies that initiate criminal prosecutions.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Summary Procedure Act 1921*

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

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 4 of the principal Act to delete the definition of 'complaint', a term no longer used in the Act.

###### 5—Amendment of section 5—Classification of offences

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 5 of the principal Act.

###### 6—Amendment of section 20—Form of warrant

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 20 of the principal Act.

###### 7—Amendment of section 22—Form of summons

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 22 of the principal Act.

###### 8—Amendment of section 22A—Description of offence

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 22A of the principal Act.

###### 9—Amendment of section 27—Service

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 27 of the principal Act.

###### 10—Amendment of section 27A—Service of summons by post

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 27A of the principal Act.

###### 11—Amendment of section 27B—Hearing on a written plea of guilty

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 27B of the principal Act.

###### 12—Amendment of section 27C—Hearing where defendant fails to appear

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 27C of the principal Act.

13—Amendment of heading to Part 4 Division 2

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the heading to Part 4 Division 2 of the principal Act.

14—Amendment of section 49—Information

This clause amends section 49 of the principal to set out how an information can be laid.

This is the key clause in the measure, as it amends the provisions that require summary offences to be charged on complaint. Summary offences (and indictable offences) are, following commencement of the measure, all to be charged on information.

15—Amendment of section 51—Joinder and separation of charges

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 51 of the principal Act.

16—Amendment of section 54—Allegations and descriptions in informations and proceedings

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 54 of the principal Act.

17—Amendment of section 56—Exceptions or exemptions need not be specified or disproved by informant

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 56 of the principal Act.

18—Amendment of section 57—Issue of summons

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 57 of the principal Act.

19—Amendment of section 57A—Procedure enabling written plea of guilty

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 57A of the principal Act.

20—Amendment of section 58—Issue of warrant

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 58 of the principal Act.

21—Amendment of section 60—Forms of custody etc

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 60 of the principal Act.

22—Amendment of section 62—Proceedings on non-appearance of defendant

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 62 of the principal Act.

23—Amendment of section 62A—Power to proceed in absence of defendant

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 62A of the principal Act.

24—Amendment of section 62B—Powers of court on written plea of guilty

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 62B of the principal Act.

25—Amendment of section 62BA—Proceedings where defendant neither appears nor returns written plea of guilty

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 62BA of the principal Act.

26—Amendment of section 62C—Proceedings in absence of defendant

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 62C of the principal Act.

27—Amendment of section 62D—Proof of previous convictions

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 62D of the principal Act.

28—Amendment of section 63—Non-appearance of informant

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 63 of the principal Act.

29—Amendment of section 64—If both parties appear, court to hear and determine the case

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 64 of the principal Act.

30—Amendment of section 67—When defendant pleads guilty, court to convict or make an order

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 67 of the principal Act.

31—Amendment of section 68—Procedure on plea of not guilty

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 68 of the principal Act.

32—Amendment of section 69—After hearing the parties court to convict or dismiss



This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 69 of the principal Act.

33—Amendment of section 69A—Examination of defendant

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 69A of the principal Act.

34—Amendment of section 70A—Convictions where charges joined in information

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 70A of the principal Act.

35—Amendment of section 70B—Conviction for attempt where full offence charged

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 70B of the principal Act.

36—Amendment of section 71—Order and certificate of dismissal

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 71 of the principal Act.

37—Amendment of section 78—Non-association and place-restriction orders

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 78 of the principal Act.

38—Amendment of section 80—Issue of non-association or place restriction order in absence of defendant

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 80 of the principal Act.

39—Amendment of section 99AA—Paedophile restraining orders

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 99AA of the principal Act.

40—Amendment of section 99AAC—Child protection restraining orders

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 99AAC of the principal Act.

41—Amendment of section 99C—Issue of restraining order in absence of defendant

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 99C of the principal Act.

42—Amendment of section 99G—Notification of making etc of restraining orders

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 99G of the principal Act.

43—Amendment of section 99J—Informations or applications by or on behalf of child

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 99J of the principal Act.

44—Amendment of section 102—Joinder and separation of charges

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 102 of the principal Act.

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

This clause amends section 104 of the principal Act to require affidavits (rather than declarations) to be filed in court.

46—Amendment of section 107—Evaluation of evidence at preliminary examination

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 107 of the principal Act.

47—Amendment of section 181—Charges

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 181 of the principal Act.

48—Amendment of section 187A—Proof of convictions or orders

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 187A of the principal Act.

49—Amendment of section 189C—Costs against informant in proceedings for restraining order

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 189C of the principal Act.

Schedule 1—Related amendments and transitional provisions

Part 1—Amendment of *Acts Interpretation Act 1915*

1—Amendment of section 44—Interpretation of references to summary proceedings, complaints etc

This clause amends section 44 of the *Acts Interpretation Act 1915* to make amendments that are consequential to this measure, and to make provision saving references in other Acts and regulations to 'complaints' by providing that such references will be taken to be references to 'informations'.

Part 2—Transitional provision

2—Certain statements to have effect as affidavits

This clause makes a transitional provision allowing certain declarations made before the commencement of the clause to continue to be filed in court in lieu of the requirement for an affidavit.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

## RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:42):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Residential Tenancies Act 1995. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:42):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Residential Tenancies (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 amends the Residential Tenancies Act 1995 to clarify or provide solutions to several administrative issues that have been brought to my attention. The bill aims to support an informed tenancy sector where parties understand their rights and obligations. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Parliament considered a comprehensive range of reforms to the Act with the *Residential Tenancies (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2013*, which was assented to on 9 May 2013. These reforms (referred to as the 2013 Reforms) were the result of extensive public consultation to reflect changes that had occurred over the previous 15 years. The majority of the reforms commenced on 1 March 2014, with all remaining provisions commencing on 9 May 2015.

The 2013 Reforms increased protection for both tenants and landlords, whilst achieving a fair balance of rights and responsibilities for all parties to tenancy agreements. The amendments do not propose to overturn the underlying policy of the 2013 Reforms, but rather tidy-up and clarify a few provisions that industry have said could be clearer.

The Bill proposes a few minor changes to the landlord's right to entry. The 2013 Reforms recast these provisions to remove what was commonly referred to as the 'tenant consent provisions'. These provisions meant that the landlord could attend the premises without any notice and that the tenant could consent to access at or immediately before the time of entry. This raised concerns that when unexpectedly confronted with the landlord at their premises, the tenant could be intimidated to provide access to the landlord.

Presently, the landlord must provide a minimum period of notice to the tenant to attend the premises. This is 48 hours' notice for non-urgent maintenance and repairs, and a minimum of 7 days' notice for garden maintenance. However, with the removal of the 'tenant consent provisions', the landlord is currently prohibited from attending the premises in these circumstances prior to the notice period – even with the tenant's consent. The Bill proposes that at the request of the tenant, the landlord may attend the premises for these purposes prior to giving the required notice.

A landlord is also prohibited from showing the property to prospective tenants prior to 28 days preceding the termination of the tenancy. Within 28 days preceding termination, the landlord may only enter the premises for this purpose on a reasonable number of occasions and within normal hours where the tenant has been given reasonable notice. The difficulty is that if the tenant intends to break the lease, the termination date may be contingent on the finding of another tenant to reduce reletting fees.

The Bill proposes that at the request of the tenant, the landlord may attend the premises for this purpose prior to 28 days preceding the termination of the tenancy. Unless otherwise requested by the tenant, the landlord may only enter the premises for this purpose on a reasonable number of occasions within normal hours where the tenant has been given reasonable notice.

It is not proposed to revert back to the 'tenant consent provisions'. The Bill seeks to empower the tenant to permit the landlord (or their agent, including a contractor) to attend the premises at their request. Requiring the tenant

to make such a request, rather than provide consent, continues to provide the tenant a level of protection from being intimidated by the landlord to provide access to the premises.

The Bill proposes to specify a period of time that a tenant may terminate a tenancy in certain circumstances where the landlord fails to disclose information relating to the sale of the property.

Presently, if a landlord enters into a contract for sale of the property within two months of a tenancy commencing and failed to disclose to the tenant (prior to entering into the tenancy) the property had been (or was intended to be) advertised or there was an existing sales agency agreement, the tenant has the right to terminate the tenancy. The period of time the tenant has to terminate the tenancy is unspecified and therefore applies for the life of the tenancy. Pursuant to s71A(2) of the Act, the landlord must advise the tenant in writing of the sale of the premises at least 14 days before settlement or as soon as possible after the contract is entered into.

The Bill specifies that the tenant has the right to terminate the tenancy on these grounds within two months of receiving written notice of the sale of the premises. If the tenant does not receive written notice, whether at the time of sale or later, the period of time the tenant may terminate the tenancy on these grounds remains unspecified.

The Bill seeks to address an imbalance of power between the tenant and landlord. At present, the failure of a former landlord to disclose the sale or intended sale of the property disadvantages the new landlord, as there is no certainty as to the length of the tenancy. Specifying a period of time the tenant has to terminate the tenancy only after receiving written notice of the sale of the premises ensures the tenant is informed and may exercise their right to terminate the tenancy if they wish. This amendment would only apply to new tenancy agreements entered into after the commencement of this provision.

Lastly, the Bill will clarify an existing practice and interpretation of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal with respect to abandoned property. Presently, the landlord must not remove a tenant's possessions until at least two days have passed since recovering possession of the premises. However, the tenant may never be given the opportunity to recover these items, as the landlord may not provide access to the tenant during this period. The Bill makes it clear that the landlord must allow the tenant access to the premises to reclaim any abandoned property during this time.

The Bill has the support of both industry and tenant advocacy groups as it seeks to provide common sense approaches to these issues while maintaining a fair balance of rights and responsibilities for all parties to tenancy agreements.

I commend this Bill to the House.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Residential Tenancies Act 1995*

###### 4—Amendment of section 72—Right of entry

The clause amends section 72 to make it a term of a residential tenancy agreement that the landlord (or an agent of the landlord) may, at the request of the tenant, enter the residential premises to carry out maintenance (including gardening maintenance) and to show the premises to prospective tenants.

###### 5—Amendment of section 85A—Termination by tenant if residential premises for sale

The clause inserts a new subsection (2) into section 85A providing that a notice of termination referred to in subsection (1) must, if the landlord has given written notice advising the tenant of the contract for the sale of the residential premises (whether in accordance with section 71A(2) or otherwise), be given to the landlord within 2 months after the day on which that notice of advice is given to the tenant.

###### 6—Amendment of section 97B—Action to deal with abandoned property other than personal documents

The clause amends section 97B inserting a new subsection (2a) to provide that a landlord must, within the period of 2 days after recovering possession of the premises, allow a tenant access to the premises to reclaim abandoned property.

###### 7—Insertion of Schedule 2

This clause inserts a new Schedule as follows:

Schedule 2—Transitional provisions—*Residential Tenancies (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2016*

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

## JUSTICES OF THE PEACE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:43):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act 2005. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:43):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Justices of the Peace (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 amends the Justices of the Peace Act 2005 to provide a more efficient mechanism for appointment, suspension and removal of a justice or special justice of the peace from office.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! If you have something to say, deputy leader, you will have a turn eventually.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Justices of the peace perform an important community service by volunteering their services to the community, sacrificing their time to witness thousands of official and legal documents each year. At the Grenfell Street offices alone, JPs witnessed 90,000 documents for over 20,000 clients last financial year. The South Australian community is fortunate to be served by 7,200 JPs, with some dedicated individuals having provided faithful service for over 60 years.

With up to 300 appointments every year, together with managing the applications, voluntary and disciplinary suspensions and the removal of JPs from office, this bill aims to reduce red tape by streamlining the administrative processes and ensuring the timely and efficient management of JP matters. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

The Bill amends section 4 of the *Justices of the Peace Act 2005* to allow the Attorney-General to appoint a JP to office following a rigorous process to support the appointment. The Act currently requires the Governor to make such appointments and upon consultation with His Excellency and the Royal Association of Justices of South Australia, it was agreed that refining the process would improve efficiency whilst also maintaining the integrity of appointments.

A further amendment to section 4 will remove the requirement that all information supplied in support of an application must be verified by statutory declaration. This amendment will allow the online submission of applications and will also maintain the veracity of the information through the insertion of a new section regarding false and misleading statements later in the Act.

The Bill amends section 5 of the Act to allow the Attorney-General to appoint a Member of Parliament or the principal member of a council to be a JP, rather than involve the Governor, as with appointments of members of the public.

In reviewing the operation of the Act, it was identified that as there was no specified timeframe in which JPs must take the requisite oaths in accordance with the *Oaths Act 1936*, some appointed JPs were not taking their oaths in the time prescribed by their conditions of appointment and therefore could not perform their duties. This failure to take their oaths triggered a laborious administrative process. The Bill amends section 6 to include the obligation of the appointed JP to take their oath within three months of their appointment, or risk being suspended or removed from office.

The Bill further amends section 6 to exempt reappointed JPs from repeating their oaths, further reducing red tape and ensuring the seamless provision of service.

A Special Justice sits in the Magistrates and Youth Courts to hear minor matters and is appointed to that position after having completed specific training and fulfilling other criteria. The Bill amends section 7 to allow the Attorney-General to appoint a Justice to be a Special Justice.

A JP may apply to have their office suspended for a period of up to two years. Typically this is requested to allow the JP to travel, to accompany their spouse on an out-of-state posting or for personal or health reasons. The Bill amends section 10 to allow the Attorney-General, rather than the Governor, to suspend the JP's office for the nominated time and compels the JP to notify the Attorney-General of their intention to return to the State when the suspension period ends. This amendment will reduce the administrative burden on Justice of the Peace Services staff, who must conduct extensive searches to determine if a JP has returned to the State following a period of voluntary suspension.

The Bill also amends section 11 of the Act, which is concerned with disciplinary action, suspension and removal of a Justice from office. Again, the Bill relinquishes the power of the Governor to take disciplinary action and transfers it to the Attorney-General, allowing action to be taken against a JP if the justice breaches or fails to comply with either the Act, a condition of appointment or the Code of Conduct.

The Bill again removes reference to the Governor, in respect to taking disciplinary action against a person who improperly uses the title 'JP (Retired)', and instead gives the Attorney-General power to take the appropriate action.

Section 16 is similarly amended by the Bill to remove reference to the Governor by substituting his title with the Attorney-General, in this instance to restrict the use of the title 'JP (Retired)'.

Section 16A will create a punishable offence for knowingly making a false or misleading statement when providing information required under the Act, with a maximum penalty of \$10,000 or two years imprisonment. If the false statement is made unknowingly or in any other case, the maximum penalty is \$5,000. This section provides protection from the removal of the statutory declaration requirement, as applicants will commit a relatively serious offence should any information submitted by them, whether by inclusion or omission, prove to be false or misleading.

Section 16B is inserted to confer power upon the Attorney-General to delegate any powers or functions under the Act to particular people, either absolutely or with the imposition of certain conditions. This will ensure the streamlined administration of matters relating to Justices of the Peace.

This Bill seeks to balance the valuable contribution made by members of the public who volunteer their time as Justices of the Peace with the crucial need to maintain the integrity of the role they perform. In addition, the amendments streamline the administrative process to ensure that red tape is minimised and the provision of service is maximised.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Justices of the Peace Act 2005*

###### 4—Amendment of section 4—Appointment of suitable persons as justices

This clause amends section 4 so that it is the Attorney-General, rather than the Governor, who is empowered to appoint justices of the peace. It also amends the section to remove the mandatory requirement that information provided in or with an application for appointment must be verified by statutory declaration. Instead, it substitutes a provision that empowers the Attorney-General to require such information to be verified by statutory declaration.

###### 5—Amendment of section 5—Appointment of persons occupying certain offices as justices

This clause amends section 5 so that it is the Attorney-General, rather than the Governor, who will appoint a Member of Parliament, or the principal member of a council, to be a justice of the peace.

###### 6—Amendment of section 6—Justices must take oath before exercising official powers

This clause amends section 6 so that the oath required to be taken by a justice of the peace before exercising official powers must be taken within 3 months after the appointment of the justice.

###### 7—Amendment of section 7—Special justices

This clause amends section 7 so that it is the Attorney-General, rather than the Governor, who will appoint justices to be special justices.

8—Amendment of section 10—Justice may apply for suspension of official duties for personal reasons

This clause amends section 10 so that it is the Attorney-General, rather than the Governor, who may suspend a justice from office on application by the justice. It also amends the section to require a justice whose office has been suspended by reason of a prolonged absence from South Australia to notify the Attorney-General whether he or she intends to return to the State when the suspension expires.

9—Amendment of section 11—Disciplinary action, suspension and removal of justices from office

This clause amends section 11 to include, as proper cause for taking disciplinary action against a justice, a breach of the Act, or a failure to comply with the Act, by the justice. It also substitutes all current references to the Governor with references to the Attorney-General, so that the Attorney-General is empowered to take disciplinary action.

10—Amendment of section 12—Disciplinary action—retired justices

This clause amends section 12 so that the Attorney-General, rather than the Governor, may take disciplinary action against a retired justice.

11—Amendment of section 16—Offence to hold out etc

This clause amends section 16 to replace a reference to the Governor with a reference to the Attorney-General, so as empower the Attorney-General to prohibit retired justices from using certain titles or descriptions.

12—Insertion of sections 16A and 16B

16A—False statements

Proposed section 16A makes it an offence to make a statement that is false or misleading in a material particular (whether by reason of the inclusion or omission of any particular) in any information provided under the Act. The maximum penalty is to be \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years if the person made the statement knowing it to be false or misleading, or \$5,000 in any other case.

16B—Delegation

Proposed section 16B empowers the Attorney-General to delegate powers and functions under the Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**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) (15:45):** I move:

That standing orders and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Committees and Subordinate Legislation set down on the *Notice Paper* for today to take precedence over Government Business except for the receipt and any consequential consideration of messages from the Legislative Council.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2015-16**

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

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:48):** There are two points that I want to make in my remaining time. The first relates to quite an odd statement made by Mr Jackman under questioning in relation to his salary. Mr Speirs asked him, 'Are you able to advise the committee of the total value of your salary package?' He said, 'Yes, it's on the public record: it's \$375,000.' Mr Spiers said, 'Is any component of that paid for by Defence SA?' He said, 'Yes, there is: \$75,000 out of that package is paid for by Defence SA.'

I find it quite an extraordinary situation that a man in a role is getting paid by another organisation that I would suggest does not have too much direct correlation. There is no direct correlation between Defence SA and SAFECOM. I am sure that the government can pretend to try to find a link.

I find it quite extraordinary that part of his salary package is still being paid for by Defence SA. I wonder why it is happening that way. Is it because it was cheaper to do that than pay him some sort of redundancy? Was it the case that SAFECOM was not able to provide the total remuneration of what he was expecting and so Defence SA kicked in the last of it? It seems an extraordinary situation that Defence SA, which has nothing to do with emergency service provision, is paying \$75,000 so that SAFECOM can have the privilege of Mr Jackman's position.

The last point I want to wrap up on is that South Australians have a very strong feeling and a strong affection towards their emergency services, and I would urge this government not to abuse that goodwill in seeking to find ever more ways to plug the holes that they have in their budget bottom line.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:50):** I will not keep the house for very long. I want to commence by reinforcing points that have been made by other speakers and to acknowledge, thank and show my gratitude to those people who work in the emergency services sector, both volunteer and paid personnel. I also acknowledge the good working relationship between the various sectors and, indeed, I acknowledge the support that the people of South Australia give them and certainly the gratitude that they feel when they are the recipients of the services that they provide.

A couple of things came out of the hearing last week. One was some questioning in relation to some problems that had occurred previously in relation to the computer aided dispatch system, and of course the point has been made quite regularly by the member for Morphett. I was very pleased to learn through Chief Crossman, and indeed it was reinforced by other chief officers, that the computer aided dispatch system is working much better than it was before, and they believe that it is certainly on track to not create the problems that it had previously.

As I understand it, a lot of those problems related to some maps and the inability to be able to read those maps properly. Last time I rode around in a fire truck, you would always carry the latest street directory as well to make sure that you knew where you were going. It was very heartening to hear the chief officer say that they believe they have this nailed and that they believe it will deliver an excellent service in regard to ensuring that they get the appropriate number of appliances and the closest appliances that can attend there, under both a single response and a dual response responsibility between the services. I thought that was very important, and I want to put that on the record following the hearing.

The other point that I would like to make is this: the member for Schubert made a couple of statements during his presentation here today that I think need to be challenged and, in my view, corrected. One was his view of the failed reform processes and the two personnel who he believed were sitting there doing nothing and not being utilised effectively. I think that was a disgraceful thing to say because the evidence that we were given was that they were gainfully employed and doing responsibilities connected to their core responsibility of working within that sector of SAFECOM. I think that he is somewhat misleading when he asserts that people were sitting around on their wages doing nothing at all.

The other point that he made, I think just a moment ago, was about the \$375,000 that is paid to the executive officer and saying things like, 'For the life of me I can't understand why Defence would be paying \$75,000 there', trying to intimate that there is something crook in Tobruk through this particular process. I chaired that hearing, and I thank the member for Little Para for the honour of being able to do that, notwithstanding the fact that I did not get higher duties, but we will let that ride.

The point I want to make is this: the member for Schubert sat through that hearing and never asked a question in relation to this particular matter, which I know Mr Jackman would have been more than happy to answer. It is a bit rich to come in here and assert these things, which is really pretty poor politics, without ever taking the opportunity at the hearing to front Mr Jackman and have

the courage to be able to say what it is he is saying here in this parliament. I think that reflects more on the member for Schubert than it does, certainly, on Mr Jackman.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** If you want to know, you have to ask. If you don't want to know, don't ask—it's as simple as that. There is \$282.2 million being expended on the emergency services this year, and that is going to be of great benefit to the emergency services but also to the people of South Australia who rely on these emergency services.

I am going to be controversial, and my colleagues here will not like this or maybe they will, but this certainly will not see the light of day during my period of time. I believe, in a modern country like Australia, we need to have universal coverage of emergency services, which we do have, and have them available to the people of South Australia, in this instance, and Australia, at the minimum cost, knowing full well these are always going to be user-pay services—they always have been.

If we go back to bygone days, if you did not have a little plaque on your house that showed you were insured, the fire brigade would not come to your house. Under the emergency services levy, everyone pays. I would love there to be remissions back in place, but we know why those remissions were removed. If the federal government returns the money that it removed, that we have had to install into health and education, those remissions, I understand, would be returned.

My point, which might be seen to be controversial, is this: we have a very good ambulance service that, again, provides coverage to South Australians. One day in the future, and I might be dead and gone, I would like to see that coverage extended universally to all South Australians, in a similar form that an emergency service is in regard to it being available, with a user-pay system, to give them universal coverage of the ambulance services. It happens in other parts of the world. I think the time will be right in the near future—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Here in Australia?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —even here in Australia, Deputy Speaker. I hope that one day we will have a debate on that. I expect I might cop a bit of flak, but I would see that being a way by which every person in metropolitan Adelaide, in South Australia, will have available to them, save and except for the user-pay costs that are collected, universal coverage of an excellent ambulance service that rates as well and as high as any ambulance service in the world. With those few words, I commend the report to the house. Again, I just congratulate and thank all emergency services personnel—that includes the police and others, of course—for the role that they play in protecting life and property and making South Australia a safer and better place than it otherwise would be.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:57):** I will come to a couple of comments the previous speaker just made, but let me first start off with some numbers in the report that the Economic and Finance Committee have made. They have published the figures which were given to the committee by RevenueSA or Treasury.

I would have liked the Economic and Finance Committee to seek a much better breakdown of the expenditure of these moneys. It has been a controversial area over the last couple of years, ever since the rebates were withdrawn by the Treasurer, and I will come to that in a moment, but can I say there has been a dramatic turnaround, according to these figures, on where the emergency services expenditure is being spent in South Australia.

If you look at the report, South Australia is divided into basically four different regions, and there is a breakdown for the amount of money spent in each of those regions. Region 4 is land within any metropolitan council—so, the greater metropolitan area—the Adelaide Hills Council, Corporation of the Town of Gawler, the City of Onkaparinga or the City of Playford. Basically, it is the greater metropolitan area and includes the Adelaide Hills Council. That is region 4.

Since the financial year 2015-16, when the expenditure on emergency services in region 4 was \$221 million, it is now projected that, in year 2016-17, there will be a reduction of expenditure back to \$194.3 million, so that is a significant reduction of well over 10 per cent in money spent in region 4—the metropolitan area.



If we look at the other regions, which are obviously regional South Australia, region 1 is the areas of the cities and towns of Berri, Goolwa, Kadina, Loxton, Millicent, Mount Barker, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Naracoorte, Nuriootpa, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Renmark, Tanunda, Victor Harbor and Whyalla. I have always made the assumption that they are towns that have an MFS presence, but that is not the case because I certainly know in my home town of Millicent there is no MFS presence.

Notwithstanding that, region 1 comprises major regional centres, and the expenditure in region 1 on direct emergency services has gone from \$27 million, in the last financial year, to a projected \$31 million. In the financial year prior to the last financial year, it was only \$18.5 million, so over two years the expenditure on emergency services in those towns has gone from \$18.5 million to \$31.3 million.

In region 2, which is the rest of regional South Australia not included in the two regions I have already referred to or not included in the unincorporated areas of South Australia, the expenditure has gone from \$10.7 million, two years ago, to \$18.2 million to \$52.1 million, so over two years it has gone up by a factor of 500 per cent. I do not know where the money has been spent, but it is not in my part of the state. I would guarantee that there has not been a 500 per cent increase in the expenditure in rural South Australia.

The reality is that I suspect that the books have been cooked because the amount of emergency services levy raised in rural South Australia, because it is a property-based tax, has increased dramatically. I think the books are being cooked to try to justify the huge increase in the levy take from rural South Australia. I would like to see the Economic and Finance Committee of this parliament undertake a much closer investigation into exactly where the money has been spent.

I can tell the house that at the estimates committee last year I asked questions of the Minister for Emergency Services, and his answer was we should ask them of the Treasurer because the numbers come out of Treasury. I had some questions asked of the Treasurer and all he did was repeat the numbers. Both answers were unsatisfactory. I do not believe the figures that have been published in this report. I do not believe they accurately reflect the figures, and that is not the committee's fault: it is the information that has been provided to the committee. I wish that the committee would investigate it further and get to the bottom of it because I think there is a need for that to happen.

Let me come to another point that has been raised by the previous speaker, the member for Colton, about how he would love to see the rebate reinstated, if only the commonwealth would come back and reinstate the payments to the health budget. Let me read into the *Hansard* what the Bevan and Abraham show put on the record on 24 May. This is from the ABC's Fact Check. I never thought that the ABC was on the side of the Liberal Party or the Coalition. They have never been great friends of ours, but this is what Fact Check said:

...16 hours ago they ran a ruler over the Coalition's promise of 'no cuts to health' and they say that promise has been delivered. This is just a synopsis but there's quite a long analysis of it—they say that the budget promise has been delivered—there have been no cuts to health. Budget documents released throughout the Coalition's term show health spending increased above the pace of inflation and population growth year on year in 2013/14 and 2014/15. Spending on health was projected to increase significantly above the CPI and population growth in 2015/16.

The ABC's Fact Check says that there have been no commonwealth cuts to health in South Australia. There is another quote that talks about the future funds that our Treasurer claims have been cut. The Fact Check says:

But the changes are not due to begin until July 2017 and it is far from certain that the Gillard promises would ever have been fulfilled because they were far into the future and never budgeted for.

Something cannot be taken away if it was never given in the first place.

That is from the ABC's Fact Check unit. We have been lied to. We have been lied to by a government that has made certain claims about federal cuts to South Australia and they have never occurred. Indeed, GST payments to South Australia have increased dramatically over the last couple of years. This state is receiving half a billion dollars more than it expected, but what the Treasurer tried to argue on that program on Tuesday morning a fortnight ago was that the money coming to South Australia was not health funding.

Does the Treasurer want the federal government to say, 'We will give you some specific funding. We will cut your GST payments and make it specific to health, and will you then be satisfied'? The reality is that the decision to cut the \$90 million rebate on the emergency services levy was based on a lie, and the lie has been shown up by the ABC Fact Check.

The reality is that this government was always going to cut the rebate. Indeed, they made contact with the company that does the IT work that sets up the program for the sending out of the notices before that federal budget back in 2014 even came down. They had started the process to cut the rebate. I remember a question being asked in the house and the Treasurer confirmed that. I remember saying 'snap' at the time.

This is an outrageous thing that this government has done. As the member for Colton said, there should be a cost across the board for everybody to pay for this so that we enjoy a high level of emergency services. This government has transferred a lot of that cost to the people who are not actually receiving the service, and that is people that I represent in rural—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member's time has expired.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** That is a great pity, Deputy Speaker, because I would like to say more.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is unfortunate. The member for Light.

**Mr Whetstone:** This will be good.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:07):** Actually, it will be good; thank you. It is unfortunate that some of the members of the committee on that side and members in this place who are not members of the committee did not actually bother reading the *Hansard* of the committee. Not only did they not read the *Hansard* but they did not actually read the answers to the questions asked by their own members.

The member for MacKillop raised the question about the increase in the expenditure, that country and regional areas had been duded. That question was actually asked by Mr Knoll, the member for Schubert, and it was answered as well. The explanation is this—

**Mr Whetstone:** Was it answered though?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** It was answered.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Davenport is already on one warning.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** It was answered by Mr Jackman. If the member for Davenport had bothered reading before he opened his mouth he would see the answer.

**Mr Whetstone:** Is that why you are still a minister?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** That's correct, and that's why you are still in opposition.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is on one warning and I will not hesitate to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Chaffey, you are already on one warning and I will not hesitate to name you again. The Speaker drew your attention today—

**Mr Duluk:** You have to sit down to say that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! You are warned for the second time, member for Davenport.

**Mr Whetstone:** What about over there? She is standing up to interject.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I can't hear them; I can hear you. The Speaker has asked—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Speaker has asked you all today to comply with standing orders 131 and 142, and I insist that you do that now.

**Mr Whetstone:** And Muriel does matter.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** She will matter more to you in a minute if you are out the door. You can go and read all about her. The member for Light.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** When the member for Schubert asked a question, he asked that very question which the member for MacKillop actually raised, and it was quite clear. The answer provided by both Mr Raymond, the Treasury official, and Mr Jackman, the SAFECOM chief executive officer was as follows:

...SAFECOM has gone through and tried to do a re-evaluation of where the expenditure, especially some of the head office expenditure, is actually spent.

For example, because training, until recent times, was actually all provided by head office, it was all charged to head office, but a lot of that training is actually for volunteers out in the regions. They have actually allocated the cost of that training for those people in the regions where they live, which is appropriate. A whole range of other expenditure has now been properly allocated. In fact, Mr Jackman says:

The accounting teams have actually gone through in areas such as the aerial resources that Greg has on call and tried to split it out a lot more specifically.

Previous figures were inaccurate to the extent that they were not showing the true expenditure in the regions. They have gone through it and through proper accounting, which will be audited by the Auditor-General, and showed that a lot more has been spent in the regions.

One of the criticisms was that the ESL is being collected out in the regions but not spent in the regions. Quite rightly, the CEO has gone through it to make sure that the income is matched against the expenditure. The explanation is quite simple; there is no mystery to it. In fact, it is good practice to make sure that you match up the incomes and the expenditure, and particularly, that you allocate expenditure where it is incurred.

The other point the member for Schubert made was that somehow this is a 4 per cent increase rather than a 1½ per cent increase which is really just a nonsense. The reality is that the ESL is set in the same way council rates are set. It is exactly the same process. You work out what you need to expend, you look at what other fixed income you have from other sources of income, and then the gap is filled by the varying amount, by general rates for councils or in this case by the ESL, which is applied across the state according to a rate in the dollar.

**Mr Whetstone:** Wealth tax.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Well, if you are saying your council rates are a wealth tax, so be it because they are calculated in the same way and on the same basis. What this means is that it is a \$4 increase for the median property value in metropolitan Adelaide. More importantly, this year, it also represents a modest decrease for rural and regional South Australians in regions 1 or 2 as appropriate.

The regions are: region 1 is a range of country townships, region 4 is essentially the city areas and then what is in between is region 2—all the other rural areas. You will note that there is a reduction in actual revenue expected from those two regions, so in this financial year 2016-17, we will be collecting less from rural and regional South Australia than we did in this financial year, which is very important.

The second thing is that all of it is actually spent on emergency services, bar the amounts that are actually concessions. Because under the act every dollar collected for emergency services has to be spent on emergency services, any concessions given, like pensioner concessions, cannot come from the emergency services fund itself, but are provided by general revenue, so the other forms of taxation provide for that. Those discounts for regional areas represent somewhere between 20 to 90 per cent in regional areas depending whether the landowner owns their property. In addition, there are also pensioner concessions.

I would also like to highlight where some of this extra money is being spent this year. Some \$9.3 million will be spent over the next four years to accelerate the government's fire truck replacement program as well as funding the retrofitting of safety systems to existing fire appliances to provide burn-over technology including water spray deluge systems and in-cab breathing systems. Additionally, the funding will see three new CFS appliances added to the fleet and 30 CFS appliances retrofitted with safety systems in 2016-17 alone.

Over the next four years, \$6.2 million will be spent to ensure ongoing provision of trainers for CFS and SES volunteers. I am acutely aware of the importance of providing accessible training for those who want to serve our community, so we need to make sure they are properly trained. Also over the next four years, \$5.5 million will be spent to enhance SES flood response and incident management capabilities, and that is about making sure we have the necessary data and can plan and also respond to situations when floods occur. There is also \$4.6 million over four years to ensure SAFECOM can continue to provide key emergency management support functions, including volunteer support, work health and safety, public information, procurement support, etc.

This is something which is very important for the regions: \$2 million over the next four years will be provided to fund the continuation of the Zone Emergency Risk Management System (ZERMS), the committee of which, last time I looked, was chaired by the CEO of the Barossa Council, from memory. I do not think that has changed in recent times. That money is used in the regions to make sure that various agencies, including local government, do the planning and preparation work for their regions to plan for and respond to major incidents. That is very important in relation to making sure that we minimise any danger from a fire or flood, etc.

In addition, funds also go to Surf Life Saving South Australia; \$4 million will be provided. That was an election commitment in 2014, and that money will continue. Also, there will be money to Volunteer Marine Rescue SA. In this coming financial year, \$1.2 million will go into Volunteer Marine Rescue. There are about 1,200 to 1,400 volunteers in Volunteer Marine Rescue. It is probably the one volunteer group which perhaps does not have the profile of the others, but they do very important work along our coastline to make sure that people who go out to sea are safe.

I have met a number of those rescue squads and they do a wonderful job. They are probably the least resourced group because they had, until recently, half a person allocated (half a resource) to manage them from the SES and the rest is all volunteer work. They do a great job in that. There is also some money to SA Police, Ambulance, DEWNR, Shark Beach Patrol, State Rescue Helicopter, etc. These are all things that require money in emergency situations.

I would also like to raise a couple of other things the member for Schubert tried to suggest. Firstly about the reform process, the figures he gave actually are quite incorrect. He clearly was not even listening to the answers that were provided to him by Mr Jackman. In the period of June, the additional expenditure from the old reform office to the new continuing improvement program which was started by Mr Jackman and the CEOs was a cost of \$16,333 in that month. It is in the record; people can read it for themselves.

Secondly, I would also like to mention that—it was very interesting that the member for Schubert decided not to mention it—in terms of the reform process and continuing process, Mr Jackman made it very clear that both processes are leading to major savings and improvements to services. For whatever reason, the member for Schubert neglected—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Well, you could have asked questions.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Time has expired.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Deputy Speaker, I actually lost a minute to the interjections.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I did so.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I may have to insist that you save that for a grievance if you have extra, unfortunately. Are you standing up, member for Morphett? Trying to attract my attention?

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** I am—waving, not drowning.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** In that case, I will have to call you.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:18):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. The emergency services levy was introduced by a former Liberal government. It was a very good initiative. There were remissions put in place because the basic argument was put that, because your house might burn down but the land is still there, the land retains its capital value. That is perhaps a very simplistic expression of the argument that was put, but that is why the remissions were put in place: to give South Australians a fair go.

What this government has done by removing these remissions is impose a wealth tax, an extra land tax, a levy, a charge, on South Australian taxpayers who are already doing it very, very tough. The cost of living in South Australia is very high. The bit that I find really despicable is how they are using the CFS and SES volunteers and our MFS firefighters as human shields to try to protect themselves from the real shame that is involved in the gouging of South Australians through their emergency services levy.

The member for MacKillop points out, quite correctly, that this state is receiving more money for health and education than it has ever received. There is no reason that this government would be imposing this massive increase on the ESL on South Australians other than the fact that, for the last 14 going on 15 years, they have mismanaged the state budget and we are now in a state of despair, with the highest deficit and the highest debt we have ever seen.

They have spent the rivers of gold that were coming in the early days, and now they are saying, 'Well, we've got to pay for these services: the user has to pay.' They have been paying. They have been paying in the past and they will continue to pay in the future. However, with a future Liberal government you will find that there will be balanced budgets—there will be budget surpluses.

Where else can it happen, as it happened in the past, that the emergency services levy is topped up out of general revenue? I read this week that as well as collecting funding for emergency services from the fire service levies and the insurance levies, the New South Wales government then put in another \$90 million on top out of general revenue. They did not go and slug the users of their services for that extra \$90 million because they know they have already paid. They have paid through their other taxes, rates and levies that they are already paying in other areas. The government has managed the budget there. They have produced a budget that was balanced and had surpluses, and then they were able to reinvest that in the areas that are a principal state government responsibility.

You do not keep gouging at the taxpayers for more and more because of your own incompetence, yet that is what we are seeing over and over and over again. I refer to the *Hansard* dated Tuesday 24 May. I was absolutely staggered to hear the Treasurer say that the emergency services levy is going down. He said that if you live in regional area 1 and you have a residential property in regional area 1, you will receive a 1.3 per cent reduction in your ESL bill. If you live in regional area 2, you will receive a 1.1 per cent reduction in your ESL bill.

According to the briefing documents of this year and last year, the prescribed variable rate has actually gone down. It has gone down from .001283 to .001266, but then if you look at other areas of the report it shows how property values have increased. So, there has been no real reduction in the take in the emergency services levy. In fact, it has gone up. What we are seeing here is a government that is using volunteers as a human shield to try to protect themselves from their own mismanagement; criticism about their inability to provide services which are core government services.

When you see CFS sheds out there that have no toilets, no wash facilities and no change facilities for firefighters, particularly now that there are male and female firefighters, it is a disgrace. We hear that money is going to be spent on upgrading firetrucks and retrofitting firetrucks. Our CFS volunteers deserve more than that. They deserve to be valued to the extent where they are not

having to still go out and raise money to do additional training, to do the training that they know they need to serve their communities.

The SES men and women who do so much work for us in floods and storms, and other rescues and searches across this state, deserve better than to be in old sheds. You see the occasional new shed, and there is a lovely new one being built out at Salisbury. Congratulations to the Salisbury SES on the new facilities they are getting next to the new MFS station out there, but we see so many other examples where facilities are still substandard, and it should not be the case.

I remember that as a CFS volunteer at Happy Valley we got a new truck—fantastic! The fact that we had to cut the concrete to dig the floor out so that the truck would fit into the station was not really ideal. Yet we still see that scenario being presented in South Australia in 2016. Some of these outdated and old open-backed two-fours being used by CFS brigades are going to be replaced with bigger vehicles. They are higher, heavier and wider, and they do not fit. I suppose the excuse is, 'We'll delay the delivery of those.' That cannot happen. You cannot keep our volunteers hanging on.

This government knows that our volunteers will never walk away from their communities, and they are abusing that sacrifice made by our volunteers. Their families see their loved ones go off into danger—life-threatening situations—for days at a time in some cases, particularly when they travel interstate to help our fellow Australians. They see their loved ones getting up in the middle of the night and then going to work very tired the next day. The employers who back our volunteers deserve the plaudits they get in spades—but receive in very limited amounts by this government—because they save this state millions and millions of dollars.

The service that is being freely given by our volunteers could never be paid for if we had to pay for the fire service, so providing the training, providing the facilities, providing the appliances and equipment that volunteers need is so necessary. It should never, ever be taken for granted, and our volunteers should not be used as a human shield.

Regarding MFS firefighters, the other day I had the pleasure of going to a graduation ceremony for 18 new firefighters. They were looking forward to getting out on the trucks, and 'putting the wet stuff on the red stuff' as they say. They were looking forward to doing that, and good on them. My father was in the MFS for many years, and I should put on the record that I am still a registered CFS firefighter and I turn out whenever I can. There is no conflict of interest; trust me, there is no conflict.

I will do everything I possibly can to make sure that our CFS and MFS firefighters and emergency workers get everything they need to do their job. They cannot have everything they want, but certainly we want to give them everything they need, and we should be able to do that with the funding the state government has received over the years.

We need to make sure that our farmers, who also supplement this, when they are paying the emergency services levy on their farm firefighting units get some rebate. I would like to see that completely removed from the farm firefighting units but, no, we do not see that. We see Treasury saying, 'Oh, well, we would have to put the emergency services levy up somewhere else.' Well, no, if you managed the budget you would be able to do that and give these guys and girls a bit of appreciation for what they do.

Getting back to our MFS firefighters, I understand that a new EB is being negotiated. Eighty-five per cent of the MFS budget is in wages, so it will be interesting to see how minister Malinauskas handles this, as a former union organiser, to see that they do get a fair go and a fair outcome. My father was heavily involved in the unions and the MFS for many years, so it is certainly not anti-UFU. It is a matter of making sure that we value our firefighters in the MFS and give them the very best reward for the job. They are the ones who are running into the danger when most people are running away, and they are the ones who put their lives on the line to make our state a safer place.

We need to make sure the organisations behind the volunteers, the CFS and SES, as well as our paid firefighters, the MFS, are able to work the way they should. That is imperative. We have seen the deep and savage repeated cuts into SAFECOM over the years, and the Ernst & Young review showed this: the deep and savage cuts to the SAFECOM budget were having an effect on volunteers was laid out in the May 2014 report. This government seems to have ignored that.

We need to make sure that we continue to value our volunteers. It is so important. I think there are still some questions about the way we split the ESL into various spends and about why the police budget is able to draw \$20 million from the ESL. I find that a bit of an issue. Why can they not have that out of the police budget? Sure, the STAR Force does some search and rescue, but so do the SES, the MFS and the CFS. We need to value our volunteers and make sure that we spend this money where it needs to be spent—that is, on the volunteers. Do not dare use them as a human shield because, through your own government incompetence, you cannot raise the money and you cannot balance the budgets.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:28):** I would like to speak on the 19<sup>th</sup> report of the Economic and Finance Committee in regard to the emergency services levy. This is obviously an issue that affects some more than others, and the government speakers have highlighted the issues: that is, that the remissions that were in place are now affecting a certain set of people, those people with an average household (and an average household is about \$430,000 here in South Australia). They face a \$268 emergency services levy bill.

However, what about the people who are a little more affluent, people who, in some instances, have a million-dollar property? They are in line for a \$556 ESL bill. With all the wisdom that came from the former minister and other members, what about people who are asset rich, finance poor, farmers who have large properties who are now going to be hit with astronomical ESL increases? They have farms, large landholdings with a shed and a house.

I listened to the member for Colton, who said that he would like to see universal coverage at a universal cost. Would that not be something to behold? Imagine if everyone in South Australia paid a universal cost. I bet we would hear a lot of yelping and squealing from government members on the other side of the chamber today. At the moment, this is just another wealth tax that has been introduced in South Australia in recent times. It is the third increase in the emergency services levy over consecutive years. The latest, at 1.5 per cent, is lower than the previous two.

I remember listening to the Treasurer saying that it would have no superficial impact on people in South Australia. The Treasurer might have been eating Polly Waffles for lunch because he certainly was not putting the facts in place. The ESL tax does not just hit home owners; it is also levied on sporting clubs, community organisations, churches and independent schools. I know a number of sporting organisations that are absolutely livid at this government's attitude about the emergency services levy. They are absolutely livid, and they have said that they are in some ways asset rich, but they are staffed or supported by volunteers.

We heard the member for Light talking about volunteers. Imagine how you would feel if you were a volunteer, a CFS, SES, or emergency services volunteer. You are giving up your time, and your employer is giving up his or her business time so that they can go out and attend emergencies, such as fires, vehicle crashes, flooding, life-saving, police, the lot. All of a sudden, they are getting an increased bill as well. They are not only giving up their time, they are not only volunteering, they are not only being supported by their employer but they are also going to cop it in the back pocket because they are going to get an increase in the ESL.

I think it is absolutely outrageous, but there is good news. If the South Australian taxpayers want the ESL remissions reinstated, they should vote Liberal at the next state election. Vote Liberal because we have already put out a policy that states that we will reintroduce the remission.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr WHETSTONE:** People over there are looking and no doubt saying, 'Oh, that's not a bad initiative. It's more money in my pocket. Maybe I'll vote Liberal.' The ESL increases have added to challenges already facing the everyday cost of living. The everyday high cost of living is something that every person in South Australia faces under this current government. Every day there is an increase in the cost of living, whether it is from the ESL, some form of tax, levies, reintroduction of something that is going to get a little bit higher, or the NRM levy—again, another wealth tax.

I would like to say that volunteer firefighters are some of the hardest hit by these levy increases. Volunteers in general are the gift horse whose mouth this government is looking into at the moment. It is absolutely outrageous. I think that the Treasurer has made a point that he will

continue to increase the ESL. He is going to continue to increase it until the 2018 election so that we will uphold our pledge, our promise, one of our policies that we will reinstate the remission. It will cost us more money but, mark my words, we will reinstate it. We will look after the South Australian taxpayers who are being absolutely targeted by this current government.

I like the style of the member for Colton's universal coverage. It gives equity back to people who are propping up this government's lame inability to look after their own budget, and that is why we are seeing this cost shifting exercise. We are seeing a government that cannot manage its own budget, so they are again introducing another tax, another levy, another cost to the cost of living.

It is making South Australia less competitive. For those businesses that do want to be a part of our economy, it is just making it harder and harder for them to live in South Australia. I say, shame on you, government. This increase in the ESL again is another hit to the hip pocket. It is another distraction for businesses that want to start up in South Australia. I know that the member for Hammond is dying to get up on his feet.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I hope it will not be necessary for me to defend the member for Hammond.

**An honourable member:** Never!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:35):** Thank you for your protection once again, Madam Deputy Speaker. I rise to speak to the 90<sup>th</sup> report of the Economic and Finance Committee, entitled the Emergency Services Levy 2016-17. As has been indicated by the member for Chaffey and others on this side, this is purely a land tax—purely a land tax.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Stop the clock.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Chuck them out, ma'am.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, we will just wait until everyone has finished. Okay, start the clock.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. This is just a land tax, a pure land tax. What gets me is this: how many events will we have until we are taxed into total oblivion? This is tied directly into fire events, so what happens if, God forbid, we have 10 major fire events over summer? We will just keep getting hit and hit and hit, as the Treasurer sees fit, just to keep belting people with the levy. It does not take into account the valuable work of our CFS, of which others on this side and I are members, or the work of our Metropolitan Fire Service volunteers and our State Emergency Service volunteers, who all do vital work in the emergency services field.

Around the Rockleigh area, about three electorates merge—my electorate, the member for Schubert's electorate and the member for Kavel's electorate. It looks like finally, after a farmer has been basically hosting—

**Mr Knoll:** I've just got the email.

**Mr PEDERICK:** You've got the email right there—a fire truck, an old local fire rig at his farm, they will be getting a new fire truck and, hopefully, they will be getting a new fire shed. I must say that I have had excellent discussions with minister Malinauskas from the other place. He is a very approachable minister, and I commend him for that. We have had some good discussions offline and directly, and he personally made sure that I received the appropriate correspondence. I certainly appreciate that; it does not happen all the time.

This process has been ongoing. We are all aware that there have been about four or five very serious fires in the Rockleigh area only in the last few years. With the resilience of the community, and the resilience of the firefighting services, and obviously the aircraft that came in as well, all but one dwelling was saved, and that was due to a sudden wind change. It was magnificent work. I drove around the area not long after the fire had occurred and I just take my hat off to them.



I certainly learned where a lot of the hidden driveways were in Rockleigh. 'Rockleigh' almost sums it up—it is a very rocky and hilly area. I really do commend the people who put everything on the line, put their lives on the line that day, to preserve life and save property.

They deserve the proper facilities but, from what I gather, when the department was doing all of this work and found the site for the Rockleigh fire shed, someone forgot to do the native title check. You would have thought, with the number of people in government departments, tens of thousands of them, someone would have made the right call and got that check going a long, long time ago, as soon as the site had been identified. From what I understand, finding a new location is the reason why it is being held up, and I am hoping that work is being fast-tracked because this community, like every other community in this state, deserves good facilities for our volunteers because they have—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Are you blokes alright? They have had some major fires, but we have seen what has happened at Sampson Flat and also at Pinery with the aftermath of those fires and, sadly, the tragedy of losing two people in the Pinery fire and also some terrible injuries from fire. I hate to think what it is like to be burnt in that situation, as the fire goes over the top of you because you are doing your best and you just cannot get out of the way. I also look at where I think some major blunders were made in regard to Cherryville, just at the back of the Adelaide Hills. I think it is in the member for Bragg's electorate.

**Ms Chapman:** No.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Anyway, it is up in the Hills. It was interesting that the planes were not called in. From what I understand, there has been a policy change in more recent years where the planes go up not just for asset management, which is a good thing because they are the first responders that can get to that fire front, whether it is in scrub or infrastructure, and put those initial doses out, then the land crews can come in and pull the fire up.

We had all sorts of excuses why the planes were not deployed, and I think it just got as simple as this: it was a budget decision because it was on the cusp of the season. They had demobbed the planes for firefighting from Aerotech, who I believe have the contract, and the government obviously made a decision that, 'No, we will not pull out emergency procedures and get those planes back in the air.' It would have taken a minimum of one or two hours to get those planes changed over, back into firefighting mode. I know that the pilots and the ground crews would have done all they could to get them up as quickly as possible.

We had all the excuses under the sun on talkback radio about why they did not go up and why they should not have gone up. What a joke! Yes, planes are not the be-all and end-all, but they are a large part of it. I know families who have been saved by having water and foam dropped on their house while they are hiding in a bathroom because they have been caught without a chance to get out of their property. If it was not for the planes dropping water, who would know what the outcome would have been. It is absolutely vital that all of our firefighting equipment is activated appropriately, especially when we see that emergency services funding of about \$290 million goes into this, and the vast majority of this is funded from the emergency services levy/land tax.

We heard the member for Morphett talking about farm firefighting vehicles, which are absolutely essential. I had a farm fire going back about 16 or 18 years ago, and I only had about an 800-litre fire tank. I had the house and shearing shed under threat and, if it were not for locals and the CFS, I may not have had anything left. I have now graduated since that fire to 4,600 litres on the back of an old Ellis trailer built in the early 1900s, and that is a great source of water. You can hook that up to any kind of tractor. You put it onto a big four-wheel drive, and you can go wherever you like. You have a lot of water, and you can get in place and also pump from that to CFS units if you need to.

People have all sorts of farm firefighting units. Whether they be small 200-litre, 500-litre or 1,000-litre tanks, they are absolutely vital on a fire front for, in a lot of ways, being the first responders and sometimes the only responders. We have had fires where there have been so many spot fires with lightning strikes that all of the CFS were tied up 30 kilometres away. I happened to be on

Kangaroo Island when a fire was lit by lightning on our place, and I was panicking and trying to monitor it from several hundred kilometres away. If it were not for the good neighbours who just blew in and blew it out, and grabbed my fire unit as well, we would have had a much bigger problem.

We need to respect all the people in our emergency services. I take my hat off to them all and I take my hat off to the farm firefighting people. As the member for Chaffey said, if you want to make a saving to your budget, and I urge Labor members over the other side to think about this, vote Liberal. It is the only way to go. If you want to save money in this state, the only way to go—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** I might get a new roll of Liberal voters over here yet. You can only live in hope!

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** You can drive his water tanker.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes, you can come home and drive my water tanker and I will give you free instruction. But I am serious—the people of this state need to know that if they want relief from the emergency services levy the only way to do it is to vote Liberal.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (16:45):** I think we have debated this excellent report long enough. I want to thank everybody who has made a contribution to this year's emergency services levy report from the Economic and Finance Committee. I will not go over all the contributions and I do not intend to use my full 10 minutes or whatever it is. I enjoyed everyone's contribution, particularly the contributions from the member for Light and the member for Colton.

The member for MacKillop says that he would have liked to see the committee digging down into the details of some of the financial information that he claims the department either erroneously or deliberately used to mislead us. The member for Schubert was at that hearing, the member for Bright was at that hearing and the member for Hartley was at that hearing, and, as far as I know, none of those good members did what the member for MacKillop claims should have happened. Perhaps he needs to have a chat with his colleagues and coordinate before the next hearing and perhaps we might tease out some of the information he is after.

In any case, I commend the report. It is an excellent report full of detail. I for one believe the figures provided by the department until I am shown some evidence that they are in fact false, as the member for MacKillop claims. I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

#### **NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LEVY PROPOSALS 2015-16**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.W. Key:

That the 101<sup>st</sup> to the 105<sup>th</sup> reports of the committee, on the Natural Resources Management Board Levy Proposals 2015-16, be noted.

(Continued from 1 July 2015.)

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (16:49):** I would like to thank members for their cooperation and the whips for organising this. This is the Natural Resources Committee's reports Nos 101 to 105 from last year, the 2015-16 report. Although it was 11 months ago, I would like to thank very much the members for their contributions on the previous natural resources levy report. I move that the report, as detailed under item 10, be noted.

Motion carried.

#### **NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: KANGAROO ISLAND NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT REGION**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.W. Key:

That the 100<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Kangaroo Island NRM Region Fact-Finding Visit, 5-7 November 2014, be noted.

(Continued from 18 March 2015.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:51):** I rise to finalise my comments briefly on the 100<sup>th</sup> report of the Natural Resources Committee, entitled Kangaroo Island NRM Region Fact-Finding Visit. In closing with a couple of comments, I would like to commend the Natural Resources Committee for what it does in its regional visits, going around the whole state to look at what is going on with natural resources. That is why I found it most interesting that the Premier needed to actually write to the Natural Resources Committee so that they could at least do one regional visit when it is common knowledge that they do regional visits as part of their remit. That is their role and I commend the whole committee for doing that.

I certainly commend the committee for going over to Kangaroo Island and seeing what is happening over there with issues related to land use, weed management and the water management situation, as well as natural resources in all senses. As I said, I would like to commend the committee for their work in going around the state, looking at regions and seeing what is going on. As I indicated earlier today, I do not support the outrageous levy rises, but I do support the good work that this committee does in actually getting out there and having a look at what is going on.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (16:52):** Again, this is an older report from our committee. In fact, it refers to a visit that we made in 2014. I would like to acknowledge the most recent comments that have been made by the member for Finniss about some of the issues that Kangaroo Island people suffer from, and also the fact that he has a small natural resources committee in the electorate of Finniss and then a large natural resources committee, and the difficulties he has in trying to make sure that all the issues that come under that banner actually get dealt with.

I think it is really important that we do try to visit the different natural resources regions in their region, as opposed to only hearing from them in Parliament House, so I commend the work that was done on Kangaroo Island on our regional fact-finding visit and ask that this report be noted.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: VETERANS' MENTAL HEALTH PRECINCT TRANSFORMING HEALTH PROJECT**

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 546<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Veterans' Mental Health Precinct Transforming Health Project, be noted.

(Continued from 25 May 2016.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:54):** I had just opened and identified two areas of potential conflict of interest on the veterans' mental health project, and I had sought leave to continue my remarks. Members will not be surprised when I express my outrage at the government's decision to progress the \$15 million veterans' mental health project away from the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park, which currently accommodates the provision of mental health services for returned veterans, to the Glenside campus of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, formerly the Glenside Hospital, which has been raped already by this government.

Members should understand what has happened so far. The government has sold off 40 per cent of the Glenside campus site. It has stripped naked the current site and rebuilt the hospital in the corner. It has crammed into that the drug and alcohol services and crammed right next to it services otherwise known as halfway accommodation. Apparently, some of those are to be tipped out to accommodate the proposed redevelopment of the PTSD clinic, renamed the veterans' mental health project.

So far, the government has also demolished two significant premises that are under heritage listing. It has ripped up hundreds of trees on a site that has over 2,000 trees. The Massada school next door has been sold off to a property developer, when the government clearly had an opportunity to buy it. Renewal SA is currently preparing the property adjacent to it along Conyngham Street for sale. A portion, including the old Z Ward, has been sold off to Beach Petroleum, an occupier of property adjacent to that facility.

What we have now is a tiny area allocated for mental health and a large portion of the area currently occupied by a facility in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, namely, the

South Australian Film Corporation, when the heart was ripped out of this site and transferred to them. It is half empty most of the time because it has now become a corporation to distribute grants rather than make movies. To demonstrate its insistence on trying to get the financial benefit to prop up their bottom line in this premises, the government has even denied the local Massada school, dog clubs and others access to the oval which, of course, has had mountains of dirt on it for a while and now is to be covered with accommodation in a private housing development.

The government's miserable approach to the provision of care for veterans is demonstrated by the fact that they were prepared to spend \$42 million to upgrade a facility for the SA Film Corporation and a measly \$15 million (and I think they allocated an extra \$2 million) for the mental health of our veterans. It shows the disgraceful disregard they have for this most important group in the community which is ever-growing due to the continuing return of men and women from active service in conflicts on our behalf to protect our way of life. They put their own lives on the line, returning broken and needing our important services, and \$15 million for a relocation is the best they will get.

The government, of course, has decided to sell off the Repat hospital to a sister company of the RSL for aged-care facilities. It is clearly still going to be there. There is no reason why they could not allow veterans to stay there next to other acute health services. Ward 18 was completely rebuilt for civilian services. The facility is less than 10 years old. It is a magnificent facility and it ought to have been available for the veterans of South Australia, rather than their being crammed into the back end of the Glenside campus site with almost no room round them.

I think it is a disgusting treatment of these people who are getting a 24-bed facility at Glenside. That is minimal money. They will be lucky to be able to refurbish those parts of the buildings that will be salvaged from that part of the site. It will also accommodate services for research. It is what I call the skinny version, with the outpatients for all the drug and alcohol services, of course, crammed into the health site, without acute care and amenities.

Perhaps the final concern I have is in respect of women returned veterans. They are, apparently, to have a swipe card separation from the male patients with no external or internal private area of their own. I find that shameful, and I am absolutely appalled that there has been an acquiescence to a development where they are going to be crammed into this facility.

Other very well-known and highly regarded specialists, who are the heroes in this debate—people like Professor Warren Jones and Dr Robert Black, specialists and neurologists—have fought for this. Let me say that there are plenty of other people over the last 14 years I have been here who have come out and fought for this site for the mental health patients of this state. One of them I know particularly had his contract severed from providing public mental health services as a psychiatrist of this state when he spoke publicly and gave evidence to an inquiry in this parliament.

It is disgraceful—absolutely disgraceful. He said to me, 'I do this for two days a week because I feel a commitment to public health that's required for the mental health of people in this state. If the government don't want me, fine. There is nothing I can do about it. I can make plenty of money out of private practice,' and that is what he does today, five days a week instead of three days a week. How stupid has the government been in dismissing the wonderful services that have been offered by these people?

I wish to commend the member for Chaffey and the member for Finnis for having the courage to submit a dissenting report on this matter because clearly they understand that not only is it bad practice but it is the indecent haste with which they are throwing these people into the back end of a site at Glenside, away from the acute services they need and the specialists have clearly identified as being important.

This government has left a stinking legacy in respect of the provision of mental health services, in this case for veterans' affairs. They have imposed a wretched decision upon those who have served us and gone to the front line to fight for us. They have come back damaged and they expect and are entitled to our support for their recovery and a place or some precinct of sanctuary in which they can recover. They have been treated in such an indecent way by this government.

Finally, it has left forever an indelible stain on the public record of the Minister for Veterans' Affairs, who is the local member covering the Repatriation General Hospital, and he should hang his head in shame at his failure to protect those who have gone out there and fought for us.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (17:02):** I will not hold the house up for long. One of the things that impressed me—and I am on the Public Works Committee; I do not often speak about many of the references, but I feel compelled to speak about this one—is that what was notable through the presentations that were provided to the committee was the significant work that was undertaken in engaging various people who are connected in various ways with the management of veterans' affairs and, in particular in this case, mental health issues.

I have never seen such a comprehensive consultation and communication, but it was more than just communication: it was actually getting feedback from those people involved in various areas of the management and delivery of the services that are required by our veterans. I think it was a credit to those people who have done it.

We know that in its various forms Transforming Health is an emotional issue. We just saw the contribution of the member for Bragg, and some might say that was pretty emotional. I would say it was probably more political than emotional, and far from productive, and that is her. She talks about her 14 years being here and what she has seen over that period of time. Well, I can tell you that it is pretty hard sitting on this side of the chamber seeing her over the last 14 years contribute in the way she does, politicising every aspect of every issue that comes here. If she continues to do that, I just think they and she may spend another 14 years sitting on that side of the chamber.

The presentations given to our committee were excellent. The committee was very sure that what is being provided there is something better than we have at the moment. As I have said, all aspects of Transforming Health—and this indeed is part of it—are an emotional subject but, if you have a look at the current Ward 17 that was built in the 1940s, it is clearly in need of redevelopment. It needs to be done in such a way that it meets the modern needs, the clinical needs, and the social needs of veterans, and the committee was convinced that is going to be the case.

What was also impressive with respect to the presentations was the wraparound services that are going to be provided to veterans, where there will be a variety of services provided that will meet the mental and health needs of veterans. I think that is a good thing, and I also think it is a very good thing when we see the existing site at the Repatriation Hospital where the RSL are involving themselves in what is going to be the management of that site.

I cite the example of RSL care that is provided by the RSL in Queensland and the work they are doing in providing services for veterans up there, whether it be in aged care or certain aspects of health and mental care. I am very glad that the government is engaging the RSL in such a way that we are going to utilise that precinct at the Repatriation Hospital for the further delivery of services that will be provided to our veterans.

We know there is a lot of work being undertaken by the RSL and others on certain aspects of supporting those veterans who suffer post-traumatic stress disorder. The Henley RSL, along with other RSL clubs, are having a march along Adelaide beaches to raise money and awareness for post-traumatic stress disorder and the Operation K9 program. There are also other fundraising events going on to raise money for this.

It is very interesting that in regard to those people who have served overseas representing Australia in a variety of areas many have come back from Vietnam, as we know, and also from our most recent conflicts in Afghanistan and Timor with post-traumatic stress disorder. So I urge everyone here to speak to their local RSL in South Australia, and you can go online at [www.gofundme.com/25rpss24](http://www.gofundme.com/25rpss24) or to any Bendigo Bank branch and provide some money for this worthwhile fundraising campaign to raise funds for advancing the health and wellbeing of those people who have represented and fought overseas as Australian soldiers and returned suffering from significant problems as they relate to post-traumatic stress disorder.

I wanted to get that plug in because I know that some people in this chamber—and, Madam Deputy Speaker, I know you are not one of them—are renowned for having what we call deep pockets but short arms, if that is the right terminology. They are pretty tight. They should put their

hand in their pocket and give some money to this good cause, instead of standing up here arguing about what the government is doing wrong in relation to the support that we provide for returned servicemen and women.

I did note one reasonable aspect of the member for Bragg's presentation, and it was actually raised by the committee—that is, how do we manage the aspect of women's mental health at that particular site. We were reassured by the people who presented to us that that is not only well and truly on the radar but we have processes in place with a view to managing it in an even more proper way as this precinct is built.

As I said earlier, it incorporates other health facilities and wraparound services that will be provided to those returned servicemen and women, and I think that is a good thing. There has been a lot of heat about Transforming Health, particularly a lot of heat about the Repatriation Hospital and the establishment of a health precinct at Glenside. I think the heat is going out. We have support from the RSL and we have support from others.

Whilst I know we will continue to have people marching every Tuesday or Monday or whatever it is, the 20 or 30 and sometimes seven or eight of them, marching through town saying, 'Save the Repatriation Hospital', it reminds me of the comments that were made about saving the RAH; the only way to really save the RAH was to pull it down and start again. I am not being disrespectful to anyone, but I actually say that the best way of ensuring we provide the best possible services for returned service men and women is to ensure that we utilise existing aspects of the Repatriation Hospital but also provide modern, new services that are sensitive to the needs of those returned service men and women.

I think the government is doing the right thing, and I wish those opposite would stop criticising this issue. The majority of people are now supporting this approach, in particular, to managing the needs of our returned service men and women.

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (17:10):** First, I would like to thank all those members who have contributed. I acknowledge the anxiety that some from the other side have expressed but, as the Chair of the Public Works Committee, I point out that this was a project we thoroughly interrogated, in particular on the location and the consultation process. If you look at the report I think you will find that it was an extremely extensive consultation process, very transparent, and with many layers of people involved and gathering their ideas.

To have the accusation laid that we will not be catering for women is something I find highly offensive as a woman myself, as well as on behalf of the other committee members. It is something we were all concerned about, and it was greatly considered. This is not simply just a \$15 million relocation exercise. This is an exercise to ensure that we have the best possible, most appropriate, most respectful facility for some of the men and women who are deserving of our support and concern, who go and serve on our behalf in many different conflicts overseas. To suggest we would give them anything less is a shame.

I think what those opposite are expressing, what we have heard over time, is fear of change. This is quite natural, fear of change is quite natural, but rest assured this is a project that has been supported by both parties. Although there was a minority report submitted—which members can all read—it was supported by all committee members, and it is certainly worthy of our support and our commitment. I would like to say that on the day we received the project we had a number of Save the Repat campaigners present, many of whom I have met with on a number of occasions. The Repat borders my electorate and I have never, ever shied away from the fact that I am there to support them. The Repat would close or would change, but I was always there to support them with their concerns.

Change is never an easy thing for some of us. I did get to speak with most of those Save the Repat campaigners who were present that day post our Public Works Committee meeting, and they were all supportive of the plans they had seen presented at that particular meeting. They liked what they saw, they liked the facility, they liked the difference between the modern, contemporary facility that was proposed for the Glenside site as compared to the older site at Ward 17.

While there is some sadness at moving out of Ward 17, I think there is also some sort of eagerness to see that contemporary site we will see at the Glenside campus. The Repat has served

our veterans and South Australians since the 1940s, and with that there have been some things that have progressed and some things that have not. Ward 17 is one of those things that has not had a lot of progression as far as its physical standing.

My previous work life began as a registered nurse, and I know that over the years there have been significant changes in our healthcare system. I have witnessed and been part of those significant changes. These people who are going to use the PTSD facility I think will be grateful. These people will see that the South Australian government has paid them the respect that they deserve when they see this new facility built. I commend this report, and I hope that with time everyone will support this project.

Motion carried.

#### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO THE SEXUAL REASSIGNMENT REPEAL BILL 2014**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Odenwalder:

That the report of the committee, on the Sexual Reassignment Bill 2004, be noted.

(Continued from 18 May 2016.)

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (17:15):** I welcome the opportunity to conclude my introductory remarks on this report on behalf of the committee. Significant health issues affecting the gender-diverse community were raised in the evidence and in submissions to the committee. We were concerned by the matters raised. The establishment of a multi-disciplinary clinic was suggested, and the committee accepted that this option should be considered.

The committee also considered the potential for a married person to invalidate a marriage by way of changing their legally recognised sex. The committee took the view that marriage should not be an impediment to obtaining a change of a person's legally recognised sex, taking account of individual rights and potential mental health issues, however, noting that South Australian Law must also be reconciled with commonwealth law. The committee acknowledged the issues faced by prisoners who are unable to access private medical care and it was of the view that prisoners would benefit from the provision of specialised, publicly funded medical services for the broader gender diverse community.

The potential for unlawful activity was also brought to the attention of the committee. The committee considered the need for providing notifications to other agencies upon the completion of the processing of applications relevant to any new regime; for example, notifying an agency of a change of a person's legally recognised sex. The Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Office is not currently required to notify other agencies of a change of a person's sex. The committee did not support the introduction of notifications in respect of a person changing sex, as privacy was the paramount concern.

The status of laws and recent law reform in other jurisdictions was also considered by the committee. In 2014, the ACT introduced the most recent Australian reforms removing the need for reassignment procedures to be carried out before a person's change of sex would be recognised by the ACT register of births along with the need for applicants to be unmarried. The committee also noted the significant reforms which have occurred in overseas jurisdictions in recent years.

The committee expresses its hope that the findings and recommendations set out in the report will contribute to the commencement of a process which addresses many of the concerns put to the committee during the course of this inquiry. The committee would like to thank the previous secretary, Mrs Jennifer Fitzgerald, the current committee secretary, Mr Matt Balfour, and the committee's research officer, Mr Ben Cranwell, for the helpful support provided to the committee throughout the conduct of this inquiry. I commend the report to the house.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (17:17):** I can only imagine what gender confusion is like. To question the fundamental nature of your being must be terrifying and extremely confusing. I have extreme sympathy for those who find themselves in this situation. I would like to thank the Legislative Review Committee because I think it came at this from a position of compassion and one

of seeking to gain a depth of understanding in what it was seeking to achieve. I have no doubt that we will be seeing legislation in this place to deal with this at some point in the future.

I would like to go through some of the recommendations and some of the report and what it talks about. It seems that the main recommendation coming out of the report is to remove the need for somebody who wishes to undergo sexual reassignment to appear before a magistrate and prove their new sexuality. I think that is a sensible move. It is a piece of red tape that is extremely unedifying and can be embarrassing, and it can also be a very difficult process for people to have to go through. Indeed, we should be treating this as much as possible as a medical situation as opposed to a legal situation. I think the comments in relation to removing the need to go to the Magistrates Court to approve applications is entirely sensible, and something that personally I would be happy to support. The member for Little Para said:

The submissions and evidence also criticised the need for the prior carrying out of reassignment procedures before a person satisfies the criteria allowing for an amendment of the register of births to occur.

That is something that I have been struggling with over the past days to understand. Again, I will make some other comments in relation to the difference between gender and sex. It is an issue that we have had to deal with in a couple of pieces of legislation, with the gender identity changes and also the parentage presumption changes that we have gone through. We need to be able to distinguish between when we are talking about sex and when we are talking about gender.

To that extent I would like to quote from a statement from the American College of Pediatricians. I will go through a little bit more about some of the things they say, but in relation to the difference between gender and sex I think what they say here clarifies what I think this house has been grappling with in some of the debates we have been having. They state:

No one is born with a gender. Everyone is born with a biological sex. Gender (an awareness and sense of oneself as male or female) is a sociological and psychological concept; not an objective biological one.

I think that makes sense. I think when we are talking about people's understanding and identity of themselves, that can have a much more diverse set of meanings and, indeed, can have a multiplicity of meanings. I understand that LGBTIQ is a term that is now used to cover off on the totality of gender diversity that people feel. Certainly, when it comes to that, I think it is entirely appropriate, but I struggle a little bit with the fact that we are dealing here with sexual reassignment, not gender reassignment, and I think we need to be cognisant of that fact. The American College of Pediatricians state:

Human sexuality is an objective biological binary trait: 'XY' and 'XX' are genetic markers of health—not genetic markers of a disorder. The norm for human design is to be conceived either male or female. Human sexuality is binary by design with the obvious purpose being the reproduction and flourishing of our species. This principle is self-evident. The exceedingly rare disorders of sex development...including but not limited to testicular feminization and congenital adrenal hyperplasia, are all medically identifiable deviations from the sexual binary norm, and are rightly recognized as disorders of human design. Individuals with DSDs do not constitute a third sex.

They then go on to say:

A person's belief that he or she is something they are not is, at best, a sign of confused thinking.

I think that is something that I do not necessarily agree with and am struggling to understand. They go on to say that there are children who suffer from what they call gender dysphoria:

Gender dysphoria...formerly listed as Gender Identity Disorder...is a recognized mental disorder in the most recent edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association...The psychodynamic and social learning theories of GD/GID have never been disproved.

Essentially what that is saying, I think, is that what we need to deal with here is more of a medical condition in terms of gender identity than, potentially, a legal one. They go on to say this—and this is something that I think will define my contribution to any legislation that comes before this place:

Puberty is not a disease and puberty-blocking hormones can be dangerous. Reversible or not, puberty-blocking hormones induce a state of disease—the absence of puberty—and inhibit growth and fertility in a previously biologically healthy child.

They continue:



According to the DSM-V, as many as 98% of gender confused boys and 88% of gender confused girls eventually accept their biological sex after naturally passing through puberty.

They then talk about puberty blockers as potentially creating issues down the track and can be:

...associated with dangerous health risks including but not limited to high blood pressure, blood clots, stroke and cancer.

Getting back to the report, it looks at and talks about when people can consent to a sexual reassignment procedure. It obviously talks about people over the age of 18 being able to give that consent for themselves and, essentially, lowering to 16 the age when people can consent for themselves, and then outlines a different process for children.

Can I say that, according to that information from the American College of Pediatricians, for those who have been through puberty and still have the desire to change their biological sex, I think we as a parliament should make that as easy and as clear as possible. I think that is an entirely valid and appropriate response, but I have some reservations where this is done to children who have not gone through puberty. Potentially, they are going through treatment that may correct itself naturally through puberty, so I would be very wary of anything that increased access or made it easier for sexual reassignment therapies to happen for children who have not gone through puberty because, according to this, the vast majority of people who suffer from gender dysphoria will make a different decision post-puberty.

The recommendations of the report go on, as I said, to talk about changing the burden of having to go through the Magistrates Court to get approval to, essentially, statements from registered medical practitioners. I think this is entirely sensible. I have just talked about recommendation 3 in terms of dealing with children of various ages, and I will wait to see what comes back before the house.

Recommendation 5 talks about the protection of privacy, and I think that is something we dealt with very well with the parentage presumption changes. A person's birth certificate should have the sex as it is recorded and not previous sexes, but that information should be retained on a separate register. I understand that is happening for a variety of different reasons, and I think that is entirely sensible and something to support.

Recommendation 6 states that 'a change of a person's sex must not be allowed to occur more frequently than is reasonably determined'. Understanding what sexual reassignment looks like, I would struggle to see too many people who would enjoy going through that process more than they absolutely have to so, while I understand we are trying to deal with that, I do not think it is going to be that much of an issue.

Recommendation 9 goes on to talk about providing increased access to publicly-funded specialist medical care for gender diverse people, and a multidisciplinary approach. Again, that is in recognition of the fact that we should deal with this from a medical perspective as opposed to a legal perspective, and I think that is entirely appropriate. I commend the Legislative Review Committee for their work. I imagine it was difficult and confronting, but thank you very much. I certainly look forward to participating in debates around legislation that may come to this place in the future.

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (17:28):** I was part of this committee that reviewed this legislation, and I think it is noteworthy to make the comment that, since its commencement in 1998, the Sexual Reassignment Act has remained relatively unchanged, so this review was well and truly due. The review was both complex and detailed and, at times, of a very sensitive nature. I would like to pay tribute to and applaud those who came to present evidence to us, and in particular those who are personally living this journey or living close to this journey, who gave us their stories when they came before the committee. While most of them were very helpful and supportive to our deliberations, at times, these candid conversations were very moving.

I would like to put on record that I support the nine recommendations as discussed in the report, and I draw particular attention to the focus and consideration the committee had when contemplating the welfare of the group of people affected by this act. The committee considered complexities of sexual identity in the use of language; births, deaths and marriage registration; registration of a baby at birth; and the ability to amend the sex of a child and that of an adult—all very

complex issues to deal with. The protection of privacy was also something that was paramount to the committee when we discussed and heard evidence. The committee heard evidence about the psychological and social stigma and anguish faced by those on this journey, and the relatively high and saddening incidence of suicide and self-harm was of particular concern to us for this group.

I am making some brief comments, but I would like to highlight what I see as one of the really critical recommendations. I believe recommendation 9 underpins this whole legislation:

The Committee recommends providing increased access to publicly funded specialist medical care for the 'gender diverse'...community, particularly in respect of psychiatric services, and endocrinology services.

What is critical to this is a multidisciplinary approach, a holistic approach that these particular people and families really need access to, and they are very deserving of this. Those are my few brief remarks and I support the recommendations and the report.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (17:31):** I commend the report to the house. I want to thank both the member for Schubert and the member for Elder for their contributions. The member for Schubert made a very thoughtful contribution. He has obviously read the material and thought quite deeply about. These are complex and vexed issues, and I hope that other members, like the member for Schubert, take the time to read and consider the recommendations.

I want to reflect on the fact that it was a difficult subject matter and that these recommendations and conclusions were not easy to come to. I want to thank the witnesses who appeared. A range of experts came to speak to us about this really complex subject matter, as did some witnesses who had firsthand experience of some of the issues faced by people who are affected by this legislation. I want to thank them publicly for the taking the bold step of appearing before the committee, taking the step to initiate some change in legislation. Many of the recommendations we made are probably long overdue. Again, I urge members to take the time to consider the recommendations of this report and I commend it to the house.

Motion carried.

#### **SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE INQUIRY**

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Cook:

That the 39<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Domestic and Family Violence Inquiry Report, be noted.

(Continued from 13 April 2016.)

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (17:33):** I return to where I left off the last time we were considering this report. I start by continuing to cite some of the facts about domestic violence. They are:

- one in three women are now subject to violence at some time in their lives starting from the age of 15;
- more than one women per week in Australia is killed as a result of domestic violence;
- there is a spike in domestic violence perpetrated against women who are pregnant;
- domestic violence has a profound effect on children who witness it, and in some cases it constitutes child abuse;
- women are most at risk of violence in the home from men they know, and the most common location for physical assaults against women is in the home;
- one-third of clients seeking specialist homelessness services have experienced domestic violence; and
- it is now one of the leading causes of death in Australia for women under 45.

These statistics are worse if you are Aboriginal, if you are a young person or if you are affected by disability. These statistics are growing, they are deeply unacceptable and they are a call to action for all of us.

This call to action is even more pressing and important as we process the absolutely tragic deaths of Adeline Yvette Rigney-Wilson (known as Yvette) and her children, Corey (5) and Amber (6). Yet again, we mourn the death of a woman who was killed by her partner. Heartbreaking tributes continue to flow for these precious lives lost, including one as reported by *The Advertiser*, and I quote: 'I'm really sorry that you died...you always played with me. I was your friend,' said one note left by a young schoolmate of one of the children.

Sadly, some commentators have focused on unfounded allegations about Adeline's drug use at this tragic time. Amongst this commentary, however, Celeste Liddle, an Aboriginal activist and a national Indigenous organiser whom I admire, cut through and shone with her incredible article that I encourage you all to read. The article, entitled 'How victim blaming is heightened when sexism interacts with race', really sheds light on the human face of the statistics I mentioned earlier. I quote directly from Celeste's words:

Let's be absolutely clear here: Yvette and her children are not dead because she apparently took ice. They are not dead because her cupboards were bare. They are dead because a man, her partner, chose to kill them...Yvette deserved to live her life, yet she was denied this very basic human right due to the actions of her partner. She deserved better than this. Her children Amber and Corey deserved better than this. Their grieving family deserves better than this. Yet while we have a society which remains content with the perpetuation of victim blaming along with the demonisation of Aboriginal people, we will continue to see Aboriginal women who are murder victims treated in these kinds of ways.

I know I speak for all in this chamber when I say that I will not forget Adeline Yvette Rigney-Wilson and that her death and the deaths of her two children will not be in vain. It is crucial that we continue to build towards better outcomes for all victims of domestic violence.

I turn back to the report of the Social Development Committee, which arose through my motion to inquire into all aspects of domestic violence and the services and supports in place. The impetus for moving the original motion to establish this inquiry was partly personal. Months before I moved it, I had spoken in my inaugural speech in this house about my own childhood experiences of witnessing domestic violence and the impact that that has, and I note that the report explores this issue.

I remember that, before I spoke about this impact in that speech, I was deeply hesitant and embarrassed to do so. Nonetheless, I did, and I did so because I believe that we here in this place, as leaders, must speak up and out about domestic violence and, in doing so, encourage others to speak up. We must empower the voice of those who experience domestic violence for as long as it takes to end it.

For me, moving the motion to establish this inquiry and the production of this report was to give voice through the committee's deliberations to those who experience it and those who work day in and day out to prevent and end violence. No matter how uncomfortable it may be, we must engender conversation, we must empower voices around domestic violence and we must hear the stories of those whose experience it, and these stories must be used to shift perspective and collectively open our hearts and minds to change.

In our relentless speaking up about domestic violence, as I believe the report outlines, we must articulate the underlying and fundamental cause of domestic violence: the gender inequality that is inherent in so many aspects of community life. We have to recognise the fact that what we are teaching and showing our young men and young women about how women should be viewed and how it is okay to control a woman you are in a relationship with, or have been in a relationship with, through violence is unacceptable.

To effectively address domestic violence we have to meet this issue head on and in a focused way. I am very pleased that this report contemplates this issue and it is now up to all of us to bring this issue to life in the communities we represent through education around this. I am proud to be part of a government that is committed to this and, as I have done before, commend our Premier for his stance on gender equality and his recognition of the link between an imbalance in power between genders and violence.

The report outlines many strategies for us to contemplate in the coming weeks, and together we will do so. We must, however, also work together as a parliament and as a community to ensure

that the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness, which directly links to support for those experiencing domestic violence and homelessness as a result, is funded by the federal government beyond 2017. As I said in moving the motion to establish this inquiry:

I hope that through this inquiry we have effectively reached out to...community leaders, practitioners, leaders, service providers and others to thoroughly explore and measure together what initiatives to eliminate violence against women we are doing well, what we can expand, better support and grow, where we can expand particular initiatives so that domestic violence does indeed become everybody's responsibility and what negative impending changes we can fight together. The incidence of domestic violence is too great and I hope that this inquiry enables us to work together and take another step together towards ending it.

I look forward to speaking and acting together with you all and with everyone in this place wherever we can to end domestic violence. I look forward to our collective will making a difference.

Earlier, I thanked a number of parliamentarians but, in closing, I want to put on the record my deep gratitude to those who provided evidence to the inquiry for providing that evidence and, importantly, for their enduring leadership day in, day out, year in, year out and, in some cases, decade after decade in working with our community to bring an end to domestic violence.

In particular, I thank a number of front-line service workers, women who have dedicated decades to making a difference, many of whom I am deeply proud to call friends: Ms Desi Alexandridis, Ms Gillian Cordell, Ms Susie Smith, Ms Sue Underhill, Ms Elle Wilde, Ms Vicki Lachlan, Ms Sandra Dunn, Ms Maria Hagias, Ms Sharyn Potts, Ms Katrina Almond, Ms Rosney Snell, and Ms Megan Hughes. I thank all who contributed in many different ways to the inquiry, both for their contribution and their leadership in our shared objective to end domestic violence.

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (17:41):** I too rise to speak on this very important motion before the house and I would like to start by quoting some of the 2014 South Australian statistics of victims of family and domestic violence related offences. There were a total of 4,534 female victims of whom 44 per cent were aged between 20 and 34 years, five victims of violence-related homicide offences, 5,691 victims of assault and 249 sexual assaults.

Late last year, I had the absolute honour and privilege of speaking at the White Ribbon Breakfast which was a huge sellout with what, from the stage, looked like thousands of people. I just said yes and did not think about how many people might be there, so it was quite overwhelming looking into the audience and seeing how many people were there.

What that highlights is that there are thousands of people who want to make a difference in this area, but it also highlights the fact that not much has changed. The statistics are incredibly high and we must continue to fight and push to make sure that there is not only awareness about this but action and change, because we cannot continue the way we are.

One in four children are exposed to domestic violence in Australia, and exposure to domestic violence during their childhood increases the risk of children developing mental health, behavioural and learning difficulties. These children are also at increased risk of going on to commit or experience violence. Fifty per cent of calls that police attend regarding domestic violence involve children. These are shocking statistics. Home should be your safe haven, where families stand together and protect each other.

It is devastating to think that in Australia almost two women per week are killed from domestic violence. It is statistically safer to walk alone through Hindley Street late at night, yet we continually hear about government measures to make the city safer when the real danger is in our homes. More needs to be done about domestic violence at all levels—community and government. The economic toll from family abuse is estimated at around \$14 billion a year. We cannot afford to keep doing what we have always done.

Thank goodness for organisations such as White Ribbon, Catherine House, the Luke Batty Foundation, and the Zahra Foundation that are keeping the media spotlight on this terrible blight on society. Whilst we need to support women and children, who are predominantly the victims of domestic violence, we must put more money and effort into helping the offenders change their behaviours. Otherwise, we are simply moving the problem onto the next woman to be abused.

When I visited New York almost two years ago, I was fortunate enough to visit with child protection agencies and homeless and housing agencies, but I also met with domestic violence agencies because of the close relationship with child protection. It was heartwarming to hear that they are having very good success when they work very early on in domestic violence situations within a relationship. Where the male offender has not yet left the home, they said that they have had very good results in making and helping the man realise the effect it has on the children.

By taking the focus away from the male-female relationship and focusing on the husband or partner's role in the children's lives and the devastating effect his behaviours have on the children, they have actually managed to change behaviours before it was too late. Often, once the male has left the home, it is irreconcilable and the damage is done. It is a lot harder to repair the damage to all members of the family and to change the behaviours because the incentive is gone: they have lost their family, so there is not the big incentive to actually change. We do need to act early on and get in there with early intervention programs that are very successful.

From newspapers back on 20 and 21 November 2015, there was an article that stated that, for the 70,000 domestic violence offenders, only 5,000 places were available in behaviour change programs. That is less than 10 per cent, despite the results from such programs being that one-third of participants fundamentally change their behaviour, with another third making some changes. For the women and children in their lives and society as a whole, I would suggest that this is a very good outcome and something we should be focusing on as a community.

Perpetrators need ongoing support, so why do we not set up groups akin to Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, where there are regular meetings throughout Australia where people, when they are feeling pressure and need a release and need other people who understand how they are feeling, can go to a support group. I have been to lots of different groups—Soroptimist and many different wonderful community groups that have programs like this set up—but they are bits and pieces here and there and it is not really a well-coordinated system like AA and NA.

There is a really good network. You know when they are on and you know they are in community centres and churches in every local area. There are at least eight in my electorate that meet regularly. Potentially, I think that could be of use to men or people who feel immense anger and do not have a way of releasing that anger or have the skills to know what to do about that.

From the report *Vulnerable Children, Fragile Families*, by Emeritus Professor Dorothy Scott, under parental characteristics of children entering out-of-home care in 2007, 65.2 per cent of parents were involved in domestic violence. So, we can see that domestic violence has effects on many other portfolios, which is why I have an interest, given my child protection portfolio. It is an issue that is widespread and affects all areas of our community.

Correctional Services data indicates the following. In 2014-15, police issued intervention orders to protect individuals and their families from physical violence and threatening and controlling behaviour 2,883 times, with 1,066 applications to the court for an intervention order in the same period. In 2014-15, there were 90 criminogenic programs delivered and 4,874 program hours across Community Corrections and prisons, with 75 per cent of offenders successfully completing offence-focused programs. That is a start, but we need to do more.

The prevention of violence against women will change society for the better, and I would encourage everyone to go onto the White Ribbon website and take the pledge, which I note changed considerably last year, from simply pledging that you would not commit violence against a woman to actually being more proactive. The pledge is: I will stand up, speak out and act to prevent men's violence against women.

Whilst there are thousands of men who are good men who stand up and would never be violent against women, we need those same men to protect other women around them from their male friends, colleagues, sporting mates, the men at the bar—because it is going on. Women cannot make men change; men can make men change. You really all need to get together and say, 'This is not good enough.' We need your help. Women are in danger, and I call on all the men in this parliament to talk to their friends about it to make this unacceptable, because it is unacceptable.

Drink driving was common years ago, now it is unacceptable. It is looked down on because we, as a community, said enough is enough. We need to say that with domestic violence.

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (17:49):** I welcome the opportunity today to speak on the 39<sup>th</sup> report of the Social Development Committee inquiry into domestic and family violence, and I will keep my remarks brief as I am mindful of the time. The committee sat through many hours of evidence, some of which was heartbreaking, examining the effectiveness of current, national and South Australian domestic and family violence policies, programs, legislative frameworks, and court processes. Domestic and family violence is, to quote from the summary in the report:

...one of the most prevalent, pervasive, harmful, yet relatively hidden and often ignored forms of abuse. It is a violation of basic human rights.

We know that it can have long-term and intergenerational, psychological, emotional, and financial consequences. It is disruptive to employment and education, and often results in social and economic isolation, homelessness and, tragically, in some cases death. The abuse can be in the form of physical violence, psychological and emotional, threats, control, and financial disempowerment.

The committee received 53 written submissions and heard evidence from 99 witnesses. The evidence came from individual members of the public, government and non-government organisations, police justice, and courts. Thirty-five unanimously supported recommendations were made by the committee, with the aim to continue to progress the fight to prevent and eliminate domestic and family violence in South Australia. The committee heard evidence that:

- domestic and family violence rates the highest amongst our most vulnerable populations;
- Indigenous women are reported to be 31 times more likely subjected to domestic and family violence;
- 25 per cent of Indigenous women have experienced one or more incidents of physical violence in the past 12 months;
- women from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds are particularly vulnerable when they are subjected to domestic and family violence;
- women and girls who have a disability and live in residential care are more likely to experience more severe and longer episodes of abuse than those without disability;
- women and girls living in remote and regional areas may delay accessing help and support services due to fear of reprisals in the community because they do not want to leave their support networks for safe accommodation in metropolitan areas; and
- the sad fact is that domestic and family violence often initiates during pregnancy.

We know that more needs to be done to prevent domestic and family violence from occurring in the first instance and that strategic, coordinated and targeted service delivery responses are needed to support the most vulnerable victims.

The committee heard that, while abuse can be suffered in all forms of relationship and kinship settings, violence and abuse is more often than not perpetrated by men against women. There is no doubt that effective and culturally appropriate programs are necessary to re-educate and address the needs of men who are perpetrators of violence against women and, importantly, men and women need to be united in the goal of ending domestic and family violence.

The South Australian government is committed in its response to violence against women, leading the way in service delivery by the Multi-Agency Protection Service, the Family Safety Framework and the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service. Importantly, our government's commitment to continue working hard towards eliminating family and domestic violence is unwavering.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (17:53):** I commend the committee on the good work of this report, and acknowledge all the members of the committee on the good work and the very good recommendations they put forward. I also acknowledge the work of the DV services around the state. Most of them are volunteers and some of them—too many of them—are past victims or survivors of

domestic violence. I want to acknowledge them and their commitment to domestic violence, but also their contribution to this process.

I will not speak long because I know there is a discussion paper coming out from the Attorney-General's Department, which is imminent, and we shall canvass a lot of these issues. I expect I will be speaking on many of those issues as time goes by. I was going to address some of the recommendations, but I think I will save that for another day. I agree with the member for Adelaide and the member for Torrens that it is a men's issue. I do not want to 'mans-plain' or anything, but it is an issue that men do need to take ownership of and accept that it is a problem of men's violence.

On Friday night I will be attending, on behalf of the Premier, a White Ribbon event called the 1,000 Men Challenge launch. The aim of that launch, or that part of the White Ribbon committee, is to reach 1,000 men by the end of 2016, 1,000 men who may not have heard of the White Ribbon campaign, in order to change the hearts and minds of men to help combat domestic violence. With those few words I commend the report.

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (17:55):** I am really pleased to offer some closing remarks on the 39<sup>th</sup> report of the Social Development Committee's domestic and family violence inquiry. The issue of domestic and family violence was brought to the Social Development Committee in 2014 by a previous member of the committee in this place, the member for Reynell Ms Katrine Hildyard, who should be commended for her relentless pursuit of a society that ensures women and children live in a community that is safe.

In the year of hearing evidence and writing this report the committee considered a huge amount of evidence from the South Australian domestic violence sector as well as victims of abuse, police, and legal and associated government agencies that manage the outcomes of domestic and family violence. However, nothing brings the importance of this inquiry to a head more than the tragedy that we have seen in the past few weeks in our community, a stark reminder with the terrible loss of life of a loving mother, Adeline Rigney-Wilson, and her dear children Corey, aged five, and Amber, aged six.

I feel nothing but sadness and despair at the loss of life and hope that has been taken from those dear souls and also from the community. How much sadness the young children in their community must be feeling, their friends lost to their lives. It is devastating and horrific acts of domestic violence like this that take lives, not the actions of any worker or of any system. It is not the empty cupboards, it is not the ice use; it is the act of control and violence by a man in the life of these poor women and their children.

I cannot state it more powerfully than the member for Reynell did before. People in this place, particularly the leaders in this community, must heed this warning and must listen to this, and we must let the police now do their work. We must not score any cheap political points on something like this. It is not the fault of any system or the role of the mother in this; it was an act of control and violence. We have to measure our response and our support. It must be unwavering.

The recommendations from this committee must be taken seriously. They are born out of a deep consideration of evidence and best practice results; not media articles, not hearsay, not knee-jerk reactions. There needs to be a societal shift to say that this is not right, that we will not allow this to happen to our daughters, nieces, friends or colleagues. Men and women must be united in their stand against this covert and insidious part of our culture that causes such great misery, pain and fear to so many and that is perpetuated in silence. We know how we can effect change, we know that bringing this issue into the open will do this. I thank all those people who contributed to this inquiry. Their testimony is doing just that, it is bringing it out into the open.

In closing, I wish to thank my fellow members of the Social Development Committee: from the other place the Presiding Member, the Hon. Gail Gago, who for many years has been relentless in her pursuit of fairness and equality for women and girls, a trailblazer in this state and a role model for all of us in pursuit of safety for women and children; the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Kelly Vincent, both from the other place; the previous presiding member, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, himself a fantastic role model for men who wish to help men change; from this house Dana Wortley, the member for Torrens; Adrian Pederick, the member for Hammond; and, of course, again, former member of the committee and my dear friend and colleague Katrine Hildyard, the member for

Reynell. As I said earlier, having seen the consequences of this abuse and the struggles faced by the amazing women's sector in providing services to victims, she, on motion, brought this inquiry to the committee in 2014.

Thank you also to the Social Development Committee secretary, Robyn Schutte, present in the house at the moment, as well as research officer, Dr Helen Popple, who came to the committee late in the piece. I would also like to acknowledge the previous research officer, Carmen O'Connell. I thank them for all their work over this long process. It is tiring and it is exhausting to hear some of the stories we heard, but thank you for sharing that with us. Thank you to everyone who has contributed to the debate. I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Thursday 9 June 2016 at 10:30.