

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 3 August 2017

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

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

### *Bills*

#### **PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL**

##### *Conference*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (10:31):** I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

### *Personal Explanation*

#### **ELECTRICITY GENERATION**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (10:31):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** During yesterday's question time, I was asked a question by the shadow minister from the opposition about who the government is leasing the generators from. The government has a contract with SAPN to provide that service with APR Energy. The government's option to purchase the generators is directly with APR Energy. That is a response to a question from the shadow minister, Mr van Holst Pellekaan.

**The SPEAKER:** Always a bad idea to use a member's name rather than the office.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I apologise, sir.

**An honourable member:** Stuart is a lot easier.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, Stuart would save Hansard keystrokes.

### *Bills*

#### **CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) (HOME DETENTION) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November 2016.)

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (10:32):** The very sensible intention and proposal from the opposition under my bill has been incorporated in the government's Sentencing Bill, which was assented to yesterday; therefore, I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

**CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (GUARDIANSHIP) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 December 2016.)

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (10:34):** I am not going to detain the house for an enormously lengthy period of time on this. I realise there are some other legislative instruments that are contemplating some of the same harms that were brought to the house's attention by the member for Bragg and the member for Adelaide in raising this matter in November and December last year.

However, before any other activities are undertaken with this particular piece of legislation, I want to state for the record my strong support for it, whether the purposes that are sought to be achieved come about through this legislation or through other means. It was an area that I had particular concerns about when I was the shadow minister for families and communities, which is a little while ago now. At that stage, this was a problem, and Commissioner Nyland addressed a number of these issues in her royal commission.

To put some of this in context, the Department for Child Protection—and I feel that we will probably be talking a little bit about child protection this morning as I see there is also a motion listed on the *Notice Paper* for later on—is a substantial agency. It has nearly half a billion dollars in expenditure in 2017-18. There are more than 2,000 full-time equivalent staff working in this area.

One of the challenges, of course, is that, in managing children who are not able to be left with their families because of the nature of that family situation being a substantial risk to the child obviously, it is preferable if a family environment guardianship can be a long-term solution than for them to be in an institutionalised care setting. We know that the outcomes for children who are in institutionalised care present greater challenges for them going forward than if a family arrangement can be made, and if guardianship can be with that kinship carer, or Other Person Guardianship can be with that kinship carer, then that is a preferable outcome.

I note that, in relation to the royal commission, the budget papers this year in Agency Statement 1 to do with child protection say that a highlight of last year was the establishment of the Child Protection Reform Implementation Team to lead the implementation of recommendations from the child protection system's royal commission report. It said that, of the 256 recommendations accepted by the government, 34 have been completed, 63 are currently being implemented, 86 are in the planning phase and 73 have not yet commenced. I encourage any member who is further interested in this detail to look at the *Hansard* of the estimates committee last Friday where the member for Adelaide and the minister spoke at length about these issues.

A highlight listed was the number of foster care placements, which had increased by 4.1 per cent from 30 June 2016 to 30 April 2017, and the number of kinship-care placements, which had increased by 3.4 per cent for the same period. Increases are good. The following page identifies that is an increase from 1,478 to 1,504, but the target was 1,584—a much more substantial increase than actually took place. The target for the current year is for children in out-of-home care placed with relatives (kin) at 30 June to become 1,594. That is the sort of increase that was not possible last year. We need to remove barriers where we can to Other Person Guardianship.

In relation to the recommendations of the Nyland royal commission that this bill seeks to enact, recommendation 153 is to:

Amend the Children's Protection Act 1993 to enable carers to apply to be appointed an Other Person Guardian where children who are subject to long-term orders have been in their care for a minimum period of two years, or such lesser period as the court in its absolute discretion determines is appropriate in the circumstances.

Then there are two other recommendations. Recommendation 154 is:

Amend the Children's Protection Act 1993 to provide that biological parents who oppose an application for the appointment of an Other Person Guardian bear the onus of proving to the court on the balance of probabilities why the order should not be made.

This is really important because they are complex and challenging situations. Often we are talking about a situation where a grandparent is applying to the court to have, effectively, the custody of the child who is their grandchild, which means that it is them against their own child.

This is a tremendously difficult situation and we have to be on the side of the child. We have to make it easier, therefore, for the right outcome to take place, so the onus should be on the parent who has been identified as being unsuitable to prove to the court on the balance of probabilities why the order should not be made. I think that is why Commissioner Nyland included that recommendation in her report. The other recommendation the bill seeks to deal with is recommendation 155:

Establish an independent assessment panel to consider applications for Other Person Guardianship, in accordance with certain procedures.

Currently, under section 38(1)(d) of the act, the Youth Court can appoint up to two people under the minister to be the legal guardian or guardians of a child. The bill would make it easier for foster or kinship carers of the child to become the other person guardian.

This is a challenge that is substantial. Nobody pretends that managing a child protection system is an easy task. It is some of the hardest work there is to do, and this government has, unfortunately, found it very, very difficult to restore confidence in the system and to encourage people to work in the child protection system, and that is a real problem for South Australia. One of the key things that will reduce the intense pressure in the child protection system, at least a little bit, is if we can get more foster carers and if we can get more Other Person Guardianship orders made.

Reducing the administrative burden and reducing the legal challenge of having those undertaken is not just a worthy goal but it is a critically important goal. This bill from the member for Bragg, working very closely with the member for Adelaide, whether through the mechanism of the bill itself or through other legislation, is going to produce outcomes that will make it easier to establish those goals, which I am sure everyone in this parliament is absolutely signed up to. Therefore, I endorse the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

### **ROAD TRAFFIC (HELMETS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 June 2017.)

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (10:42):** I rise to make a contribution to this private member's bill, and I congratulate the shadow minister, the member for Schubert, on the work he has done thus far in bringing the bill to the house. It is a very important bill; in fact, it is a simple amendment that seeks to clarify that, as long as the structure of a helmet is not compromised, such as by using screws, then cameras attached to helmets via a sticker or mount are acceptable to the Road Rules.

As we know, bicycle helmets have been compulsory in this state for a number of years now, and for good reason. Cycling is certainly becoming a more and more popular pastime, and not just a pastime but also a mode of transport. At the moment, there is some confusion in the motorcycle and bicycling community with regard to the legality of wearing cameras on motorcycle and bicycle helmets. We are talking generally about what is commonly known as a GoPro, I think.

I am not especially familiar with a GoPro, but my young adult children certainly are and use them quite a bit on all sorts of adventures all over the world. In fact, my youngest son used one to record footage as part of his year 12 research project. Because of that confusion, there has been some angst brought up in the motorcycle forums regarding the legal status of these types of mounts. In a situation in Victoria, where a court case was eventually dropped on appeal, the issue was raised that the attachment of a camera to the helmet rendered the helmet noncompliant, so this needs clarification. Certainly, there was some commentary on that court case. One important piece to take away from that was, and I quote:

There is however no statement in any of the legislations that any such modifications render a helmet to not be an approved bicycle helmet under the rules.

What this all means is that in South Australia, for a helmet to be approved under the law, it needs to comply with the Australian Standard at the time of sale, and affixing a light or camera following that time does not render it outside the definition of an approved bicycle helmet. That is really important commentary on this particular bill.

Of course, I think it is good idea, as well, for cyclists to wear a light on their helmet. Like many others in this place, I have driven home on a cold, dark and wet winter's night and come across cyclists who are using the road lawfully but who are very difficult to see. They often wear dark clothes with not much more than one little reflector on the tail and certainly no lights. I find that a very dangerous situation for both the cyclist and the motorist. Anything that improves the safety of those cycling on our roads would be a good thing. For them to be comfortable and know that they are within the law, fixing a light to their helmet, as well as a GoPro, would be a good thing.

Unfortunately, without explicit instruction, confusion will continue to reign until a test case is brought before the courts in South Australia. It seems to me that most of the other states have made this change or are at least considering it, and I spoke earlier about Victoria. In Victoria, in what was shaping up to be a test case, police had alleged that a gentleman had breached Australian Standards by fixing a GoPro—a 20-centimetre camera, in fact—above the top of his helmet and had another 10 centimetres of that protruding to the left. It must have been a sizeable piece of equipment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Size does matter!

**Mr TRELOAR:** I missed that, Deputy Speaker. Unfortunately, in March 2014 this gentleman, after being pulled over by police in Frankston, in Melbourne's south-east, was fined \$289 and lost three demerit points (I feel for him) for failing to wear an approved helmet. During the appeal, it was argued that standards apply only to manufacturers and not customers—a very good point raised. When riders are injured in road accidents, video from helmet cameras is some of the best evidence you can have, especially if you are in a collision. So there is an upside, even to a collision: if you are wearing a GoPro and have footage of that, there is no doubt then who is in the wrong in that particular situation.

Footage from cameras will not only provide evidence of an incident but should also encourage compliance to the Road Rules by both riders and drivers. This type of evidence will also help to reduce spurious or vexatious claims of road rule offending. Police are also beginning to roll out body-worn cameras. There is commentary most weeks in the media about how those body-worn cameras are assisting police in their work, particularly when evidence is needed and prosecution is made. In fact, police are also beginning to use helmet-mounted cameras for the same purpose.

It seems to me that the bill will bring South Australia into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It is always a challenge for legislators to keep up with what is going on out in the broader community. I cannot see any risk with this legislation whatsoever. As I mentioned before, cycling is becoming more and more popular. There has been a revival, in fact. I am going back a few years now, but when I was a boy to own a bicycle was really to have freedom, the freedom to roam far and wide. Of course, we lived out in the country, a long way from town and our neighbours were far away.

**Mr Gardner:** How long did it take you to ride into town?

**Mr TRELOAR:** To ride to town? I only did it once, member for Morialta, and I think it took me more than an hour.

**Mr Gardner:** That's a long walk then.

**Mr TRELOAR:** It was a long walk. More importantly, particularly when those who were living on neighbouring properties who were of a similar age also had bicycles, then the weekends, and particularly Sundays, became ours to ride, to meet, to have adventures together. I will never forget the excitement of being given my first bike one Christmas when I guess I was about six years old. It had trainer wheels on the sides, and eventually I mastered the art of riding a bicycle. I had two brothers, and my brother Michael and I received new second-hand bikes for Christmas, which a neighbour had done up.

I had a 28-inch Malvern Star with a sprung saddle. It was pretty hard to top. I think I saved up for a while and eventually got a bell to fix to the handlebars. As I said, it gave us freedom. I have only recently disposed of that bike. I resurrected it from the front of the shed a little while ago, thinking that I would get some new tyres and new tubes and could once again ride my 28-inch Malvern Star, but I discovered that 28-inch tyres and tubes are no longer produced or sold. I could not believe it. Apparently they are all 27-inch now, which was not any good to me so, sadly, the bike had to go.

This bill is particularly about bike helmets. I remember that, when the legislation came in, not everybody was happy about being forced to wear a bike helmet. I know that one elderly neighbour of ours decided that that was the end of his cycling; he was not going to wear a helmet at all. I remember one famous day when a World War II immigrant who lived in Edillilie (that is a bit closer) was pulled over by the police on North Terrace, Edillilie, and prosecuted for cycling without wearing a bike helmet. He was fined and was most distraught.

**Mr Pederick:** It was a slow day in Edillilie.

**Mr TRELOAR:** It was a slow day in Edillilie. There are not many fast days in Edillilie, member for Hammond. The member for Colton knows that, too. I think you were there on a busy day.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** I was.

**Mr TRELOAR:** This fellow was an elderly, postwar eastern European immigrant who had worked dutifully on the railways for his whole career and who had worked hard, saved up and owned a few acres. He had been simply cycling down to his property. Not to be outdone, the next time I saw this fellow he was wearing a helmet of sorts. He was wearing an ice-cream bucket on his head, and he was hoping that that would suffice as a bike helmet. Needless to say, he did not ever manage to fit a GoPro to that helmet, but there would have been some interesting footage had he done so.

Anyway, it is always good to reminisce in this place, but I congratulate our shadow minister on bringing this to the house and on all the good work he has done. I hope that the government find their way clear to support this.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:52):** I rise to support the Road Traffic (Helmets) Amendment Bill 2017. I commend the member for Schubert for thinking of this road safety initiative, and I note some of the issues happening interstate. The member for Schubert is trying to clarify that, as long as the structure of a helmet is not compromised by using screws to attach a camera via a sticker or a mount, it is acceptable to the Road Rules.

I am certainly not a motorcycle purist. I own a few motorbikes with my children. We have a vast range of them (about five or six) sitting out in the backyard, and obviously there is a range of helmets that go with them. Technically, for the purists in the motorcycle game, if you drop a helmet then its life is done. You would have to throw a lot of helmets out, and it would get a bit expensive. I have what is called a 'peanut' helmet, which I have had for many years. It has a few scars on its lid, but they are not from falling off a motorbike: they are probably from the helmet being put down on the ground, or occasionally it might have fallen off a bench.

When you talk to the purists, they say that the lifespan of a helmet ends when it falls from a height and hits the ground. In my mind, you could do a structural integrity check and that sort of thing, but I guess that shows the technicalities that some people employ in assessing whether helmets are fit for use. Certainly in regard to the legislation, whether it is fitting a GoPro camera or another cheaper model—GoPro is certainly the most well-known brand and they come in a range of styles; I should know because my boys—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes. No, my boys, being keen motorcyclists, have them. The eldest lad, Mack, had one that was not a GoPro but a cheaper model, and then he got a GoPro. You do see some interesting motorbike footage over time. There is some confusion in both the motorcycle and the bicycle communities with regard to the legality of the wearing of cameras on motorcycle and bicycle helmets. There has been quite a lot of discussion amongst motorcycle forums and a lot of angst generated regarding the legal status of these types of mounts.

There was a situation in Victoria (and I note that the court case was eventually dropped on appeal) that raised the prospect that the attachment of a camera to the helmet rendered the helmet noncompliant. I noted that to motorcycle purists, even if you drop a helmet from, say, waist height onto the ground, that means that is the end of its life. I would challenge that, but it probably would need a structural integrity check. However, that may cost more than a helmet, although the best motorcycle helmets now would run into several hundred dollars.

With regard to the statement about the legislation involved in attaching cameras, there is nothing in any of the legislation stating that any such modifications render a helmet not being an approved bicycle helmet under the rules. What this all means is that in South Australia, for a helmet to be approved under the law, it needs to comply with the Australian Standard at the time of sale, and affixing a light or camera following that time does not render it outside the definition of an approved bicycle helmet.

As the member for Flinders stated, there are a lot of cameras fixed, especially to bike helmets. People are using footage, whether they are in a near miss or unfortunate enough to be in an accident. I note that the Road Rules that we must comply with now state that, if you are going past a pushbike on a road, you have to give them a one-metre clearance in a 60 km/h an hour zone and I think it is 1½ metres on a highway. One thing that still troubles me with that legislation is that it is the only time that a car driver can cross a double white line.

Sadly, I think we might have some issues with that down the track. In my travels, I head across to Goolwa in my electorate and travel through some winding roads. I occasionally drive up through Belair and Blackwood, and some of those roads are favourites for people on pushbikes—and there are a lot of winding roads with double white lines. You see some interesting things at times when people take a heck of a chance because they are not prepared to sit behind a bike. I take the safe option and figure that if I have to wait for five minutes I will just sit back.

However, I can foresee that there might be a challenge in court one day if someone is severely hurt or killed when a driver has flicked out over the double white lines. As the legislation stands, it is legal but, if you are coming from the other way and you are faced with a car on the wrong side of the road, that might be a matter for the courts. It certainly is a concern. I am not saying that pushbike riders should not be given clearance; it is just a matter of people perhaps needing to have a bit more patience and waiting until they get the opportunity to go past. What the member for Schubert is trying to work out with this bill is how to avoid the confusion that will reign without explicit instruction until there is at least a test case brought before the courts in South Australia.

What happened in Victoria in what was shaping up to be a test case was that police alleged that Mr Max Lichtenbaum breached the Australian Standard by fixing one GoPro camera on the top of his helmet and another protruding to the left. He was well organised with cameras. The gentleman was fined \$289 and lost three demerit points. I am sure that plenty of people in this place have lost demerit points; I know the Treasurer has had 68 fines. I will not say that I am a complete saint, but it does happen, when you occasionally accidentally go over the limit. However, this person was fined for failing to wear an approved helmet. In March 2014, he was pulled over by the police in Frankston in Melbourne's south-east.

During the appeal, it was argued that standards apply only to manufacturers and not to customers. When riders are injured in road accidents, videos from helmet cameras are some of the best evidence you can have, especially if you are involved in a collision. Footage from cameras will not only provide evidence of an accident but it should also encourage compliance with the road rules by both riders and drivers. This type of evidence will also help to reduce spurious or vexatious claims of road rule offending. It is a way that pushbike users can verify claims made against them by other people using the road.

I note that our police force is beginning to roll out body-worn cameras and helmet-mounted cameras for a similar purpose. A lot of people are using dash cameras, even in vehicles. Sometimes, police put out a call for any dash camera footage of an incident because, unless it has not been filmed very well, it is conclusive footage of what really happened, if someone is giving a conflicting account of the story.

Going back to the bike-riding days, as the member for Flinders espoused, I think we have all grown up on pushbikes at various stages. I think it was in the early seventies that I got my first dragster. I cannot remember what brand it was, but it was very flash, being a dragster. We had 28-inch bikes, and I am deeply saddened to know that you can no longer get 28-inch tyres and tubes. It reminds me of more recent times, when I bought a bike several years ago, thinking I was going to start a fitness regime.

**Mr Treloar:** How did that go?

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes; it went very well, thank you, member for Flinders. It was a 27-inch bike. I certainly commend the bill from the member for Schubert.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:02):** I rise to speak in support of the member for Schubert's amendment bill. I listened with interest to what the member for Hammond said. I have a picture of him riding on a 26-inch bike, which is not good in my mind, I have to say, but there you go. More to the point, the thing that concerns me is that I do not know why and if the government would oppose this measure. It is just more of the nanny state that we have turned into, where everything has to be considered as potential litigation, legal action, or whatever. To me, this is just a common-sense approach to a problem.

I am not a cyclist—in fact, I am not anti-cyclist—but when I am out on the roads, which I frequently am, I get annoyed from time to time with some of the cycling fraternity, who do not seem to understand that we are sharing the roads. They get cranky when a driver is stuck behind them, but that is another story. In this case, cyclists, motorcyclists, farm operators or anybody who drives any sort of motor vehicle—be it a car, a truck or a bus—is putting these cameras in their vehicle for future protection from litigation or potential litigation or in the event of an accident.

I might open a GoPro shop when I leave this place, as I reckon it is big business. Now people are putting cameras into the front of their cars and the back of their cars. The cyclists and motorcyclists want to put them on their head. They have them stuck on the handlebars. Why the government would not support this piece of legislation defies comprehension.

I cannot stand the nanny state; it drives me mad. I was brought up in a world where you take responsibility for your own actions, and that is the way it should be as far as I am concerned. There is this business of running around and putting money in lawyers' pockets all the time to try to get a quid off someone else for something you should have done yourself, or a situation where you should have looked after yourself. You have to be responsible for your own actions. It is absolutely critical to be responsible for your own actions.

It does not make sense to me. I find it just ridiculous that we should even have to bring this sort of legislation into the house. There is clearly some confusion in the motorcycle and bicycle community with regard to the wearing of cameras on motorcycle and bicycle helmets, and this is an attempt to clear that up.

These days, with the epoxy glues, superglues and heavens knows what else that are around the place, there is no reason in many cases why you should even have to drill into the bicycle helmet or motorcycle helmet to attach a camera of any shape or form. That is just the way it is. Technology is taking over, and I dare say these GoPro cameras or similar types of devices will be made smaller and smaller and, in due course, you probably will not even know if someone has one attached to their person when they are out riding a bike.

On my meanderings into Parliament House, when I look out the window at stop lights and suchlike, I notice that there seems to be a plethora of cameras in motor cars now. Everybody seems to have one. They all wanted to have a Navman or GPS at one stage; now they all want to have a camera in there to record what is going on. I find it an interesting exercise to have a look at what is going on. At least they do not have to touch them.

I am still staggered and bewildered by the number of people who use mobile phones in cars for texting or simply making calls. I walked out the front of this building the other day to cross the road. There was a chap out the front of the Stamford hotel, sitting with his phone while waiting to turn into one of the drive-offs there. I thought, 'How stupid are you?'

There is an attempt being made here by the member for Schubert to put some sense back into this. In Victoria, there was a court case, which was eventually dropped on appeal, which raised the prospect that the attachment of a camera to a helmet rendered the helmet noncompliant. I am not a technician. I do not design bicycle helmets, but I have had over many years a succession of motorbike helmets. They are pretty tough sorts of instruments, I can tell you. They have saved a lot of lives, and they continue to, but they are not foolproof.

I would suspect without knowing, and I will stand corrected if necessary, that anybody who is in that fraternity would not be foolish enough to screw something into the helmet if that is going to weaken the structure of the helmet and render them more likely to get a serious head injury in the event of the helmet shattering. Helmets are an interesting thing.

We have grandchildren in Darwin, and we go there regularly. Up there, it is not unusual to see people roaring around on motorbikes or pushbikes without helmets. There does not seem to be a great deal of enforcement. In many parts of the world, they would not know that a helmet exists. In footage I have seen from places like Bali, they do not need to wear a helmet there at all.

We are overprotected. We are a nanny state. It makes sense to wear a helmet. When I had my ag bike, before the kids successfully wrecked it, I would ride around the paddocks without a helmet all the time. It was just something you did; you jumped on the bike and went out around the stock and you never wore a helmet. We never came to grief.

I was fortunate, as I know of cases of people who have had accidents in paddocks on motorbikes and things who have run into stones or stumps or whatever and who have been seriously injured, possibly because they were not wearing a helmet. It is the same in relation to seat belts. When I am out in the paddock I never wear a seatbelt in the ute, I do not even think about it, but as soon as you hit the road it is automatic that you pull the seatbelt on. You just do not wear a seatbelt when you are driving around the paddocks, around the stock or whatever.

I do not know where this is all going to end, but I urge the government to give strong consideration to what is proposed by the member for Schubert under the Road Traffic (Helmets) Amendment Bill 2017. It is common sense, and under '6.5 Delivering a safer community through a fair and transparent justice system', and the issue that has happened in Victoria, we just need to bring more common sense and less nanny state into our daily lives. It is got to the point of being ridiculous.

As I said a few minutes ago, people have to be responsible for their own actions and their own safety. You cannot expect legislation to cover everything. I just find it ridiculous. We are overlegislated and overgoverned, and we are making people weak between the ears as far as I am concerned. Everybody wants, wants, wants instead of needs, needs, needs. This something that is wanted and, in my view, it is a want that makes some common sense in relation to the wearing of bicycle and motorcycle helmets and the ability to have a camera on them. I support the bill that has been put up by the member for Schubert.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

## **CONSTITUTION (ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION) (APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 May 2017.)

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Newland; no, the member for Morialta.

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:12):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and thank you, member for Newland, for your kind consideration of my desire to speak on this bill. The Constitution (Electoral Redistribution) (Appeals) Amendment Bill was brought to this house on 13 April by the member for Bragg, and I also acknowledge the member for MacKillop, who spoke to this bill in May. Tempting as it is to use this bill as an opportunity to freelance at great length about the failure of the Labor Party—in particular, its appellant Reggie Martin—to succeed in the quest to overthrow Justice Vanstone and her Redistribution Commission's proposed redistribution up to the Superior Courts, I will mostly refrain from doing so, notwithstanding that I note the ALP had costs awarded against it.



This bill arises out of a suggestion by the Chief Justice that he felt should be considered by the parliament. In particular, His Honour noted in the appeal:

Parliament may wish to consider whether a registered political party, or any other person with an interest in an electoral redistribution, particularly if that party or person has made representations to the EDBC, should be entitled to bring an appeal against an order of the EDBC. It may also be prudent to allow the Court a power to preclude a political party from appearing on an appeal through a proxy if that party made representations before the EDBC. As a practical consideration, Parliament may also wish to contemplate prescribing a procedure for the giving of public notice that an appeal has been instituted and the right of persons to be joined.

I am not sure why the government has not acted on this. I am hoping that when the member for Newland rose before it was, rather than to adjourn the bill, to in fact speak in furious agreement with the member for Bragg and the member for MacKillop. Certainly, I myself take it seriously when the Chief Justice considers it important to bring matters to our attention.

The Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission's redistribution that was handed down late last year is certainly a good document. It was a strange course of events to see Mr Martin listed as the person appealing it. The bill, of course, would provide an opportunity for political parties to very clearly be out appealing, rather than just individuals. We had Sascha Meldrum as our appellant.

I think it would have made more sense if it were a matter where the Liberal Party and the Labor Party were able to clearly, in full sight of the public, put forward their points of view. As the member for MacKillop has advised, perhaps there are opportunities for individuals, who are not necessarily South Australians, to be able to have a point of view that is worth considering by the court.

The circumstances surrounding the redistribution are always of interest to the people of South Australia, whose democracy is served in this way. The bill significantly adds to that democratic process by making things more transparent and making the appeal system better. I commend the member for Bragg for bringing the bill to the house and I urge all members to support it.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:16):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 21  
Noes ..... 16  
Majority ..... 5

AYES

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

NOES

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

## PAIRS

Bettison, Z.L.  
Goldsworthy, R.M.  
Weatherill, J.W.

Sanderson, R.  
Vlahos, L.A.  
Marshall, S.S.

Snelling, J.J.  
Williams, M.R.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

**CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (INFORMATION SHARING) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 December 2016.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:23):** I am pleased to advise that, given the passage of the principal bill, this bill no longer required. I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

**INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (MISCONDUCT AND MALADMINISTRATION) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 February 2017.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:23):** Similarly, this is a matter in which the subject is covered by another bill, regrettably not to the extent that we would have liked, but in the circumstances I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MEMBERS CONTESTING STATE ELECTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 May 2017.)

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:24):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on the Local Government (Members Contesting State Elections) Amendment Bill and commend the member for Unley for bringing it forward and the member for Goyder, who took the opportunity to also give his point of view on the matter. I want to acknowledge, not in any partisan way, that there is another candidate for Morialta, who is a member of local government, and if this bill is passed, or if Mr Ngo's version is passed, it may possibly impact on his candidacy. I do that to identify that I think it is absolutely suitable for members of local government to wish to run for state parliament as well.

I think that community service in the way of being a member of council is a laudable way to serve the community and should be encouraged, as I believe that anyone who has the gumption to put themselves up for state parliament in any seat, for any party, or as an Independent, should be congratulated on that act. It is an act in itself of community service to provide a democratic choice to the people of the community. Whether they are running with the Liberal Party or the Labor Party, or any other party, or as an Independent, I thank all of them.

Our community, by and large, benefits from having choices, and the broader the range of choices that they have, in representatives of different traditions or values, the more valuable those choices are. We should always seek to have the best person who is in a position to serve the

community able to do so. The fact of their prior election to a different level of government should not preclude them from doing so.

I honestly do not support in any way the criticism of people who seek to move from one level to another on the basis of cost, unless that person has told their community that they will not be seeking election in any other form. They should hold to that promise if such a promise has been made. I do not believe it has in the Morialta case. I just want to put on the record that I think that form of service is to be lauded.

This bill should in fact be welcomed by any councillor seeking election to another place, whether it be to this chamber or the Legislative Council, because it provides clarity about what the situation is to be should an election take place and should a candidature take place by member of a council. The significant kerfuffle (for want of a better word) that happens whenever a mayor or a local councillor runs—Should this person stand aside? Should this person not have run in the first place? Should this person be on leave? At what time should they be on leave?—is unhelpful. It is one of the duller process stories that can be driven. Of course, at the moment the situation is by and large that it is up to each candidate to make a decision that they feel suits them and their constituents, but the very fact of it is that it is a waste of time in our public debate, and it adds nothing to the discourse.

Having clarity about what that situation is and what those rules are to be is of substantial benefit. The member for Unley's bill, I think, is a very sensible way forward and an improvement on the bill proffered by the Hon. Tung Ngo. The particular reason why I think it is an improvement is that the Hon. Tung Ngo's bill presents a different set of circumstances for a candidate depending on whether they are a member of a political party or an Independent, and I do not think that there is any valid reason why a councillor who is seeking election as an Independent, or a councillor who is seeking election as part of a political party, should have differential treatment in this way.

There is no public benefit from having that differentiation take place. The fact is that people who join political parties do so for a range of reasons, to be sure, but at their heart, in joining a political party, there is the opportunity to be part of a cultural and political tradition of values: values for the Labor Party that arise out of the union movement; values for the Liberal Party that arise out of the philosophical traditions of liberalism and conservatism, which I have found always fit very neatly together; values out of the environmental movement—and some might even cheekily suggest, socialism—that the Greens represent; and, values out of the depth of conservatism that the Australian Conservatives represent. It is shorthand for people knowing who you are and where you come from to be a member of a political party. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### *Motions*

## **CHILD ABUSE REPORTS**

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:30):** I move:

That this house condemns the Labor government's record on child protection and in particular notes—

- (a) the average waiting times on the Child Abuse Report Line having extended greater than one hour in 2016, compared to 10 minutes in 2012 and 20 minutes in 2015;
- (b) that over 200 children and young people currently live in emergency care as compared to zero in 2002;
- (c) that almost half of calls to the Child Abuse Report Line go unanswered and of those answered, the majority are closed with no action due to a lack of resourcing; and
- (d) the number of children under the guardianship of the minister has reached a record high of 3,280, showing that more needs to be done in the areas of prevention, early intervention and rehabilitation.

I note that these figures were correct as of last year when I actually researched the motion, so some of these figures—for example, the number of children under the guardianship of the minister—have actually risen since then. Although the time to answer calls has dropped, it is nowhere near the level it was in 2012, so it has significantly gone up and any improvements that are being made are still far worse than when this government came to power in 2002.

So, where to start? We have just had estimates, and we were just able to speak on estimates, so a lot of information has already been covered on this topic. Starting from the beginning, the government is putting in extra money, and I welcome the extra money being put into child protection. There was \$200 million announced last year, a further \$232 million in the Mid-Year Budget Review and a further \$86.5 million was added in the 2017-18 budget.

However, unfortunately, this is really just to cover the extra cost or blowout in costs in residential care because of a failure to employ a number of residential care workers, as announced in 2014 under then minister Rankine. An extra 360 workers should have been employed to save on the cost of using agency staff outside the government. The government, by not fulfilling its own election promises and announcements, has cost the state millions and millions of dollars. They continually make announcements of things that will be done, yet they are not implemented and not fulfilled.

We see that in the 2016-17 year there were 64,899 calls to the Child Abuse Report Line, which we know is an extraordinary number of calls from people who are concerned about the welfare of children in this state. It is unfortunate to see that around 23,000 of those calls were unanswered, which is quite a shocking number—23,595 calls went unanswered. We know that, of the people who did get through, many of them were waiting for extraordinary periods of time, up to five hours, just to get their calls answered.

There was a total of 64,899 calls, and 41,304 of those were answered, whilst 23,595 of those were not answered. Some 51,200 were taken as notifications, which I gather means that some of them were duplicates or referring to the same child. Of those 51,200, 21,100 were screened in, so that means they were considered as worthy of being screened in, and we know that around 4,058 of those were investigated. So from all the people who call and wait their five hours a number are screened in, and thus it narrows down and down. From that, there were around 1,500 substantiations, so that is where they are investigated and it is found that there are issues.

However, the figures are slightly confusing for this year. This year we have 21,100 who were screened in. Of those, 1,240 were considered tier 1, which means immediate action was required or that the child was actually in danger. If it is tier 1, you would normally perhaps call the police if a child was in that scenario. For tier 2, it was unclear of the figure. I know that last year it was 16,401. This year, I am still to work it out. We had 3,788 for infants, which has never been separated before, but then there were 7,604 for non-infants, yet apparently there were a remaining 12,908. The figures do not really add up, at this stage.

There were 538 in tier 3, which, in theory, should mean that with the right supports the family can work towards keeping the child safe in their home. There were 2,542 extrafamilial. They are children who are abused or neglected by people other than their immediate family. We can see that it is quite shocking in South Australia. Of course, the government does not cause people to abuse their children or neglect their children—I am not implying that at all. The government's role is to set in place the policies and procedures to give the right supports to families and to identify those most at risk. We know that young mothers or single mothers would be considered most at risk and most likely to end up in this scenario. People who are drug users are high risk. It is quite clear.

You can see—and I have over 100 open cases in my electorate office right now—that people who work in the industry can tell you who is most at risk. It is the government's role then to put in place the policies and procedures not only to identify those most at risk but to support those most at risk and to give them the capabilities and capacities so that they can look after their children safely, because it is not the government's role to remove every child from somebody who poses a risk.

As we can see from the figures that are increasing year on year on year, this is unsustainable, it is bad for the child, it is bad for the mother and the father, and the whole family suffers. As we have seen in Belinda Valentine's case, the grandparents suffer, the uncles and aunties suffer: everybody suffers when a child is removed or left in harm for too long. We can see that the figures are continuing to increase.

We know from the figures reported from the government's own website that there are 3,470 children under the age of 18 in out-of-home care. Out-of-home care includes foster care, which is 1,334; kinship care includes 1,548 children and young people. At the moment, residential care has

388; independent living has 38; and commercial care has 162. Both commercial care and residential care have eight-hour shift workers and that is considered to be the worst form of care for the majority of children. I acknowledge that the minister has indicated that there are some children for whom that is the best type of care, but I would expect that that is quite a small percentage, compared with the number of children who are actually living in those conditions.

It is a shocking indictment that when this government came to power in 2002 the Liberal Party had worked tirelessly and recognised that commercial care, or 'emergency care' as it is known, was the worst form of care for a child. They had policy settings and money spent to ensure that there were no children in emergency care when this government came to power. The numbers are purely a result of this government's handling of this situation. This is not something that has to happen. It is not something that has happened for all time. This is something that has happened under the Labor government under their policy settings.

Whilst commercial care has dropped for this year, because it was at an all-time record high, the figures in residential care have gone up more than the emergency care figures have dropped. Basically, you could say that they have just been moved to another form of care. It is not as if something miraculously has happened.

The government is spending some money on an Early Intervention Research Directorate, as per the royal commission. However, we know that we already have many research facilities on a federal level and a state level. We have Professor Fiona Arney and there are many researchers in South Australia. It is surprising that after 16 years in government they are only now researching early intervention and prevention when it is obviously a very important area that probably from day one, or from the first time that the government could see they had lost control of their child protection department, they should have been researching what was going on all around the world and what they could do about it. They should not have had to wait for a royal commission that took two years and \$6 million to now start researching. It is all a bit backwards, if you ask me.

We can see that there are a lot of issues with the Child Abuse Report Line. In the royal commission, it was quite astounding to hear that notes were handwritten and then their duplicate was entered back into a computer system. The computer systems do not talk to each other. You cannot just enter something once. In Victoria, I believe, it is an interactive form, so if you make an eCARL, an online report, it will trigger different questions and it will ask certain questions. That exact template into which you can enter data that goes into a database immediately can also be used for phone calls. Why are we not using that in South Australia? Two years ago in estimates when I was asking about this, the government had sent a team to Victoria and New South Wales to research this. They came back and they are not using it. It astounds me.

Also, three years ago in estimates I was asking about the callback facility that had been purchased and was supposed to be trialled. It is only now being implemented, three years later. There have been problems in this department for such an incredibly long time that I am over it, the public are over it and even the staff are over it. We have seen the high level of churn in this department. By the minister's own admission, there was a high turnover of staff. This is a very stressful area, but so it is for health, police and ambulance workers, but they somehow can manage their departments so that they do not end up with what the PSA allege is around 390 FTE unfilled jobs. That is why the staff are so stressed: they are expected to work under incredible pressure and they are understaffed.

This government is very good at announcements. They have announced \$4.4 million for foster care in 2015 to increase numbers. Then in February they announced \$9 million in 2016 for an extra 130 foster carers. We still do not know how many extra foster carers we have. I have asked in estimates, 'How many new foster carers did we get for each of the two years since all this money has been spent? How many left the system? How many do we have in total?' We cannot get the figures. When they say there is a 4.1 per cent increase in 10 months of foster care placements, for all I know they could have been existing foster carers who were already there, who have a spare room and have taken on an extra child, because the figures do not tell us that.

We all know about permanency for children being extremely important and we know about Other Person Guardianship. Again, three years ago in estimates I asked minister Rankine about it.

That was coming along quite well. There were over 100 children on OPG orders and there were about 75 or 85 underway. That dropped off for some reason. Something happened; either the department stopped recommending or there were some issues.

Three years later, we are still having issues with Other Person Guardianship. Not enough people are making it through the system to take pressure off foster families having to ring the department with questions about haircuts, school camps and trips interstate. It would also take pressure off the department in that it would not have to answer those type of questions. It would take pressure off foster carers and it would give the children a sense of permanency without it being an adoption. It is a win-win for everyone. I still have no idea why this government cannot get that system to work properly in order to give children more stability in their life.

As part of the budget, we now have \$1.7 million for the Commissioner for Children and Young People, for which we are thankful. It took many, many years. That was a Liberal policy many years ago, as was separating the department. We have also announced several policies such as the registration of social workers; foster care to the age of 21, which will give children better stability; and an audit of all children in residential care. I commend this motion to the house.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:45):** I rise today to speak against this motion. In June 2017, our Labor government released its first progress report on the reform of our state's child protection system, reform that we are deeply committed to driving.

**Mr Pengilly:** After 15 years.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms HILDYARD:** The report outlined significant changes in this area, some of the most significant seen in South Australia, clearly demonstrating that our government is rightly well down the track of implementing a complete overhaul of our child protection and, indeed, our child development system.

**Mr Pengilly:** What a disaster.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Finniss!

**Ms HILDYARD:** As a government, we are absolutely committed to fostering real change, change that will ensure that our youngest South Australians have the best opportunities to thrive. Our commitment to change is evidenced through our \$432 million funding investment to ensure our overhaul of the system is adequately resourced and supported. In our 2017-18 budget, our government invested an additional \$86.5 million to further meet the needs of children in state care, an investment which brings our financial commitment to improving child protection in our state to over \$515 million.

We have increased our funding and our staffing numbers to better support our most vulnerable children and young people with very high needs through the implementation of a raft of the Nyland recommendations. Alongside this work, in communities across our state, we are working together with service providers, community members, local leaders, local government, and local clubs and businesses to encourage community members to take collective community responsibility for the wellbeing of all our children and to reach out to those families in our communities who are in need.

Through this collective impact work, we are a part of fostering conversations about how we can work together with families and with vulnerable children, aligning our every effort to strengthen families and ensuring that every child is safe, healthy, active, ready to learn and positively engaging with others. We must absolutely do everything we can to protect our most vulnerable children and we must also do everything we can to ensure that those who are at risk also have the early support of their community in a way that is aligned and that gives them the best possible chance of being well, safe and happy and able to access the support that they need at the earliest opportunity before they are seriously at risk.

We are improving how we identify children and families who need assistance and the services that we are offering them. We are doing this in a number of ways, including through the Child Safety Pathway that began in July this year. This is a priority reform for our state government.

The new pathway is an innovative, multidisciplinary approach to child protection notification. It unites and aligns multiple agencies and gets them working together to offer a broader and a deeper range of responses for families and children deemed at risk.

This pathway refers families to the services they need early and ensures a linked-up approach to families with both government and community organisations. When people are at their most vulnerable and reach out for help, the best supports and interventions that we can provide are those that are compassionate and focused on the person's needs, and also those that are efficient, streamlined, and do not subject the person to unnecessary duplication in terms of having to provide personal details or having to repeatedly tell their story.

We want vulnerable families and their children to access services and supports in a way that empowers them to be heard and to build their families' resilience and capacity and to build connections to their communities. This Child Safety Pathway enables them to do just that. Overseeing our reforms is the newly established Early Intervention Research Directorate, which brings together Australia's leading child protection research experts to evaluate how our reforms are performing, to assess early intervention and prevention programs for their effectiveness and to provide advice to government on the best evidence-based strategies for helping our vulnerable families stay together safely.

The passing of the Children and Young People (Safety) Bill 2017 has introduced further important reform in South Australia. This includes greater benefit to our carers, who open their homes to children in need. The new legislation gives them greater oversight of the decisions made about the children and young people they care for, which rightly gives them greater involvement in the lives of the children they have taken into their homes. Again, we want to empower these carers and ensure that they have tools and supports that they need to continue to generously and in turn effectively empower and support the young people they care for.

We are starting to see positive results from these reforms, from our state government's investment and from the collective work that is happening across our communities, work that we support and work that supports local people and leaders to take responsibility at a local level for the wellbeing of our most vulnerable children.

The wait times people experience when contacting the Child Abuse Report Line, known by many as CARL, have more than halved. This fact renders the member for Adelaide's motion obsolete. In 2016-17, the call centre received a total of 64,899 telephone calls. Since December 2016, the average wait time has steadily improved, and for June 2017 an average call wait time of 23 minutes and 14 seconds was recorded. This has halved the wait time since December 2016 and reflects a steady reduction in the average wait time in the months since December 2016. We are making it easier for people and for services to come forward with valuable information that will help us to work with the children and families that need our help.

Through gathering and analysing information like this, through deep cooperation with partners throughout our state and through a compassionate, evidence-based, collective approach that engages our communities, we will be better able to intervene early to prevent issues from escalating. We will also be able to get a clearer picture of the risks children may be exposed to, how we need to act to protect our children and what we can put in place early in families to ensure that children stop being exposed to these risks.

We are pleased our reforms are showing positive results so far, but we acknowledge that there is still much work to be done. We are deeply committed to continuing the overhaul of our child protection and child development systems in South Australia, and we are deeply committed to focusing on early intervention and on strategies that strengthen our South Australian families and enable our youngest South Australians to thrive.

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:52):** I want to congratulate the member for Adelaide on bringing this motion to the parliament. The motion states:

That this house condemns the Labor government's record on child protection and in particular notes—

- (a) the average waiting times on the Child Abuse Report Line having extended greater than one hour in 2016, compared to 10 minutes in 2012 and 20 minutes in 2015;

- (b) that over 200 children and young people currently live in emergency care as compared to zero in 2002;
- (c) that almost half of calls to the Child Abuse Report Line go unanswered and of those answered, the majority are closed with no action due to a lack of resourcing; and
- (d) the number of children under the guardianship of the minister has reached a record high of 3,280, showing that more needs to be done in the areas of prevention, early intervention and rehabilitation.

I am speaking in support of this because I did for quite some time have responsibility for both the education portfolio and for child protection. I have to say that in the areas of families and communities, child protection and some aspects of the education portfolio, there are some horrific situations that you need to deal with as a member of the opposition. People come to the opposition when they have exhausted all other options for them in order to get an outcome from the government.

I think the most famous case in recent years involved the rape of a seven year old at a western suburbs school. Wednesday 1 December 2010 was a warm, pleasant day, one week before the end of the school year. At an Adelaide public school, the OSHC director led a seven-year-old girl into the canteen to prepare snacks for the other children, then he blindfolded and sexually assaulted her. That man went on to be convicted. There was a report on ABC radio that, despite that, there was still concern within the school community about the fact that nobody knew—nobody knew.

This is a man who had been working in schools and in the Scouts and had had access to children for 20 years. The governing council were extremely concerned about the situation and continually raised it with the minister for education, who was Grace Portolesi at that time. They raised it with the Premier and they raised it with officials within the Department for Education, and the same answer came back: the school council was not allowed to tell anybody what had happened. It was in breach of an act of parliament that protects people who have charges of a sexual nature laid against them.

Do not forget that this situation was not a charge: it was a conviction. No such rule exists, there is no automatic suppression, for somebody who has been convicted. The concerning thing about this was that parents on the governing council were even told that, if they raised it outside the governing council meetings, they would lose their indemnity as governing council members and they could lose their houses if the department or someone else decided to sue them for raising this outside of the governing council meetings.

It took one brave member of that governing council to visit me as the shadow minister at the time and express the concerns she had about what was going on. We worked out a strategy for what we could do about it. We learned that there were more victims of this paedophile who had not received justice and a mother who was sure that her children were victims of this paedophile but had had no follow-through from police. She reported her concerns to the police and the police did not take her seriously. She told her story, her name withheld and her face covered, in a full press conference.

I then went on to raise questions in the parliament. The education minister at that time, Grace Portolesi, said that she had received police advice that no-one was to be told. Within minutes of that comment being made in the parliament, the police put out a press statement saying that that is not the case, that there was no directive or advice from police not to tell parents about that. As a matter of fact, the Debelle inquiry went on to establish that the contrary advice was given by the police.

The Debelle inquiry also established that the person who was giving all the legal advice in that department was not even a lawyer. They did not have a law degree. It was not that they had not been presented at the bar but that they had not even done a law degree. They were giving legal advice to all the members of the department. It is no wonder that we exposed a terrible situation for parents.

A year or two later (I cannot remember the exact dates), I attended the decision on another five or six rape cases for which that childcare worker was convicted. He ended up going to gaol for more like six or eight years, rather than the 18 months that he was first given on the single sexual assault. Those parents came forward because they noticed a change in the behaviour of their children, which could not be explained until they realised that they were in the care of a convicted



paedophile. That is what happened under this government, and the Premier, do not forget, was education minister at the time this event occurred.

This happened under this government. A series of incorrect advice and, I have to say, a very casual attitude to child protection was the culture of the government. That culture has not changed. We heard the member for Reynell talk about money. The Labor Party always talk about money. They always talk about inputs and they never talk about the outputs or the outcomes of spending that money, but the facts, according to the Report on Government Services, are that the spend on child protection per child in South Australia is \$70.37 compared with \$230.14 Australia-wide and the Australian average.

Despite all the rhetoric about more money being spent by this government to deal with this problem, we are seeing record numbers of children in care in South Australia. That number is going up: it is not going down. It was interesting to hear some of the analysis raised yesterday regarding the very poor NAPLAN results we saw in South Australia—the worst in mainland Australia. People were asking the questions: is that related to our high unemployment rate in South Australia, and is that related to our high levels of dysfunctional families in South Australia? This government spends far more money on out-of-home care—pulling kids out of families and putting them into the care of casual employees, in particular—compared with the rest of Australia: \$805.80 compared with \$506 on average for the country.

Child protection in this state is an absolute nightmare; it is a mess. We see victim after victim coming forward every year. I am very pleased whenever I hear the member for Adelaide speak about this issue. She is so passionate, and she wants to get a permanent fix for South Australia. She will have the role of dedicated minister for child protection if we are successful after March next year.

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (12:03):** I have spent many hours in silence listening to those opposite playing a pointscore game on many subjects in this house. Many things like power, traffic rules, trade, employment and so on do not have a dangerous flow-on effect if those opposite confabulate. There is not a vulnerable population at risk. Child protection is very different. I have listened to the member for Adelaide during her many fishing exercises during question time. I listened recently as the child protection budget lines were examined during estimates, and then I listened as late as yesterday during the report on estimates that was delivered in the house.

There are a couple of things regarding yesterday's report that I wanted to point out as being untruths. The member for Adelaide talks about young people in care who leave care being completely institutionalised. I do not argue that that is actually the case with some of them, but they are actually taught many life skills throughout the time that they are in care, and I have been involved in these life skills programs.

The member for Adelaide talks about these young people not ever cooking their breakfast or not being able to undertake any of these skills when they leave care. It is simply not true. What she does not take into account when she says these things is that some of these young people living in care are the most traumatised, most vulnerable young people in our community who are experiencing a level of trauma that does not allow for them to adequately take on some of these lessons.

The member made a statement yesterday regarding her visit to a house of government care. I am glad she has been to one. She went to a house where children are under the age of 10, and she made a statement that these children were not bad enough to be in this house or were not suitable for this type of accommodation. I do not know what qualifications the member for Adelaide has to be able to let her deliver such a statement, but I would love to sit with her and have a chat about that. As a foster parent, I know the suffering and the detrimental effect that abuse and trauma have on children under 10 and what they are left with. There is more I could go about yesterday's statement, but I will continue.

I have come to the end of my acceptance of just listening to some of the untruths that are said. I understand how frustrating it must be not to be able to get immediate answers to what you consider very simple and obvious questions. I do not blame the member for Adelaide completely for some of the things that have been said because she goes on what she is told, of course. I do not know all the life experience of the member for Adelaide, so I will not judge that.

Seriously, it really does not excuse making things up either in here or in public. When I am confronted with things that sound absolutely ridiculous or make no sense, I just engage a filter that says, 'Don't ask that. Don't say that.' You just do not talk when you do not understand what is being said. I experienced this myself when I was left in a situation where I could not understand how somebody could have hit my son in an out-of-control incident, in an act where they did not respect themselves enough actually to respect others.

I did not understand how that could happen so I went searching for answers. I searched data on youth crime, I searched evidence and I searched academic studies. I found so much evidence about at-risk youth and within that, deeply embedded in that, a common theme of young people in out-of-home care. There is a consistent picture, not just in Adelaide, not just in Australia but worldwide. It is not SA-centric.

This is a worldwide problem faced by young people who have experienced the most severe trauma and neglect. They have experienced things being done to them that you could not imagine, and this is why these young people are the way they are. These children are most likely to end up as recidivist criminals, if not as juveniles then as adults, and they are also most likely to end up as victims—victims of crime not just in South Australia, not just in Australia but actually worldwide.

This is not a consequence of any government's care, not state, not federal, not Labor, not Liberal. This is a consequence of the most traumatised young people and how they are treated by those who are supposed to care and love them the most, generally their parents. It does not mean that the levels of care or standards that sometimes we see around the world should be accepted; it is just the facts. I certainly based my search for answers on fact: mentoring, fostering, life skills, tutoring, all those things and more. They all cost a lot of money and they must be invested into this group of vulnerable children who cannot remain with their birth families.

I am not always sure of the motives of the member opposite, the member for Adelaide. I know that she says that she wants better outcomes for these children, but sometimes the comments that are made are just so bad and damaging to the system that is trying to be put into place for these children that I am left wondering. This emotion is obviously not aimed at improving the situation for the state's most vulnerable children; rather, it is an opportunity to try to score political points again.

Rather than offering ideas and informed opinion about how we can work to improve the situation, time is being wasted in trying to undermine improvements that are actually happening. At every opportunity, there are tragic incidents raised, individual incidents that should not be talked about in the public, even on *Hansard*, in a place where it is supposed to be protected. These children-focused incidents should not be raised individually. Jurisdictions throughout the world are grappling with child protection, as are most areas of challenge that SA is facing. We are not on an island.

Unfortunately, the number of children needing assistance in this state is increasing. These children can no longer be cared for by their parents because of these awful circumstances that are not their fault. This is an appalling situation. What makes the situation worse is that there is no magic solution and there is nothing miraculously that will make everything right. To thrive, children need the unconditional love of parents or carers. It takes a village to raise a child. We have to work together to improve the situation—and we are.

As a community, we have to do what we can to identify where there is a problem and how we can help. We are investing much time, effort and dollars. Yes, we have to talk about money, but not as the core focus. The time and effort put into relationships by great people working in the department and by people in NGOs is incredible. For children who need care, we are investing to improve the options available to them. We are improving the programs available and the circumstances that they are living in.

We are focused on reshaping the out-of-home care system. Currently, we have 145 children in commercial care, not the over 200 children in emergency care as stated. We have seen a gradual decline in the numbers, and we are working with NGOs to find forever homes for these young, vulnerable kids. We also are making a concerted effort with Indigenous Aboriginal communities to get appropriate cultural and kinship care.

I find it incredibly hard to accept the complete lack of support from the opposition sometimes in this area, and comments made publicly by the member for Adelaide are damaging. It is ironic that a party fixated on cutting back so much in spending on public services, particularly from a federal department at the moment, is critical of either how much or how little we are spending to dramatically overhaul our child protection and development systems. The public record shows on every front that the Liberal Party wants to reduce spending on every important social issue. However, you cannot improve the situation for vulnerable children and families without investing in them.

I know the member for Adelaide in a previous life got a lot of satisfaction from helping young people and young adults in Adelaide achieve improvements in their general presentation and career options through a modelling agency, I believe. Running child protection and child development systems is very different from running that type of agency. Helping children who have suffered extreme abuse and neglect and who suffer ongoing trauma requires a lot more than department lessons to permit them brighter futures. It is one thing to teach these children how to walk with a book on their head, but it is another to teach these children how to read that book: it is very, very different.

These children are vulnerable. Suggestions without evidence are dangerous. Flippant comments are unforgivable. What is even more astounding is that, a year on from the Nyland report, those opposite have not actually committed to the reforms the commissioner recommended. They sit opposite and pass motions aimed at more political pointscoreing without offering a single useful evidence-based solution.

The member for Adelaide has professed on radio that she has hundreds of ideas that will fix child protection in this state. Terrific! We would love to hear them. One idea I heard one afternoon was the member's suggestion that boarding schools would be a positive move and probably cost a lot less per child. I pulled over that day and just sat, shook my head and pondered; I just could not believe what I was hearing.

Those opposite have one eye on the election and the other on ministerial seats. That is what this member and this party care about, not our vulnerable children. I remember hearing the Leader of the Opposition saying, 'I didn't go into politics for social issues.' Well, there are many people on this side who did go into politics for social issues and will continue. Please stop looking for headlines and start supporting historic reforms that will change lives. By your own admission, member for Adelaide, this motion is inaccurate, so I expect you will join us in voting down your own nonsense.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:13):** I rise to support the member for Adelaide in her motion:

That this house condemns the Labor government's record on child protection and in particular notes—

- (a) the average waiting times on the Child Abuse Report Line having extended greater than one hour in 2016 compared to 10 minutes in 2012 and 20 minutes in 2015;
- (b) that over 200 children and young people currently live in emergency care as compared to zero in 2002;
- (c) that almost half of calls to the Child Abuse Report Line go unanswered and, of those answered, the majority are closed, with no action due to a lack of resourcing; and
- (d) the number of children under the guardianship of the minister has reached a record high of 3,280, showing that more than needs to be done in the areas of prevention, early intervention and rehabilitation.

Let me say very clearly that the member for Adelaide's motion right at the start says that she condemns the government's record. There is nothing personal in the member for Adelaide's motion. She condemns the government's record. Sixteen years in government and I do not think there is a person in South Australia who thinks that the government is doing a good enough job in this area. We have had multiple inquiries over time looking into this issue, and the recommendations of previous inquiries have not been implemented.

There is probably no-one in the state who is not aware of the Debelle inquiry a little while ago, and the damning findings it brought out, but let me say again that the member for Adelaide has not, in her motion, tried to say anything about any individual government member or minister. I think it is entirely inappropriate for any government member to be making personal attacks on her. It really

does show that the government wants to play the man and not the ball on this issue, and it is the issue that is important.

I know in my heart that every single member of this parliament, the other house included—Liberal, Labor, other parties and Independents—knows in their heart what an incredibly important issue this is. Protecting the most vulnerable people in our community must absolutely be one of the highest priorities of any government, whatever political persuasion they are. However, I say again, as per the member for Adelaide's motion, that the government's record makes it very clear that not nearly enough is being done.

This is an emotive topic as well, so it is not surprising that members of the government would have some low blows. It is inappropriate, but not surprising, that they have found this such an emotive issue that they have not been able to stick to the facts the way the member for Adelaide is trying to stick to the facts. If we are good enough to be elected, I know that the member for Adelaide will be an absolutely outstanding minister for child protection. She will be a champion for children in this state. They will receive care, protection, policy, support from her, support from cabinet and support from the Liberal government, which they have never had before and which would clearly improve upon the current government's record in this area, which is just a matter of fact.

I know that Steven Marshall, Leader of the Opposition, is incredibly highly focused on this area. That is one of the reasons he created a shadow portfolio and will create a government portfolio specifically for this issue, so that a minister for child protection in a Marshall government will not be distracted by a range of other responsibilities. That person will be the member for Adelaide if we win the election and she would do an absolutely outstanding job, and she will be supported by all of us on this side.

Every member in this house knows that it was actually the Leader of the Opposition who called for a commissioner for child protection to be established. The government said it was not necessary, and it would not do it. Well, lo and behold, after they thought about it a little bit longer, a bit harder and a little bit more deeply they realised it actually was a good idea and they have taken up that suggestion.

There are many other very positive suggestions that a Liberal government will bring into place, not least of which is having a dedicated minister to deal with one of the most important issues in our community: looking after these children who, through zero fault of their own, find themselves in bad circumstances, all the way through to diabolical circumstances, which is completely unacceptable.

In my electorate of Stuart, as you might know, Deputy Speaker, we have over 30 towns and communities, and many people living in outlying areas outside those towns and communities as well. This is not just a metropolitan issue, this is a country and an outback issue as well. There are children all over our state who need more from the government and who deserve better from the government.

This complete deterioration in the amount of time even just to get a phone call answered on the CARL is completely unacceptable. I cannot imagine there would be a member in this place, even the most ardent Labor-supporting government member, who could honestly say that it was acceptable that someone should wait on hold for an hour before their call was answered. It is preposterous to think that any member of this house would think that was acceptable.

When I wrote to ministers with concerns about particular households, institutions or children, I used to receive letters back telling me to deal with it myself. I remember one time being advised that what I should do is call the CARL. I was told not to waste time writing to ministers seeking help for a particular household or a particular situation, but I should call the CARL and report it that way. I have to say that I get very good support in my electorate office from the education minister, the member for Port Adelaide, when I talk to her about these issues.

I respect the fact that many of these issues are confidential and I do not seek all the details that are going on. However, when I get a call or an email to my office with an allegation about some harm being done to a child or a child being in a completely inappropriate situation, and if I deem that advice to be worth following up—because there is an aspect of judgement in all our work—when I go to the education minister's office I do not get that response anymore: 'Call the CARL and chase it up yourself.' I do get good support from the minister's office in that regard.

The statistics across the state make it very clear that the results are still not good enough. It is completely unacceptable to have 200 children and young people currently living in emergency care, compared with none in 2002 when this government came into office, and to have 3,280 children under the guardianship of the minister. These are completely unacceptable outcomes.

The member for Fisher said in her contribution that she finds fault—I will not get this exactly right—overwhelmingly in the parents, the guardians and the people responsible for these children who end up in these bad situations, and I agree with her wholeheartedly. It is not the kids' fault. It is overwhelmingly the fault of the adults who are responsible for those children. However, the reality is that the government needs to deal with that. The government must deal with it and the government is not dealing with it. The results that we have at the moment are completely unacceptable.

As the member for Unley said, for the government to say how much money they are spending in this area does not solve the problem. That is not an acceptable answer. It is the results that count and it is the record that counts. The member for Adelaide has been deliberately focused on the government's record and she is deliberately focused on improving the welfare of the children.

Just to say how much money is being spent in this area is not good enough because it is not achieving the results. It does not matter whether no money is spent in this area or billions of dollars are spent in this area, all that counts are the outcomes for these children. That is the highest priority, that is the only thing that really matters and it is very clear that after 16 years of Labor government the results are not nearly good enough.

Sixteen years ago we had no children living in emergency care. That is the goal that we need to get back to. That is the target that we need to aspire to and that is the outcome the current government certainly has not achieved.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:23):** I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Adelaide:

That this house condemns the Labor government's record on child protection and in particular notes—

- (a) the average waiting times on the Child Abuse Report Line having extended greater than one hour in 2016, compared to 10 minutes in 2012 and 20 minutes in 2015;
- (b) that over 200 children and young people currently live in emergency care as compared to zero in 2002;
- (c) that almost half of calls to the Child Abuse Report Line go unanswered and of those answered, the majority are closed with no action due to a lack of resourcing; and
- (d) the number of children under the guardianship of the minister has reached a record high of 3,280, showing that more needs to be done in the areas of prevention, early intervention and rehabilitation.

Before I get into the substance of my speech, I congratulate the member for Adelaide on not only bringing this motion to the house but taking on a very difficult portfolio. I would like to briefly make a comment on what some members on the other side seem to like taking as a personal attack, like the member for Fisher. When she is in this place, she tells us about her past life and her career. We hear it a lot and that is her call.

I acknowledge what the member for Adelaide has done in her previous life in running a very successful business, but she does not have to get up and scream it from the rafters every five minutes. She does not have to do that because her record speaks for itself, both in this house and previously in her work record, in running a very successful business and employing many people, and still keeping in contact with those people today as friends and colleagues. I think people should focus more on what we are discussing.

In regard to the Child Protection Systems Royal Commission, which was established in August 2014 to investigate the adequacy of the child protection system in South Australia, I note that we have had many reports over the time of this Labor government. The final report of the Child Protection Systems Royal Commission was delivered to the Governor in August 2016 and then we saw on 1 November of that year a new Department for Child Protection was established.

Of the 260 recommendations that came from the Nyland commission, the government confirmed that, after they had some consultation with the community sector, it had accepted 196 of

those recommendations, agreed in principle with a further 60, and chose not to adopt four. That was as of late 2016 in November.

It is interesting to note that a lot of money has been put forward, but it has not achieved the results that we should have achieved in regard to child protection. The government made a commitment of \$432 million over four years for statewide child protection reform and additional support for children in out-of-home care. I will just detail some of the things that they said they were going to do:

- \$299 million for additional staff, resources and new initiatives in out-of-home care;
- an additional \$45 million for early intervention programs and services, including the establishment of an Early Intervention Research Directorate, funding for the Family by Family program, \$9 million to establish three pilot child and family assessment and referral networks in northern, central and southern metropolitan Adelaide, and a further \$5 million per annum for early intervention programs and services;
- \$26 million to improve the government's investigations and response capabilities, including an additional \$10 million for professional development and training of Department for Child Protection staff;
- \$6 million to establish the Office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People;
- \$6 million to establish a child protection service at the Lyell McEwin Hospital;
- \$13 million to improve the Child Abuse Report Line; and
- an additional \$10.8 million for support for young people transitioning from care.

I note that, as of late last year in 2016, over 3,000 children were in out-of-home care and, of those, there were 1,495 in relatives care or kinship care, 1,301 in foster care, 333 in state-run residential care and 181 in emergency care, which is in motels and other accommodation similar to that. There are over 200 now in emergency care and at that stage there were 39 living independently.

There are predictions that the number of children living in out-of-home care could rise to as much as over 3,500, which since 2010-11 is a 48.6 per cent increase. We saw that, in 2015-16, 821 children were placed on legal authority for the first time. In June 2016, 190 children were in emergency care; an average of 157 days for children in emergency care; and a cost of \$600,000 for the month of June in 2015.

With regard to the Child Abuse Report Line, there is an inquest backlog. At four years, 18 per cent of cases are still open in South Australia. We can compare that with 2 per cent in the Northern Territory and 7 per cent in New South Wales. In 2015-16, there were 912 drug tests. Regarding the Child Abuse Report Line, only 62 per cent of calls were answered in December 2016 and only 58 per cent were answered in 2015-16. At the moment, the average wait time to get through on the Child Abuse Report Line is over one hour—it is outrageous.

One in four children in the state is the subject of a notification to authorities. This was admitted by the Premier in a media release on 29 November 2016. As far as reported notifications and screened-in notifications are concerned, in 2015-16 there were 54,704 reported notifications and 21,427 screened-in notifications. That tells us that overall 39 per cent of reports were screened in. There was a backlog of 1,500 around the middle of 2016. There were 21,500 projected notifications of abuse or neglect assessed as requiring further action, which were screened in in 2015-16. There were 5,375 projected investigations of child abuse notifications and 2,258 projected child protection notifications that were substantiated.

After all those many hundreds of millions of dollars, we have a major problem in this state with child protection. It is ridiculous that people get on the Child Abuse Report Line and have to wait an hour for their call to be taken. We absolutely have to make sure that our most vulnerable children are looked after. We have to look at the policies that see children, through no fault of their own, end up as renegades by the time they are three or four. Essentially, in my mind, a lot of these children are lost to society.

It takes much management, with up to a dozen staff attending schools to look after a single incident with one child. I think there needs to be far better management and far better help. I know of one lady who has had at least 14 children and they are just taken at birth by order. We have to do far more for our children. Instead of just throwing money, the government must make sure that their policies are effective.

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (12:33):** I rise also to speak in support of the motion put forward by the member for Adelaide:

That this house condemns the Labor government's record on child protection and in particular notes—

- (a) the average waiting times on the Child Abuse Report Line having extended greater than one hour in 2016, compared to 10 minutes in 2012 and 20 minutes in 2015;
- (b) that over 200 children and young people currently live in emergency care as compared to zero in 2002;
- (c) that almost half of calls to the Child Abuse Report Line go unanswered and of those answered, the majority are closed with no action due to a lack of resourcing; and
- (d) the number of children under the guardianship of the minister has reached a record high of 3,280, showing that more needs to be done in the areas of prevention, early intervention and rehabilitation.

As we look back over the history of this government's efforts in this area, it is alarming to note the number of reports and inquiries that have gone on since 2003 under this government and potentially before. If we do take note from since 2003—that is more than 10 years under this Weatherill Labor government—we saw the Layton report back in March 2003, a 400-page report into child protection put together by Robyn Layton QC. The findings from that are amazing when we look at them.

After that review found that the state's criminal justice system was failing children and that the government's child protection services were struggling to cope with demand, the amazing upshot of that was the key recommendation to appoint a commissioner for children and young people and a guardian for children. That was the key recommendation—and I note again that this was back in March 2013—and the government failed to act.

There were more reports after that, too. There was the Mullighan inquiry in April 2008, where retired Supreme Court judge Ted Mullighan QC was given responsibility to inquire into any allegation of sexual abuse of a person in state care, whether or not any allegation was previously made or reported, in 2004. So that was another inquiry held after the Layton report.

There was a parliamentary select committee on Families SA in November 2009, which received 92 written secret submissions and heard evidence from 38 witnesses, including departmental whistleblowers, who gave evidence to that inquiry. Again, very little was done by this government and things continued to deteriorate. It is a very sad indictment on this government's performance in the area of child protection.

I would like to think that it saddens everyone in this house and all the South Australian community that nothing has been done. I commend the member for Adelaide for bringing forward this motion to bring attention to this point to the house and to the people of South Australia. The member for Fisher said that this was about creating headlines, but this is actually about putting all the facts on the table.

We move on with the reports. In 2013, the DeBelle inquiry was held. This independent education inquiry was launched after it was revealed in state parliament in November 2012 that parents of a western suburbs school were kept in the dark for two years after an out-of-school hours care worker had been arrested and later found guilty of the rape of a girl in the care of the school, who was aged seven—absolutely abominable, horrendous and disgusting in every way, shape or form. As I stress, inquiries and select committees have been going on and on for more than 10 years, and this government has failed to act.

Of course, we know that in April 2015 there was a coronial inquest into the death of Chloe Valentine, where State Coroner Mark Johns held an inquiry into the 2012 death of four-year-old Chloe Valentine, who had been the subject of more than 20 reports to Families SA before losing her life. It is horrendous. Most people in the community know that story. It is terrible that so much went unattended to by the department, and that that was where we ended up.

Then, of course, we had the Nyland royal commission. Again, the member for Adelaide has made a number of very good points about this along the way. What was unearthed here was a culture of secrecy, unwieldy bureaucracy, a lack of resources and a failure to put children first, which is what I think appals everyone on this side of the chamber most definitely. That should not be accepted here in our state.

Child protection and the protection of those most vulnerable, especially young children, is incredibly important, and that is why on this side of the house our leader has made it imperative that we pay the appropriate attention on this, and has set aside the task for the member for Adelaide, who is now acting in the shadow role of child protection. We see it as a key pillar of what we would be delivering in government, namely, protection of young people. Having a minister specifically for child protection I think is a great initiative.

There is more than a decade of mess here that needs to be fixed up and it needs that specific attention. It really is a blight on South Australia's copybook that we have found ourselves in this situation. I think everyone feels a sense of shame that it has dragged on for so long. As I pointed out before, the last election that we contested called for some changes to happen. We called for the Department for Child Protection to be established and we called for the implementation of the recommendation from the 2013 report for a commissioner for children and young people. Eventually, the Premier listened and eventually that has come to bear.

As I said, I have gone through all those inquiries, all those committees and all those reports, and a royal commission is what it took to get to that point, yet we had been calling for that for a long time before. It is a shame that it took so long. It is an indictment on this government. The South Australian Labor government that has brought us to this position really has made a heck of a mess of child protection in South Australia.

I was also disappointed to hear the member for Fisher before making a very personal attack on the member for Adelaide—someone who has worked very hard in this space. The member for Fisher indicated that the member for Adelaide brought this motion on to create headlines. I think that is a pretty low claim to make. She also had a go at her for her past. The member for Adelaide has been a very successful businessperson in Adelaide. I think the member for Fisher did get very personal. On reflection, she would probably regret those comments because they were very personal and this is not about personal attacks.

This is about fixing a problem in South Australia that has been going on for more than a decade and escalating and escalating. What the member for Adelaide has done is point out the fact that there have been a number of reports that have raised red flags, admitted there are problems and pointed out the problems that we have in the system, yet this South Australian Labor government continued to ignore them. As the member for Fisher wants to talk about headlines, I note with interest *The Advertiser* headline on Wednesday 22 June 2016. The headline reads:

SA's dysfunctional child protection system has failed our most vulnerable again and again. Its design was the Premier's first major reform and he's defended it across years of scandals. Now, he's finally admitted...

I was wrong.

Families SA to be split off and boss shunted. System 'in crisis'.

That is right: this was put together by the Premier. It was his first major reform and it failed over more than a decade. There were numerous reports outlining the failures, numerous red flags, but this government did not listen. On this side of the house, we see child protection as a number one key imperative for any government. Again, I stress the point that that is why a Marshall Liberal government will put in place a minister specifically for child protection to help correct the mess that has been created over such a long period of time. We will work tirelessly to fix the mess that South Australians have endured in this child protection space and do everything in our powers to prevent anything like what we have seen from happening again.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:43):** I rise to support the motion put forward by the member for Adelaide and to make a brief contribution to it. It is quite interesting to look at the current Premier of South Australia and some of the portfolios that he held prior to being Premier. Some of the things that may have taken a bit of time to come out are coming out in due course. If this government really



wanted to win the next election, I might suggest they look at the Premier and perhaps replace him. There is probably somebody sitting in the seat right now who would be quite happy to do that.

When the Premier was in charge of the environment—I would have to go and check my records—we had a massive investment in wind farms in Clovelly Park. I am not begrudging those, but certainly we now face an unreliable grid due to intermittent energy. More importantly, when the current Premier was the education minister he made a strategic move to combine the education department and Families SA. For those working in that industry at that time, it was met with a fair bit of dismay that this was just not going to work.

In fact, when the Nyland report came out, it pretty much confirmed everything that those people who were working in the department were saying at the time. The current Premier was also the Minister for Families and Communities. It is quite interesting that after the Nyland report he said the following: 'My government accepts full responsibility for the failings of the state's child protection system in keeping children safe.' It was not 'he as minister' or 'he as Premier' but 'his government'.

I guess it comes back to not just spending more and more money. When the Premier was the minister for families almost a decade ago, he promised to fix the system which the Nyland report indicated needed an urgent overhaul. In 2014, when he addressed parliament he said that he saw no rational reason, frankly, why he would split Families SA and the education department and make Families SA a stand-alone unit. Again, the royal commission said that that was exactly what needed to happen.

Some of the other things that this government could do is adopt the Liberal Party's position of having a single, dedicated cabinet minister responsible for child protection instead of the current scenario, where the portfolio is split between the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Education and Child Development. It was and is massively confusing between those two.

I want to go back to some reports that come into my office and talk about the on-ground experience of a number of people who come into my office. As parents in our society, we always try to be positive role models. Besides being loving parents, we owe a duty of care to our children to provide sustenance, to ensure they are provided a sound education, a safe home to reside in and to look after their health and welfare.

I have encouraged my own children from a young age to participate in team sports, whether it be football, netball, soccer, tennis or dance. This provides them with physical exercise for health and wellbeing as well as helping them form lifelong friendships. Unfortunately, not all family units are surrounded by such nurturing environments. It may be due to economic reasons, due to loss of employment, marriage breakup, death of a family member, or the effects of alcohol or drugs, and in particular we are seeing the rise of ice and the devastating effect it has on communities.

Too often, we hear of family units being decimated by a parent who is addicted to alcohol or drugs. I welcome the state government's announcement of \$8 million for ice rehabilitation and the 15 detox beds that have been announced without further detail. I encourage the minister responsible for the South Australian task force to release the details of where those beds are going to be located.

Concerned relatives, teachers and friends try their best to help and may even report issues that they see, but sometimes these reports fall on deaf ears or the reporting system is simply too difficult. Help is needed now; it is not hanging on the phone for over an hour. Or it could be there are simply too many reports and there is a lack of resources to handle so many complaints. It is interesting that in December 2016, I think during a Budget and Finance Committee, that Families SA were unable to fill 300 jobs that would have taken them to their full-time equivalent of 1,949, having only recruited 1,652.

I have had many instances of people coming into my office, but I want to talk very briefly about one. A grandmother at her wits end came into my office seeking help as she was deeply concerned about her grandchildren. Her grandchildren are currently living in Adelaide, and I read the following from a letter which she has provided to me and which details the reports the grandmother has made and comments from her grandchildren:

...nothing in life changes for these children and they are told that nothing will change so they may as well stop complaining because that's the way things are.

As I said, this comes from the grandmother. The letter continues:

The children tell me they have a rule, 'what happens at home stays at home' and is not to be discussed with others. I have been told they are bodily hurt if they break any rules. The reports I have personally lodged are...

Again, this is from the grandmother.

- That the boys are being kicked by their stepfather, I have seen him put his 5 year old at the time in time out by cupping his hand over the child's shoulder and kicking him behind the knees, causing the boy to collapse onto the floor where he is left. The grandchild was profusely crying while he was waiting to be put in time out.
- One of the boys has been kicked in the back and stomach by the step father while lying on the floor as punishment for something. The boy was still in considerable pain days later. We didn't know at the time he had been kicked, we just thought it was rough play with his brothers or would have taken him to the hospital. He was not allowed to discuss with anyone—he was scared. We later reported this incident to the police, they say they can't do anything without Families SA requesting an investigation, let down again, Families SA closed file again.

The children are not fed properly. A typical meal may consist of a meat pie or chips and nothing else; on another occasion, mashed potato, nothing else; on other occasions, rice custard; and on another occasion, just fish fingers. The letter continues:

The boys are not allowed to wash their hands at home, brush their teeth or help themselves to get a drink.

The fridge...cupboards and [kitchen] are out of bounds as there is a lot of 'adult food' in them. The children are continually hungry. It is a punishable thing to help yourself to anything, being hungry doesn't count. I have seen lots of adult foods in the freezer, it contains frozen meals from the supermarket, left overs for the adults.

When I have rung Families SA to try and improve life for [my grandchildren] I am suddenly the most hated person [by Families SA staff]. The kids are struggling at school, probably from poor nutrition, poor hygiene, low self-esteem all the things that can go with [that feeling]...

They are told to accept the way things are by their mother and step father. They are abandoned. Fortunately for these children the schools do give [them food]...Someone please do something for these children.

The above letter is a harrowing story from a grandmother who desperately wants to help her grandchildren. She has reported her concerns but has been told that the files have been closed. These children need help. The system is failing them. With that, I will conclude my remarks.

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (12:53):** I would like to thank members for their contributions, particularly on this side of the house for their thought-provoking stories and for keeping it non-personal. It is very disappointing that the Labor members have to make this a personal attack. It is clearly an issue that has been going on for almost 16 years under this Labor government, and child protection has been fraught with story after story. We had the Layton royal commission in 2003, but the children's commissioner, who was recommended then, some 14 years ago, has only been implemented this year.

It is not that the government does not know what is wrong. They have had two Mullighan inquiries that also told them what was wrong. They had the DeBelle inquiry that gave them further information on what was going wrong. They have had coronial inquests into baby Ebony, into Chloe Valentine and into Jarrad Delroy Roberts. This government has been given a plethora of information on how to fix a broken system for almost 16 years.

They have spent copious amounts of money and they have done lots of reports so they can have plenty of media attention and it looks like something is happening, but we can see from the results and from the facts and figures that nothing substantial has improved for children in this state. We see that we are at the highest numbers ever of children in out-of-home care. The calls are still not being answered.

Imagine if there were 23,000 calls not answered to the ambulance. Imagine if 23,000 calls made to the police were not answered. Imagine if 23,000 calls were made to the fire brigade and they were not answered. There would be an absolute outcry. The minister would probably be sacked. This is unacceptable. These are our most vulnerable children who are being left in danger.

Then, of the 41,000 calls that did get through, many are considered notify-only concerns, so they are not taken seriously, and many are closed with no action due to a lack of resourcing, as in no staff available to do the investigation. Of the very slim number that are investigated, we then see

many that are substantiated re-substantiated within a year. We have the worst performing safety record of nearly all the states in Australia, which means that even knowingly the minister and her department are leaving children in danger—in further danger, after it has been substantiated.

As we have just heard from the member for Mount Gambier, there are many, many cases where the department knows children are in danger and they are doing nothing about it. They are left there to the crisis point. They are the ambulance at the bottom of the cliff. The children are moved after years and years of neglect. They are mentally and emotionally behind on every level. They do not perform academically. They are damaged because they have been left in chronic neglect scenarios due to a lack of resourcing at the correct end of the system.

It takes a special kind of incompetence to brag about copious amounts of money being spent for the worst possible outcomes for our children in this state. The government is spending all their money at the end—the emergency care, the commercial care. We know that there was a \$99.7 million blowout in emergency care last budget because of the failure to employ or recruit adequate numbers of residential care workers. It is an admission of their own fault: they have not employed the right number of staff, so they have spent nearly \$100 million on agency staff, when it was announced in 2014 that 306 extra full-time staff would be employed in residential care facilities.

They are not even achieving their own goals, let alone the goals that should be required, and deservedly so, for our children. There needs to be more emphasis on early intervention and prevention. This is not a personal attack. The whole of government is responsible: when you know that children are in danger, which we do, it is not your fault they are in danger, but when you find out they are in danger you need to answer the calls. You need to act on the calls. There should not be 600 eCARL reports still not dealt with. It was 1,500 a year ago, so you have improved, but that is 600 children that mandatory reporters have reported to you that no-one has even read about. They have not even started the investigation.

It is an absolute shambles, what is going on in this department. After years and years of endless money and endless reports, there has been no substantial difference made. Shame on this government. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion negatived.

*Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.*

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Remuneration Tribunal—

Determination No. 5 of 2017 Report Auditor-General, Electoral Commissioner,  
Deputy Electoral Commissioner, Health and Community Services  
Complaints Commissioner

Determination No. 6 of 2017 Report Review of Salary for Presidential Members of  
the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Determination No. 7 of 2017 Report Review of Salary of the Governor of  
South Australia

Report relating to Determination No. 5 of 2017 Report Auditor-General, Electoral  
Commissioner, Deputy Electoral Commissioner, Health and Community  
Services Complaints Commissioner

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—Relationships Register

Criminal Law Consolidation—

Criminal Organisations—Premises in Para Hills

Criminal Organisations—Premises in Salisbury South

Relationships Register—  
Fees  
General  
Rules made under the following Acts—  
Magistrates Court—Civil—Amendment No. 19

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Planning, Development and Infrastructure—  
Assessment Panels—General  
Assessment Panels—Transitional

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Natural Resources Management—  
Central Adelaide Prescribed Well Areas  
Noora Prescribed Wells Area

*Ministerial Statement*

**SOUTH-EAST ASIA TRADE MISSION**

**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) (14:02):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** Last week, I led the second of three state government business missions to South-East Asia planned for 2017. I was accompanied by around 60 delegates looking to do business with their counterparts in Singapore, Malaysia and Myanmar. We were also joined by Sir Angus Houston, our Special Envoy for Trade and Investment. Our South-East Asia Engagement Strategy is now two years old and has been instrumental in supporting our work to increase our profile and presence in the region.

South Australia has a long history with Singapore and close ties with Singapore's leaders, including the President himself, Dr Tony Tan, an alumnus of the University of Adelaide. South Australia's total trade with ASEAN was \$A3.6 billion in 2016. South Australia and Singapore enjoy a robust two-way trade relationship, with merchandise trade valued at \$A587 million in 2016. The object of everything we do is to help our exporters to sell their goods and services overseas, thus creating jobs and investment at home.

The mission was planned to coincide with Adelaide University's Australia-Singapore Relationship Conference, which I attended and where I had the privilege of launching the GIS-IVQ Joint Laboratory. The delegation included a visit to ThincLab Singapore, part of the University of Adelaide's ThincLab innovation hub network, ThincNet. This network encompasses ThincLab Adelaide, ThincLab Singapore and ThincLab Chalons in France. The network provides innovative spaces that discover and pioneer collaborative relationships with schools, industry, government, students and innovators in the wider community.

I had a productive second meeting with Singapore's Minister for Trade and Industry, minister Iswaran. I was proud to introduce him to many of our South Australian delegates showcasing their products at a business networking event, including Greenwheat Freekeh Pty Ltd, Koonara Wines, Drifter Rum and many others. Three MOUs were signed in Singapore, including an agreement estimated to be worth \$A40 million with the potential to create eight jobs in South Australia to set up an e-commerce platform to export South Australian food produce to wider Asia, using Singapore as a transshipment hub. I can mention that the Department of Primary Industries is heavily at work with our food producers getting their product to export.

The MOUs also included a collaboration between Flinders University and Nanyan Technological University on the Medical Device Partnering Program (MDPP), and Singapore was the second MOU signed. An agreement was also signed between SPRING Singapore and the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA that will enable both governments to learn from each other to further collaborate and innovate through the South Australian Food Innovation Centre (SAFIC) and Singapore's Food Innovation Cluster (FIC).

Singapore is amongst our top 10 source countries for international students, with 539 students studying in SA in 2016. Our three universities, StudyAdelaide, TAFE, as well as private education providers, were all represented on the mission. This is one of our biggest exports: education. The mission then travelled to Malaysia, where I had a second meeting with Malaysia's Minister for International Trade and Industry, Dato' Sri Mustapa Bin Mohamed. We also had productive meetings with minister Hishammuddin, Malaysia's Minister of Defence, as well as the Chief of the Defence Force and the Chief of Navy.

Two-way trade between SA and Malaysia was worth just over \$1 billion last year. That is a lot of jobs and enterprise at home. Malaysia continues to be a significant market for education, as our fourth largest source country for international students. We had 1,775 young Malaysians students studying in SA last year. The mission then divided, with some streams continuing on to Penang, led by my parliamentary friend the Minister for Health and Minister for The Arts while others travelled to East Malaysia.

In Kuching, we had a warm meeting with the Governor of Sarawak, another alumnus of the University of Adelaide, and met Sarawak's Minister for International Trade. This was followed by travel to Kota Kinabalu, where we visited the Sepanggar Naval Base and met with the chief of the naval base, followed by a meeting with the Naval Group (formerly DCNS). Both Malaysia and Australia are customers of DCNS, the Naval Group, in the business of submarines. We have much to learn from one another.

Finally, we travelled to Yangon to explore the opportunities for South Australian trade with Myanmar, particularly around education and services. We visited the project site of SA firm RJE Global, which established its office in Yangon two years ago. It provides engineering and construction services for projects in industries, including mining, energy and infrastructure. Members may be interested to know this South Australian company has established a 30-megawatt diesel gas power plant, assembled in Adelaide and maintained by South Australian workers in Myanmar. It was great to visit their work. It was a very interesting aspect of SA exports.

I look forward to hearing the outcomes from the business delegates on the mission. Our final business mission to South-East Asia for 2017 will take place from 20 to 26 August to include Thailand, Vietnam and Cambodia. I look forward to leading more South Australian exporters to make the most of the opportunities with our nearest trading partners, activities that sustain 72 000 jobs here in SA.

#### *Question Time*

#### **CARDIOLOGY SERVICES**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm the member for Lee's recent written advice to his constituents that, and I quote, 'All cardiac services will stay at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital'?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:08):** I thank the member for his question. Yes, I can.

#### **CARDIOLOGY SERVICES**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08):** Supplementary: does the government's commitment to retain all cardiac services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital include restoring any cardiac services and staff positions lost since the start of the Transforming Health process?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:08):** The truth is that all of our services emerge and change over time. We always take the best advice from our clinicians about

how they are constructed at any point in history, so these will be a matter for the clinicians. The fundamental commitment of cardiac services remaining at The QEH, including the cath lab, is one that we have made, and we are very happy to have it confirmed over and over again by the bleating of those opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is called to order, and I call to order also the member for Mount Gambier.

#### QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL CATH LAB

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09):** My question, again to the Premier, is: can the Premier inform the house how, aside from the retention of one cardiac catheterisation laboratory, his government has changed its original Transforming Health proposal for cardiac services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:09):** There is nothing further to add. Cardiac services remain at The QEH and, beyond that, it's a matter for the clinicians about how they are constructed.

#### QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL CATH LAB

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09):** For clarification, the Premier is saying the only change to the plan that existed was the addition or the restoration of the promise for a catheterisation laboratory?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:10):** The leader misrepresents the position. That's not what I said. What I said amongst, other things, is that the cath labs are remaining, which was one of the sources of contention that were raised in much of the public debate. It's what characterised a very large proportion of the public debate. So people are clear about that, I have said that they will be remaining.

The balance of the services is a matter for local clinicians, but cardiac services remain there as do respiratory and oncology services, as does our commitment for a \$250 million upgrade of the TQEH, which means that every patient-facing area in relation to The QEH, every patient-facing area—

**Mr Bell:** Pork-barrelling?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —will be new as a consequence of the commitments made by this government. I well remember, as a candidate campaigning in the lead-up to the 2002 election, where the talk was from those opposite about the privatisation of The QEH, where they were committed to the downgrading of The QEH.

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** What we did immediately was to invest in the new research facilities—that fantastic Basil Hetzel Institute that sits across the road—at The QEH, and of course the commitments we have made to build that beautiful new wing, which houses inpatient services. Now, of course, the important final stage is to invest in the new rehabilitation facilities, and also of course replace the other inpatient services in the present tower building.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier is warned for accusing the Premier of pork-barrelling the western suburbs, and the member for Hartley is called to order.

#### CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** Supplementary: can the Premier inform the house how many cardiac inpatient beds will now be retained at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:12):** No, I don't have that information with me. I will get the Minister for Health to bring you back an answer.

**CARDIOLOGY SERVICES**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** Can the Premier confirm to the house that there will be no reduction in either the number of beds or the number of staff in that cardiac unit?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:12):** There will be a continuing commitment to cardiac services at The QEH, and the way they are constructed—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —at any one point in time will be a matter for the clinicians. I am happy to bring back additional detail, because it's simply detail I don't possess because I am not the Minister for Health, but the commitment is to retain those services at The QEH.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta, I call to order.

**CARDIOLOGY SERVICES**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** Given that that cardiac unit has already lost six inpatient beds, and the plan was to reduce the number of beds from the current 24 down to six, can the Premier confirm that there will be no reduction from the current 24 cardiac inpatient beds at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:13):** As I said, the way in which these facilities are constructed is a matter for the clinicians, but I am happy to bring back an answer about what the present configuration is and what the expectations are.

**CARDIOLOGY SERVICES**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** Can the Premier then confirm that he does not stand by the member for Lee's comments, that all current cardiac services will be preserved at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, as he informed his constituents earlier this month?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:13):** The leader seems to be deliberately seeking to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Yes, and they are, and the cardiac services—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —are going to remain at The QEH.

**The SPEAKER:** I call the leader to order and also the member for Schubert.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I know the Leader of the Opposition finds it difficult when the government consults and listens to people and decides to alter its position in a way which responds to community demands, but while the Leader of the Opposition often—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —cheers for us and barracks for us to do those things, then when we do them he seems to want to complain about the fact that we have done them. It's extraordinary.

**Mr Gardner:** How is your consultation going on the Repat?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, let's talk about the plaza area. You opposed the plaza area and now you're bagging us for not doing it quickly enough. This is an opposition that just simply doesn't know its own mind. You call for us to reinstate these services and then you complain when we do.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Before we come to the member for Unley's point of order, I call to order the members for Davenport, Finniss and the Treasurer, and I warn the members for Davenport, Morialta and Schubert. The point of order?

**Mr PISONI:** The Premier is entering into a debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold the point of order. Is the Premier finished?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader.

#### CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** Supplementary: can the Premier provide the people of the western suburbs with an assurance that there will be no cuts to hospital beds, staff or outpatient services in the cardiac facilities at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:15):** Absolutely. We will give a commitment that there will be no cuts to services in the western suburbs. In fact, we are improving services, improving the quality of services to people in the western suburbs every—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Are we seriously to believe that the Liberal Party, who are seeking to tear down our public healthcare system in this nation at every step of the way, are to be trusted with our public healthcare services?

**Ms Chapman:** You don't even care.

**The SPEAKER:** I call the deputy leader to order and I warn her, and I also warn the Treasurer.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Question to the Premier, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

#### CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16):** Can the Premier confirm that the decision to modify the government's original plans and restore cardiac services to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was a decision that he and the Minister for Health made on their own on either Friday 16 June or Saturday, 17 June?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:16):** No, I can't confirm that. As the leader would be aware, because he has been happily repeating it, there have been significant representations that have been made by local clinicians in favour of the retention of the cardiac services at The QEH. We of course had the initial plans that were being proposed under the auspices of Transforming Health that involved some rationalisation of those services, but there were different perspectives being advanced by local clinicians.

On some of the occasions with Transforming Health, we take different perspectives into account. Where we think they are cogent and powerful representations, we seek to modify if we can, without doing any violence to the overall reforms that we are seeking, to alter them. That is what we did in a number of cases. There have been changes to the Flinders Medical Centre neonate wards, the Noarlunga emergency services and changes at Modbury Hospital. There have been changes across a range of various healthcare services. Obviously, our objective is to improve the quality of care. It's also—

**Ms Chapman:** You have failed.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** No, in fact we have succeeded. We have succeeded in very significant ways. The quality of care, as a consequence of these reforms, has improved. Also, because we know that high-quality care leads to the more efficient allocation of resources, we have also made some modest savings as well along the way. That has always been the way in which Transforming Health has been proposed—



*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I can hear the member for Kavel. He is called to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Where there are conflicting objectives and where there are strong community views, we have to also make sure that we take the community with us. Ultimately, it's their healthcare system. We make no apologies for taking into account the judgements of ordinary, everyday citizens about these matters because it's their services. It is critical to the success of those services that they have confidence in them, and so we take those things into account. We have made some hard decisions, which have not been popular, but we have stuck with them because they have been vital and they go to the heart of saving lives—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Morialta for the second time.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —and improving the quality of care. We will never compromise the quality of care in any of our decisions, but we will, where we possibly can, seek to take into account the views of our communities. That's simply what the Minister for Health and myself, in consultation with the Treasurer, have done in a range of these matters.

#### CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** Supplementary: did the cabinet meet on either Friday 16 June or Saturday 17 June?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19):** We don't discuss cabinet deliberations and what cabinet—

**Mr Marshall:** The date would give it away.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, I am simply not going to go into what cabinet decides or doesn't decide, except to say that all of our decisions have been made properly after due consideration.

#### CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** Can the Premier inform the house who made the decision, who was present at the meeting and when it occurred that cardiac services would be restored to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19):** This is extraordinary. Do they want us to restore cardiac services or don't they? The government made the decision and, apart from telling you what tea and biscuits were at the meeting, I think I have given you all of the relevant material which went into the decision-making process.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Davenport has shown no compunction about my earlier warnings. He is warned a second and final time.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20):** My question is to the Premier. Given that both he, today, and the health minister, yesterday, have talked about political decisions being made to change Transforming Health processes, can the Premier give any indication as to whether he will reverse the Transforming Health decision to close emergency surgery at Modbury Hospital?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:20):** No, we are not proposing to make any further changes in relation to Modbury. We have made some magnificent investments in Modbury, including the extended care arrangements in the emergency department. We have also seen dramatic improvements in relation to fewer cancellations to elective surgery because we don't have the interruption of emergency services at a range of our hospitals. I must say that it galls me to hear somebody—

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —who is suggesting that it is five minutes before the next election and we are being criticised for making intelligent decisions about a critical area of public policy.

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** They know themselves that they would be having to make similar judgements about getting high-quality care if they were ever in government. Their solution is privatisation of healthcare services and cuts to healthcare services.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** My supplementary is to the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is a delicate fellow and he cannot abide this background noise. The leader has the call.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Hear, hear! Thank you, sir. My supplementary is to the Premier. Has either the member for Newland or the member for Florey made representations to the government regarding the restoration of emergency surgery to Modbury Hospital?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:22):** I am in regular communication with our backbenchers and, indeed, I am also in regular discussion with members on the other side of the chamber and they tell me some very interesting things. They tell me some very interesting things, and their representations are not limited to health care either. I am in regular dialogue with the member for Florey, the member for Newland and other members about the quality of healthcare services in our state and, in particular, Modbury Hospital. We continue to put at the heart of our thinking high-quality health care and excellence in relation to health care.

**The SPEAKER:** Before we get to the supplementary, the member for Morialta needs to know that the Speaker is not impressed with a point of order against a minister's answer that has not got beyond 'it galls me'; there has to be a bit more than that.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:23):** My supplementary is to the Premier. In light of your earlier answers, would it be fair to say that, without the reintroduction of an ICU, there would be no way we could reintroduce emergency surgery, which is of course the point we have been lobbying for some time on? What chance is there of having the ICU reinstated?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:24):** I will have to take that question on notice. I will get the Minister for Health to bring back an answer.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

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

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:24):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister advise why the NAPLAN results in South Australia have shown lower mean scores and fewer children meeting the national minimum standards than all other states—Western Australia, Queensland and Tasmania, in particular—across the majority of categories?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:24):** I am interested to hear that the question was worded more carefully than that of his predecessor in the role of opposition spokesperson earlier today, who seemed to completely disregard the question of facts being used in this parliament.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

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

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** There are good signs within the NAPLAN results as well as challenges within the NAPLAN results, but the opposition shows absolutely no interest in the work that has been done by teachers across the state, nor by the students across this state.

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

**Mr PISONI:** By the minister offering commentary on the opposition, she is entering debate.

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

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** What we have seen is that year 7s—and the only policy the opposition in fact took to the last election on education was to move where year 7s are taught—did better against any other jurisdiction than the other years.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I trust that the member for Morialta is going to make a point of order that none of us can hear the minister because of the bellowing of the leader, or was it something else?

**Mr GARDNER:** Prior to that, she was defying your ruling to get back to the question.

**The SPEAKER:** No, in fact she made the briefest aside while talking about year 7 results. The leader is warned. Minister.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Numeracy on all levels for all age groups is up slightly on last year, but do we ever hear about that from the opposition? Not a word because all they are interested in doing is running down the work of schools in this state. Here is where we do need to act because being stable—which is broadly the case across Australia from last year to this year; broadly, when you look at the statistically significant differences, the results across Australia have remained stable—is not good enough. We need to not just remain stable: we need to get better.

We need to get better because the modern economy is putting increasing demands on the skills and knowledge of students as they exit school at the other end. They need to be good at literacy and numeracy in order to obtain all the other skills and all the other content knowledge that they are going to need in order to work in the workforce. What we need to do is not run down what schools are doing now and what students are doing now but come up with ideas on how to improve, how to lift standards. To do that, you need money.

Because this government stuck to Gonski without a word—not one word—from the other side about Gonski, because this government has stuck to our side of the bargain, we are increasing funding to education in the next two years and we will be able to spend it in a way that will make a difference. Therefore, yesterday we announced the \$67.5 million that we will be spending over the next four years to target not only students who are not meeting the standards that are required but also students who are not growing—students who might have done reasonably well but did better two years earlier and need to live up to their potential. We are spending money on that.

Imagine the world where the Canberra government stuck to their side of the bargain the way we did. Imagine that world where we would have \$210 million more for every school in this state over the next two years, if they had stuck to their bargain. Admittedly, it could have been worse because, under the Hockey budget, we would have lost \$335 million but, instead of being supine and accepting whatever it is that Canberra gives us and blaming the schools and saying that money does not make a difference, we stood up and fought.

Not just this Labor government but every school community stood up and fought and said 'That's not good enough.' They insisted. We did not win all the money back and that is to the everlasting shame of this federal government, but we won some of it back and we will spend it because we need to spend it on interventions that will make a difference. It is not about how you front NAPLAN: it is about the individual student and their experience, and we need to be able to do interventions to support them.

**EDUCATION FUNDING**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:29):** Supplementary, sir: in relation to the \$67.5 million that the minister announced the direction of yesterday, will that money be going to schools directly and, if so, in what way will the government be directing the nature of its use by principals? Or will the relevant new staff be attached to head office instead?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:29):** I am so grateful for what could have always amounted to a government question—\$67.5 million. I am glad you asked. What we will be doing is analysing the data partly from NAPLAN because we might as well make use of this diagnostic test in a diagnostic way for the individual students.

We will be using that data and will be using the data that is captured from within the schools to identify those two categories of students that I just referred to briefly at the end of my previous answer—but it is possible that members of the opposition did not hear me because they were too busy talking—one category being the students who are not meeting the minimum standards and the other category being students who are not making sufficient progress based on their previous indicated capacity through previous results.

What we will do is identify where the funding will go, to which schools, for which students. The money will go to the schools. The money will go to primary schools in the public system. How that money is spent will be guided by experts, by people who actually know about education, not by the cheap commentators who like to get on and just slam our schools and say they are doing a terrible job, worst in the nation, which is not true—is not true. We will have an independent panel of experts who will be able to help guide which interventions are effective, which style of pedagogy, what approach, but the money will be spent by and in our schools.

**EDUCATION FUNDING**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:31):** Supplementary: given the minister's explanation to that question, will the money form part of the grants to the schools each year, or will it have a specific directed purpose and restrictions on the principals and their ability to spend it so that they comply with the recommendations of the panel the minister has described?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:31):** The language in that question is quite extraordinary. The money will be spent in the schools and by the schools, with guidance from people who are experts so that we have proper evidence bases. But this, 'Will they comply? How will you make sure? How are you going to bind them up?'—it would be surprising to think that it is the other side that says that we should have more autonomy in schools.

In fact, we already have significant autonomy, and what we need to do is make sure that we get the money out to them and we get the support for making the right decisions. This, 'Can we have a list of the procedures on how we are going to bind our principals up?' No, you can't.

**EDUCATION FUNDING**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:32):** Supplementary: does the \$70 million that the minister is talking about comprise the entirety of the additional funding of the state component of NERA, apart from the part that is going to the non-government schools, or are there further parts that are still to be determined what they are being spent on?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:32):** No, it doesn't.

**EDUCATION FUNDING**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:32):** Supplementary: how much of the 2018 and 2019 components of the state's NERA funding is yet to be determined what it will be spent on?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:32):** The member asked me this question in estimates and I have taken it on notice.

**EDUCATION FUNDING**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:32):** Supplementary: since then, the minister is aware that she has identified a portion of it. When will she be able to provide an answer on how much additional funding the state is providing?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:33):** It is on notice: you will get an answer.

**EDUCATION FUNDING**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:33):** My question is to the Minister for Education. What is the status of the government's 2013 literacy and numeracy plan, titled 'Great start, strong foundations, powerful learners: a literacy and numeracy strategy from birth to 18'? Does that document still represent the government's strategy, or is there a new strategy that has superseded this document?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:33):** To the best of my knowledge, that is the name of our current strategy. I don't hold the full titles in my head at all times, but we have had a literacy and numeracy strategy in place for some time. The question is not just to have documents about what we do and how we spend the money. The more money we have the better job we can do.

**EDUCATION FUNDING**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:33):** Supplementary: without asking the minister to comment on the name of the document or the document itself, is she familiar with the strategy that is comprised in that document launched by the member for Wright in 2013?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:34):** Absolutely, I am familiar with it. I can confirm whether we have done any supplementary updates to it, but we have had a literacy and numeracy strategy in place for some time. Subsequent to the launch of that document we have had the results plus framework in the last couple of years and now we will be introducing this additional strategy.

It is as if the opposition thinks that you can say, 'It is terrible to talk about money, You don't need more money,' but also criticise our results. Schools cost money, and doing more work in schools costs more money. Of course, that's not the end of the story. Of course, it's about how we spend the money, hence the independent expert panel that we are putting together. Of course, it's about how you spend it, but there is no point in thinking about how to spend it if you are not going to stand up and get the money.

We have had to stand up against the federal government to claw back some of the money that they tried to rip out of the education system. We have done that alone, as a lone voice in this state within politics. Thank God we have had the community on our side.

**LITERACY AND NUMERACY STRATEGY**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:35):** A supplementary question: why was the literacy and numeracy directorate within the Department for Education, which had been responsible for delivering on the government's literacy and numeracy strategy, abolished in 2015?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:35):** Structure, yes, I noticed that during estimates I was asked over 50 questions about structure. I was not asked one about NAPLAN—not one about NAPLAN, apart from by the member for Mount Gambier, and not one by the opposition spokesperson on literacy or numeracy, which suddenly has become of interest because there is a bit of a sniff of the media in the air. I have forgotten the question.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Structure, of course. The structure of the Learning Improvement Division, as it is now called, was designed in order to work more closely with schools. For that reason, it was restructured in a way that plugged into primary schools and plugged into secondary schools,

rather than being divided on subject matters. Of course, literacy and numeracy have remained fundamental to the work, particularly for the primary school area.

#### LITERACY AND NUMERACY STRATEGY

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:36):** A supplementary question: who then is in charge of the panel with regard to delivering this new \$70 million of literacy programs that the minister described earlier?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:36):** We will be making detailed announcements about that panel in due course. We are not here at the bidding of the opposition to explain detail to them but, if I can correct the way in which that was articulated, the panel is not in charge of the strategy: the panel is separately responsible for guiding—

**Mr Marshall:** Hopeless!

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

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I hope there are no schoolkids in the gallery today to see that kind of behaviour. The panel will be guiding all our efforts and interventions irrespective of whether it's paid for through this particular project, but we will be making announcements about the panel in due course and the member can wait for that.

#### ADELAIDE YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:37):** I have a question for the Minister for Education. How is the government supporting the specialised staff who deliver educational programs at the Youth Training Centre at Cavan?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:37):** Has the member just asked me how we are supporting staff who work at Cavan in the educational effort?

**Mr GARDNER:** Who delivers the specialised education programs at Cavan.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** We have excellent staff there. I was visiting very recently in fact to talk to the people who offer training there. They do an outstanding job both within the two facilities that the students are unable to leave as a result of court orders and also in the allied campus, which is out in public, which was originally designed essentially for the students to be able to continue their studies after leaving the facility run by DCSI.

That in fact is now stretching a little more broadly than that. It has quite a range of students who have had nothing to do with the DCSI facility but who nonetheless are well served by that campus. The principal is doing an excellent job, having previously worked on the lands. I commend all the staff who are involved in that effort.

#### ADELAIDE YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:38):** A supplementary: why did department senior officials walk out of a recent negotiation with staff representatives at Cavan in relation to arguments over a range of matters, including staff rosters?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:38):** There are many, many industrial actions that occur from time to time. There are many disputes that arise and disappear again. I can find out the details, if the member is particularly interested in that one, but I am sure that the department is working through that in a considered way.

#### ADELAIDE YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:39):** A supplementary: is the minister herself familiar with the industrial matters that are in question in relation to Cavan?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:39):** I am aware that there is an issue, but I am not

aware of all the detail. I don't ask to be kept up-to-date in the management of staff, given that that's a responsibility of the chief executive and not the minister.

#### **ADELAIDE YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:39):** A supplementary: given the minister has provided the response that she has, will she now promptly familiarise herself with this issue and ensure that it is resolved fairly?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:39):** This is the responsibility of the chief executive. Just so that we understand how government works, the chief executive is responsible for employment. The chief executive is responsible for the employment conditions and the chief executive will be working through that.

#### **ERRINGTON SPECIAL EDUCATION CENTRE**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:39):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Why did the majority of the parent members on the Errington Special Education Centre governing council resign? Has the minister been briefed on the circumstances of the matter?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:40):** I am aware of the circumstances at Errington, and I think that members of the public will have some understanding if they have been following this matter in the newspaper. However, as the member is well aware given our discussion at estimates, there is a police involvement at present and I am simply not going to answer any questions that relate to Errington in public in order to make sure that that is able to take place without any compromise.

#### **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY LICENSING APPROVALS**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Energy. As the government's temporary diesel generators will require an EPA works approval and licence and the EPA's public advice to project proponents is that licence assessments can take up to four months, when is the government assuming its generators will receive the necessary EPA licensing approvals?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:40):** I don't have that information here with me, but I will get that for the member as quickly as I possibly can.

#### **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY LICENSING APPROVALS**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:41):** Supplementary: is the minister aware of any delays in the approval process so far?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:41):** No.

#### **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY LICENSING APPROVALS**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:41):** Supplementary: when does the minister expect to receive AEMO approvals for the plant?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:41):** Soon.

#### **ELECTRICITY GENERATION**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:41):** Again, my question is for the Minister for Energy. Having had 24 hours to check, can the minister advise the house whether the APR TM2500 diesel generators the government is installing in suburban Adelaide are the same as the APR TM2500 diesel generators that were used in Tasmania and exceeded Australian emission standards?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:41):** Yes, I have

checked; they are not, they were a generation earlier. The shadow minister is attempting to compare a VL Calais with a current model Calais. They have very different emission profiles. The generators that were used in Tasmania were an older generation and had a smaller output, approximately 25 megawatts. The new generation that we have is a 30.7 megawatt output and has different emission standards.

#### ELECTRICITY GENERATION

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:42):** My question is again to the Minister for Energy. Why did the minister advise the house yesterday that the government decided to locate the new diesel generators at Lonsdale and Elizabeth on 31 July when, on behalf of the government, South Australia Power Networks advised ESCOSA on 11 July that that would be happening?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:42):** I don't believe I did advise the house. I think it was in response to a question about an answer from an estimates question by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

#### ELECTRICITY GENERATION

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:42):** Supplementary: just to help the minister with answering the question, if I may I will quote from *Hansard* yesterday:

...on what date did the government decide to use Lonsdale and Elizabeth as the site for the installation of the diesel generators?

That was the question I asked, and the minister's answer was:

When the government signed the final contracts, which would have been the night before we made the announcement...

And that was 31 July.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:43):** I think my answers are entirely consistent. The point I am making is that, had the government not signed the contract, which is entirely within its purview not to, the locations wouldn't have been finalised. You can't locate something—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I won't be warning the leader again; I will be acting.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I think my answers cover it. I am not trying to be difficult to the shadow minister. What I am attempting to tell him is that ultimately nothing is finalised until we sign the final contract. Preparatory work is preparatory work in anticipation of a final decision. It is very different from the final decision.

#### ELECTRICITY GENERATION

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:44):** Supplementary: given that the final decision was made on 31 July, why is it that it was in the *Government Gazette* as at 3 July and why is it that SAPN wrote to ESCOSA on 11 July confirming these facts?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:44):** I am assuming that they were anticipating a final decision, and that final decision was made a day before the announcement.

#### RIVERLAND COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICE

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:44):** My question is to the Attorney-General. How does the state government plan to deal with the current cases of the Riverland Community Legal Service, which ceased on 1 July this year due to South Australian government funding cuts?

**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) (14:45):** I would really like to say thank you very much to the member for Chaffey for that question because it gives me an opportunity to report to the house about the impacts of a very nasty federal government decision about 18 months ago. If you think about it, in the context of the federal budget, it was not only nasty but miserable.

What they decided to do was to attack, in effect, the community legal centre sector, which is traditionally funded by the commonwealth government, and pull lots of money out of the community legal centre sector across Australia. They said to us in South Australia, 'We are taking all this money off you. What we'll give you, though, is a one-off grant of just over \$1 million to try to do a readjustment process.' I immediately called a meeting of all the community legal centres in South Australia. I sat down with them and asked them what they wanted us to do. Did they want us to fight the commonwealth government with them, or did they want us to accept the money and go through the change, or what did they want us to do?

We agreed that we would try to work through the change, because it appeared to be inevitable, and at the same time, in collaboration with the other attorneys around the country, we would attempt to get a reversal of that decision. I can say that attorneys-general throughout the country, irrespective of their political allegiance, were happy to sign correspondence jointly to Senator Brandis asking him to reconsider his position. His government chose not to reconsider that position, so we have been through this lengthy process whereby we were forced by the commonwealth into finding a new way of delivering legal services through the community legal centre sector with a significantly reduced federal budget.

That process ultimately resulted in a series of tenders being set. The tenders required services to be delivered across the state, just not in the metropolitan area. In addition to that, we were able to change the methodology so that the initial first call where somebody is seeking advice would not have to be to a CLC. It could be to the Legal Services Commission, who would provide a lot of that early advice across their telephone, thereby often saving people the need to engage with a CLC at all because they have had that early triage, if you like, of, 'Do you have a significant legal problem or do you not?'

We have improved the service across the state, in the sense that we now have a first answer coming by telephone from the Legal Services Commission. Then we have the successful tenderers for the delivery of those services in place around the state, delivering those services. There are two areas that had been of particular concern, and understandably so: one is the Mount in the South-East and the other one is the Riverland.

In both cases, I have had meetings with local government representatives from those areas because they have asked me, 'Can we have a chat about this?' and I have said, 'Yes, that's fine.' Can I say that the member for Mount Gambier has approached me about this as well. I appreciate him taking that matter up on behalf of his constituents.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** A hardworking local member.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, he came to me and he approached it in the right spirit, which was trying to solve the problem. We are now in a position where we are attempting to do that. I have made it clear to local government in all those areas that if there are some ways we can cooperate—for example, by local government providing us with resources like an office or housing or something that will actually enable us to stretch the service further—we are very happy to cooperate with them, and there will be face-to-face services.

**An honourable member:** Time!

#### RIVERLAND COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICE

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:49):** Supplementary to the Attorney-General: now that the majority of the federal funding has been reinstated, how will you put in place the new service to cover the 40-plus face-to-face inquiries per week at the Riverland legal service?

**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) (14:49):** Again a terrific question, thank you. What has happened is that, in the process of studying the way the CLCs were delivering the services, we discovered amongst other things that a great many of the people who were going to the CLCs were visiting those CLCs for a service that they could have received over the telephone and not had to bother turning up for. Many of those people were given a quicker and more efficient service by actually using the telephone. For those people, wherever they live, the new service is better.

For the people who live in the Mount, or the South-East generally and the people in the Riverland, we have made it clear that the actual face-to-face service will be demand driven. The amount of face-to-face service that your constituents and the member for Mount Gambier's constituents require will determine the amount of time that we have actual legal officers there providing that advice.

As to the other question about the additional money being provided by the commonwealth, yes, it is true that in the last federal budget the commonwealth said, 'We will give back some money that we took away—give back some of the money', and I think from memory it is \$1.2 million, \$1.3 million of the money they took away, which was considerably more, so it is not all of it; it is some of it. We will give the money back, but we, the state government, are not allowed to apply that to the legal services of the people of this state as are needed. We are obliged to apply that only to services which tick the box of being related to domestic violence, essentially.

That means all those other services that are provided by CLCs, we cannot give them money for that. I have made it clear to anybody who approaches us, and I ask all members on the other side of the chamber here to speak to their federal representatives: for goodness sake, allow us to give that—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, and I have said this to others: for goodness sake, please allow us to use that money where the need is the greatest. I am not for a minute saying there is not a need for DV services, but a lot of those services are being met elsewhere. To address the particular problem that is being raised by the member for Chaffey, those funds should not be locked up in the way they are.

What will happen with those funds, however, is that they will be distributed, unless the commonwealth changes its views, amongst the existing providers, and those funds will be quarantined to DV-related services delivered by those existing providers. To the extent that providers, who are existing providers, are delivering DV services and to the extent those services are in the Riverland or in the South-East, a proportion of those funds will flow through to those service providers.

However, it is very important that people understand those funds are quarantined funds. They are not funds that are available to those services to be spent on whatever demand comes through the front door. They are funds which are quarantined to particular expenditure. Obviously, I am pleased the commonwealth gave the money back; that's terrific. After stealing a large amount of money, they gave a little bit back—terrific; we appreciate that, and I say that sincerely—but they did not put it all back and they have tied the money they have given back. They waited until we had been through the whole restructuring process before they decided to give any money back at all.

I am very happy, and I say this particularly to members whose constituents are in the Riverland or in the South-East, and I am keen to work with you, your local government authorities and anybody else to make sure the service you get there is the best possible service that your community can have within the constraints that have been imposed on us.

#### **RIVERLAND COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICE**

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:53):** Supplementary, sir: Attorney, the South Australian Legal Services Commission has deemed the Riverland the most disadvantaged region in South Australia. You have installed one visit per week to the Riverland for 40 face-to-face consultations. Do you think that's appropriate?

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

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Wright to order.

**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) (14:53):** The interesting part of that question was 'I have initiated or installed one visit per week'. Wrong: Senator Brandis has initiated one visit per week.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No, Senator Brandis is the one who decided to disrupt the arrangements for the delivery of legal services, not me. As far as I was concerned, I was perfectly happy to leave things as they were. I did not disturb them: Senator Brandis did.

In a very common stunt that we see—and this is regarded in some commonwealth circles as being mildly humorous—what you do is you take money away from a service that you, the commonwealth, have been funding in the states, and then to make it really interesting you then say to the state, 'You see that mess over there. Here's 20¢ for you to go and sort it out.' That's exactly what they have done to us. What they have done is that they have gone up to the big bouncy castle with 'legal services' written on it, they have pulled the plug out and they have handed us a bike pump and said, 'Off you go, try to pump the damn thing back up again.'

Well, we are doing our best, But, notwithstanding the fact that legal services have been rudely and unnecessarily disrupted by commonwealth meanness, notwithstanding that, I come back to the point I made before: the services, the face-to-face services in the Riverland and the face-to-face services in the South-East will be demand driven. And if there is anything that I can do to assist those service providers in cooperation with local government in the South-East or in the Riverland, I have made it clear to the mayors and the CEOs from those areas that all they need to do is to discuss it with me.

In fact, after our last meeting, we have agreed to reconvene before the end of the year to do a bit of a catch-up on how things are going, and they are going to say to me what they think we can do to help them, and they are going to tell me what they think they can do to help us. I actually take my hat off to the local government authorities in the Riverland and the South-East because they have been trying to work in a cooperative fashion with the state government to get the best value out of a very, very meagre deal that was imposed on both of us by the commonwealth in their budget: not this one just gone, the one before.

#### **FOOD CREDENTIALS PROGRAM**

**Mr GEE (Napier) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, how is the state government assisting food and beverage producers?

**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) (14:57):** I thank the member for Napier for the question and thank him for his great commitment to the food industry in South Australia—a very good cook, and someone who really values the great food that we have here in South Australia.

One of our priorities as a government is premium food and wine produced in our clean environment and exported to the world. While we know we have one of the cleanest places on earth, and some of the best practices on earth in terms of growing and producing food and turning it into value-added food produce, the rest of the world want some umpires' verdicts and certificates to make sure that they can line that up with other things produced around the world.

What we have done is we have committed to supporting a food and wine credentials grant program, which supports businesses seeking third-party certification in a range of areas, including sustainability, quality assurance and environmental standards. I was really pleased this week to see that Ferguson Australia has been accredited for seven wild-caught species. They are the first in the world to be Friend of the Sea accredited for King George whiting, garfish, flathead, giant crab, ocean jacket and gummy shark (which is flake). They also have the first shark fishery in the world to ever be accredited.

They are the first in Australia to get Friend of the Sea for their Southern Rock Lobster. Ferguson Australia put that up on social media and thanked PIRSA, Primary Industries and Regions South Australia for the work they have done because it is one of this government's initiatives to put money in to help food producers around the state get these third-party certifications, and a \$13,500 grant to Ferguson Australia helped them get that. So that is terrific news.

We have conducted three funding rounds so far. The first round was offered in 2015 to the seafood sector; seven grants, totalling \$183,200 were made to South Australian wild catch fisheries and aquaculture operations. Round 2 of the grant program was offered more broadly to the food and beverage sector, with nine grants, totalling \$103,758, awarded to projects in the wine, livestock, seafood and food manufacturing sectors for organic, environmental quality assurance and food safety certifications. Round 3 of the grant program resulted in six grants, totalling \$23,195, being awarded to businesses to gain certification of their organic and non-GM status. These companies will then be able to place their products into specific markets, where their organic and non-GM status is valued.

In the latest round, nine South Australian food and wine businesses will share in more than \$86,000 in state government grants. The following businesses will receive up to \$25,000 each to attain third-party certification: Tucharke Wines, which is seeking organic and biodynamic certification for their winery operations; Wirra Wirra Vineyards; Clean Seas Tuna; Dowie Doole; Kitchenhand; The Fresh Fish Place; Growers Wine Group; feather and PECK, for Egg Standards of Australia food safety accreditation for their pastured free-range eggs; and the Southern Fishermen's Association, to assist the fishery finalise their reassessment for the Marine Stewardship Council recertification.

This program has helped South Australian businesses achieve independent verification of their high production standards and to grow exports in national and international markets. As a government, we will continue to work side by side with the food industry in South Australia.

#### INVESTMENT AND TRADE

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:01):** My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. What are the factors behind the business investment growth in the recent CommSec State of the States report and the Deloitte Access Economics Investment Monitor?

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:01):** I thank the member for Colton for his question because there has been no better time to invest in South Australia. This is supported by both the CommSec State of the States report and the Deloitte Access Economics Investment Monitor.

The CommSec State of the States report released in July 2017 ranked South Australia amongst the top states or territories for business investment. Only South Australia and New South Wales had business spending in the March quarter above decade average levels: South Australia on top at 7.2 per cent, followed by New South Wales, 5.3 per cent. Compared with the March 2016 quarter, business investment in South Australia is up 19.3 per cent, also the highest increase in Australia.

I know that those opposite hate hearing this. They hate good news, but the Deloitte Access Economics Investment Monitor for June 2017, released on 26 July, confirmed that information. It lists 90 projects in South Australia that are either privately owned or public-private partnerships. Out of a total of 147 projects listed in South Australia, 61 per cent of investment projects in South Australia are at least partially privately owned.

The Deloitte report lists five notable projects Australia-wide added to the database in March 2017, two projects of which are in South Australia. Investment Attraction SA has been working with both the project proponents. According to Deloitte, between March and June 2017 total investment in South Australia increased 6.4 per cent, from \$42.9 billion to \$45.7 billion.

The Deloitte Access Economics Investment Monitor makes note of the \$2 billion that has been committed by the South Australian government for road projects by the Minister for Transport over the next four years. Almost \$1.5 billion-worth of projects are scheduled to finish construction in 2017. No wonder there are cranes up all over Adelaide.

The report also notes that the South Australian investment pipeline has received a boost from the state budget, with approximately \$400 million to be spent on upgrading major hospitals over the next four years and \$400 million for education and early childhood services by the Minister for Education. Contributing factors to our success are listed by these reports:

- the SA government's major tax reform package, which will see \$670 million in state tax reductions over four years;
- South Australia's highly competitive environment and the ease of doing business, which supports profitable investments;
- our highly skilled workforce, competitive labour costs, cutting-edge research and development facilities;
- the pool of the state's quality graduates from South Australia's three highly regarded universities;
- a dedicated program and strategy to promote SA globally via a scheduled program of trade missions (nine trade missions since July 2016); and
- supporting 72,000 jobs (more exports means more jobs and more investment).

South Australia has a range of cost advantages. KPMG's Competitive Alternatives 2016 report found Adelaide was the lowest cost city in Australia to do business. You've got to give the Treasurer some credit: private sector labour costs in SA are 10 per cent below the Australian average.

I could go on with the string of good news and the string of positive messages. There could never be a better time to invest in South Australia. There are only seen to be a few nay-sayers: the five major banks and their branch in South Australia, the South Australian Liberals.

### COUNTRY HOSPITALS

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:05):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Given that the minister boasted on radio that the state budget is very good for those in regions, why is there no assistance for country hospitals, such as Yorketown, which has been fighting to keep surgical services at their local country hospital?

**The SPEAKER:** I will be interested in any developments for Schubert.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:06):** The regions are a very important part of the South Australian economy, producing nearly 25 per cent—

*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The only man we fear, sir. The South Australian regional economy is very important to the state, producing over 25 per cent of our gross state product. It is very, very important, and there have been dramatic investments in regional South Australia. I will start with one very important regional investment we are making: \$50 million—

**Mr BELL:** Point of order: can I bring the minister back to the substance of the question. It was around the Yorketown hospital and, if he wants to be broader than that, around health services for regional areas.

**The SPEAKER:** Would the member for Mount Gambier bring his written question to the Chair, please?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** In my defence, it was claimed that the budget had nothing for regional areas. One of the tips of the spears of our budget has been regional communities. Port Pirie and Whyalla, these communities have seen dramatic investments from this government, with \$50 million that will be invested directly into the Whyalla community.

**Mr BELL:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I know what the point of order is. The member asked about there being matters in the budget for regional areas and then gave one example: Yorketown hospital. The Treasurer can either answer the example, or he can answer in the broad, and he appears to be answering in the broad.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** My favourite investment is nearly \$48 million in PACE gas and, hopefully, all of that is spent in the South-East of South Australia—a \$48 million investment in oil and gas, \$48 million of more local jobs and \$48 million of extracting oil and gas out of our state by unconventional and conventional means. This is not to forget the Job Accelerator Grant, not to forget measures that we have in the budget now for payroll tax cuts to small businesses based in regional South Australia and not to mention the budget continuing the ability of off-the-plan concessions for regional areas, something the opposition never called for once.

There are many regional communities that want to build higher density living and where it is subject to the concessions that were available to their city cousins, and it is this government that extended those concessions to regional areas. Indeed, the South-East of South Australia has benefited from the government's policy, so much so that the South-East of this state has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country, let alone the state.

Of course, we have made other investments in regional communities as well, on top of the tax cuts. There has been a dramatic investment with local government investing in local infrastructure. There has been investment in sporting clubs, in regional communities, most recently the Port Pirie Demons—

**Mr Bell:** What a surprise!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Again, the Liberal Party attacking investment in Port Pirie is very disappointing. There have been investments in Mount Barker, but of course all of our stimulus has not been based on one region but is economy-wide. Our spending, our tax cuts and our stimulus are for all South Australians, for every South Australian, wherever they work, wherever they invest, making sure that they can get the full value of a very good government that cares deeply about regional South Australia.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Would members leave the chamber quickly and quietly.

*Grievance Debate*

**MITCHELL ELECTORATE COMMUNITY AWARDS**

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:11):** I rise today to speak about the community awards that I held in my electorate just recently. I did this last year and again this year. It is a great opportunity to recognise people who do great work in our local area but who often go unrecognised. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the people who received awards on the night. I would also like to thank Innes Patrilli and the wonderful Patrilli family because we held the function at their cellar door. It was a great evening for the Wingard Winter Warmer. We had the support of the Patrilli family and their beautiful wines. I will talk more about them later, but a big thank you to them.

The first winner I would like to acknowledge was Mrs Eleanor Isaacs from Woodcroft, who brought along her husband, Dennis. She was nominated by Debra Black. Eleanor has volunteered at Reynella Primary School for at least two days a week for more than 10 years. She is there come rain, hail or shine. After Eleanor's husband became ill, she moved into a retirement home and she continued to come every Monday and Wednesday. The school community would be lost without her, and she makes muffins for three schools in the community, if you can believe it. To add to that, she is in her 80s, so it was great to see her recognised with one of our community awards.

Mr Nick Bradley from Warradale brought along his friend Josh. Nick has volunteered his time to organise and run a tennis program for vision-impaired children aged five to 12 at Somerton Park Tennis Club. This is a genuinely great program to help these young people. If you have ever tried to play blind tennis, whether you are visually impaired or not, it is incredibly difficult, and Nick has done a great job. He says that, by the end of the six-week course, all kids could serve and rally for a short time. This is a fantastic result.

This program has enabled the kids to gain confidence in their abilities and in themselves and also allowed them to experience the atmosphere of a sports club and being a sports person, which many of them would not otherwise have experienced. The City of Holdfast Bay awarded the Somerton Park Tennis Club its 2016 Club of the Year Award and cited Nick's vision-impaired tennis program as a major factor in the decision.

Ms Lynette Dansie AM from Marion attended with her husband, Keith. I said that we like to recognise people who perhaps go a little bit unrecognised in the community. When Lyn was nominated for her award, she had gone unrecognised, but that has changed and I will explain why. Lynette has been volunteering with St John Ambulance for more than 60 years. Lyn currently works in the service's Unley museum and serves in the historical society, of which she is the secretary. Lyn joined St John's with her twin brother, Maurice, in 1957 when they were 11 years old. They took after their father, John Barry.

Lyn met her husband while the two were volunteering with St John's and this year celebrated their 50<sup>th</sup> wedding anniversary. Lyn was SA state officer for cadets from 1993 to 1999 and was appointed national Chief Officer (Cadets) of St John Ambulance in Australia in 1993 to 1999. She was made a member of the order of Australia (AM) in this year's Queen's Birthday honours list. She was recognised duly, as I mentioned, in the Queen's Birthday honours list, but hopefully our community award will sit somewhere alongside that award. In fact, on the night Lyn said she had not received her award yet, so hopefully ours is still taking pride of place on her mantelpiece.

The other winner was a young man in our community, Mr Alex Witty, from Brighton. He performed wonderful music on the night. He was given a surprise award. His mum, Anna, and dad, Brian, were there, along with his sister, and it was great to have them there on the night. Alex is a Brighton Secondary School student studying music studies. He also plays baseball and football, where he has been recognised as a talented athlete and a great club person.

Alex has won the Spirit of ANZAC Award at Brighton Secondary School and the Governing Council Recognition Award. Now, along with three other schoolmates, he has been raising funds to trek Kokoda in September as part of a reconciliation trekkers team. Congratulations to all four winners; they were absolutely outstanding.

I would also like to acknowledge the member for Bright, now the candidate for Black, who was there on the night supporting all our local community because our community does have a lot of crossover. He was a big part of the evening, as was the Hon. David Ridgway from the other house, who was there in full support. I acknowledge all the people who came along from our community to enjoy the evening.

As I said, Patritti Wines do an absolutely marvellous job. I have spoken about them a number of times in this house and the wonderful history they have in Dover Gardens. They are a little winery in Dover Gardens that people do not know a heck of a lot about, but I do highly recommend that you get along and try some of their wonderful wines.

I would also like to add that in May this year Patritti's 2015 JPB limited release shiraz was awarded a gold medal in the Melbourne International Wine Competition. This was the wine's second gold medal, with the first being awarded at the Decanter World Wine Awards in May, so they are doing wonderful things. I thank again all those who came to our Wingard Winter Warmer and community awards.

#### **ON THE SAME WAVE INITIATIVE**

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:16):** Several weeks ago, I was fortunate enough, along with my wife, Annabel, to attend the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club, a fantastic lifesaving club of which I was a member many, many years ago for a period of time. I attended with the candidate for Colton, Angela Vaughan, and also in attendance was the member for Morialta. What we were doing there that night was to recognise, acknowledge and celebrate a very good program, a component of a Living In Harmony initiative called On the Same Wave. It is a partnership between the various surf lifesaving clubs, Surf Life Saving Australia and the Australian government's department of immigration and citizenship.

The program is about engaging emerging communities in surf lifesaving. Deputy Speaker, you would be aware that, traditionally, it has been people from emerging communities who have been over-represented in drownings in South Australia; indeed, across Australia. This program is meant to provide—and it does—support to young Australians of all backgrounds to become part of a beach experience and to engage with surf lifesaving around Australia.

The program has been adopted in South Australia since 2009. The West Beach Surf Life Saving Club has been working in partnership with Surf Life Saving SA to help reduce beach fatalities and injuries amongst the state's growing migrant and refugee population. The On the Same Wave initiative is designed to engage with South Australians from CALD backgrounds and provide them with potentially life-saving surf safety education in their primary language.

On any fair assessment, the work of Surf Life Saving through West Beach Surf Life Saving Club and the other clubs, underpinned by the support of Surf Life Saving SA, has been an outstanding success. You would have loved this function, Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Schnitzels?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** There were no schnitzels, but what there was, on a very cold night, was a variety of what I call comfort food, so stews, casseroles, halal-type food with various curries and the like, and it was fantastic. The food was fantastic. The only thing better than the food was the company that we were able to share at this event.

West Beach Surf Life Saving Club is very proud of their initiative, and so they should be. You would understand, Deputy Speaker, that every initiative needs a champion in each of the clubs for it to be able to thrive, and in this case we have a man called Peter Taylor from the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club. He is an outstanding human being who is committed to ensuring that we engage people from our emerging communities and do it in such a way that they are provided with the life skills, beach skills and surf skills to be able to not only contribute to surf lifesaving in South Australia but to take that information and that knowledge back to their communities to ensure that each and every one of them becomes more aware about opportunities that exist and how they can be part of ensuring that we have a better approach to safety on our beaches.

As I said, it was a great event. The West Beach Surf Life Saving Club has also been working with the Thebarton Senior College. Those who have visited the Thebarton Senior College would know that that is an outstanding institution, too. It is a very good college to visit, with a significant number of people from our emerging communities. There are some younger ones but generally a lot of adult education. The West Beach Surf Life Saving Club is working with the Thebarton Senior College.

This college, as you would be aware, Deputy Speaker, is the only adult new-arrivals program provider in South Australia. The new arrivals program is an intensive English-language acquisition course for newly arrived adult migrant and refugee students. The focus of the program is to provide non-English speaking students with the level of language proficiency needed to undertake future SACE studies. Mathematics, science and computing are integral to the curriculum, which also has a language emphasis.

The reason I am focusing on this particular point is that that program provides the basis for the transition through to the learnings and skills acquisitions required for surf lifesaving. Since 2009, West Beach has been training students to become members of the surf lifesaving family by providing training and first aid, advanced resuscitation, the radio certificate and, most importantly, the bronze medallion.

In the 2010-11 seasons, we had the first group of South Australians from our emerging communities pass the bronze medallion certificate. It took them 18 months to achieve their goal, with most of them never having been in the ocean before and unable to swim. It is an outstanding achievement and one that, as South Australians, we should all be very proud of. I go back to the point I made about Peter Taylor and the work he has done. West Beach Surf Life Saving Club can be proud, and the people of South Australia can be proud of the work that the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club does.



## SUPASHOCK

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:21):** Recently, I was fortunate enough to join the member for Mitchell to visit local manufacturer Supashock, an outstanding company based in my electorate in Magill. It was recently announced that Supashock had reached an agreement with Rheinmetall Defence for the German technology and security group to take an equity holding in the company under a cooperative partnership. I would like to especially congratulate Supashock managing director, Oscar Fiorinotto, who recently said that Rheinmetall will take a 49 per cent stake in his company under an agreement signed in Adelaide with a member of the Rheinmetall Defence executive board and also global head of vehicle systems.

Supashock is a stellar example of a company that has the technical and also mechanical capabilities that our state should be doing everything it can to assist with. I am grateful to have known Oscar for a number of years. For those who may be unfamiliar with what the company does, Supashock designs, develops and also manufactures state-of-the-art active shock absorbers not only for motorsport but also heavy mining applications to improve safety, ride quality and loading operations. The company has 25 employees at its Adelaide facilities.

I know that this agreement will create a spectacular platform for Supashock to export its advanced suspension technology globally. It also opens up a massive opportunity to expand the many products Supashock manufactures into military vehicles. Supashock are confident they can bring significant solutions across safety, mobility and also defence to the Australian Defence Force and other groups. They are already working with Rheinmetall to develop and manufacture, for example, active suspension and integrated, intelligent load-handling systems for Rheinmetall's range of military trucks.

This partnership with Rheinmetall will underpin Supashock's future growth, and I hope that there is much growth to come, but it will also create high-value technology and enduring jobs in the automotive sector that will deliver performance improvements to customers and real benefits to our local economy. As someone who takes an interest in motorsport and also in innovation and defence, it was a pleasure and a truly exciting time to visit and be able once again to have a tour of some of these facilities at Magill.

It is great to see that Oscar is constantly outgrowing his premises. I remember when there was only one premise, but he seems to be buying out his neighbours and also expanding around the corner. It is great to see, and I wish that there were more companies like this in South Australia that were growing at such a rapid rate. I was also grateful and very encouraged to see the number of recent university graduates working at the company. I commend Oscar and his team for all that they do and wish them well.

I was also fortunate enough recently to attend the ARC Campbelltown's first birthday, a great example of three levels of government—federal, state and local—and also local community clubs working together to deliver what is a fantastic facility in the north-eastern suburbs. It was a great chance to celebrate what has been a fun-filled year for the ARC and also to renew my gym membership, Deputy Speaker, you would be happy to know. Besides cutting cake and getting active, we were also treated to a fantastic set of performances from local sports people. It was great to see the national under 11 champion, Aryan Madan, in action as well.

I would also like to welcome Reverend Bob Hutchinson to the Morialta Uniting Church. On Sunday, with the member for Morialta I attended the service of the induction of the new minister. The service marks the beginning of Bob's ministry at Morialta Uniting Church. It was an opportunity to join the local congregation in extending a warm welcome to him and his family. I wish him well in his new journey as he leads the great people at Morialta Uniting Church. All the best, Bob.

I wish to extend my congratulations to Arte Grafica, especially Ennio Cavaiuolo, the founder of Arte Grafica. The company celebrates its 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary in printing. It is a huge milestone and I commend them for running such a wonderful and professional business. Arte Grafica has dependably assisted with various printing jobs not only for my office—and before my time as the member for Hartley as a local councillor—but for many community and sporting groups, as well as local businesses. I look forward to seeing them hopefully continue their great work for another 50 years.

I would also like to thank the Hectorville Football Club, which recently hosted the annual sponsors day. I thank the volunteers, sponsors and players that make up that great community sporting club.

#### **UPPER SPENCER GULF COMMON PURPOSE GROUP**

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:26):** I rise today to talk about the recent meeting of the Upper Spencer Gulf Common Purpose Group. We met in Port Pirie on 21 July and present at the meeting were the mayors of Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla, in addition to the member for Frome and me. There were apologies from Rowan Ramsey, the member for Grey, and from the member for Stuart. We all have very busy timetables so we cannot make it to all the meetings.

It was really good to have the meeting at Port Pirie because I have not popped in to Port Pirie for a while. It was good to feel the buzz that seems to exist in the community on the back of the major smelter redevelopment. As members know, that is a half a billion dollar redevelopment and I am proud of the initiative of our government in helping to underwrite that redevelopment with a facility that amounts to \$291 million, so a considerable underwriting of that project and something that was pivotal in getting the project off the ground.

It is good to see Port Pirie go ahead and have its future secured, but it is interesting to reflect upon what is happening in the whole of Upper Spencer Gulf and the broader region. There is very significant investment occurring; there is probably in excess of \$3 billion worth of investment happening now, or about to happen, in Upper Spencer Gulf. In Port Augusta, we see the \$57 million investment into the expansion of the prison, and that is both a good thing and a bad thing. It is obviously a good thing for Port Augusta because it generates jobs.

At the conclusion of the expansion, there will be somewhere between 330 and 350 jobs in the Port Augusta community, acknowledging that some of those people also come from Whyalla, Port Pirie and elsewhere in the region to work at the prison. It was good to hear the minister talk about the need for rehabilitation and the need to reduce the reoffending rate and to move away from the old philosophy of the previous minister of rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em to a new regime that I think is a far more sensible regime.

Of course, we have Sundrop Farms at Port Augusta as well. They have a few challenges, but it is really great to see a company and a private equity investor willing to commit over \$50 million to that state-of-the-art development. Not only is there that particular project in Port Augusta but there has been development approval for DP Energy's 375-megawatt combination wind and photovoltaic facility, and a raft of other projects are on the drawing board for Port Augusta.

Of course, Whyalla is turning the corner. On 21 June in this house, I indicated that it looked like the Koreans were going to be the winners out of that process—how things change. A big welcome to Sanjeev Gupta and the GFG Alliance. They have indicated the potential for \$1 billion worth of investment commitment in Whyalla, which will be transformative. If only half of what has been discussed comes to the fore, it will be a real step forward for the community of Whyalla. It is great to see an investor like that talk about green steel, talk about pumped hydro, talk about wind and talk about solar. They know where the future lies.

BHP is currently investing \$350 million at Olympic Dam to refurbish the smelters there. It will be rebuilding the smelter flash furnace and demolishing and building a new electric slag furnace in addition to work on the precipitator, so a lot of investment is going on. We have Carrapateena's mine development with 400 jobs at its conclusion, 400 jobs during construction and also the potential for a copper concentrate plant. The story in Upper Spencer Gulf in my part of the world is actually a really positive story.

Time expired.

#### **SOUTHERN BLUEFIN TUNA HARVEST**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:31):** I rise today to talk about something I was very pleased to be part of last weekend and something I have been meaning to do for a long time—that is, to go out on a boat off Port Lincoln to be part of the tuna harvest. Last Sunday at 6am, I had permission to board the *Challenge*. My thanks go to Graham Tapley, his son Joe and also Chunky Bryant, who had me on board for the morning. We left the wharf at about 6am and steamed out for about an hour

to the other side of Boston Island where we pulled up next to a service vessel that was tied to the tuna ring. The five divers were already in the water and about to start work.

The southern bluefin tuna quota in Australia consists of some 5,665 tonnes. I understand that 96 to 98 per cent of that is owned and held in Port Lincoln and that 96 to 98 per cent of what is held in Port Lincoln is farmed—the term sometimes used is 'ranching'. The southern bluefin tuna enter the Great Australian Bight in the latter months of every year, having arrived from the Indian Ocean some 3,000 kilometres away. Southern bluefin tuna inhabit all the southern waters right around the globe but, interestingly, the Great Australian Bight is the only place in the world where the fish aggregate at the sea surface, which makes it possible for the schools to be captured via purse seine.

This occurs in December, January and February. Everybody is well aware of how important tuna is to Port Lincoln and South Australia. It was made famous by Colin Thiele's book *Blue Fin* and is celebrated each and every year on the long weekend in January at Tunarama. Interestingly, this aggregation in the bight annually during December, January and February happens to coincide with the southern bluefin tuna moving into their fastest growth rate, so the aggregation and capture coincide exactly with the fastest growth rate.

Once they are towed in within these purse seine nets and deposited into the tuna rings or tuna farms, they are at their best growing rate. They are fed each and every day with pilchards or sardines, depending on which school you went to; 80 per cent of those sardines are caught locally and the other 20 per cent are imported. The sardine quota is an interesting one. It is Australia's largest fishery, with some 42,000 tonnes at the moment and, as I said, it is mostly fished in the gulf just to the west of Eyre Peninsula. The fish are held in pens and fed for about three to six months and then harvested, and that is what I took part in on Saturday. That harvest is drawing to a close.

It is incredibly labour-intensive do. There are divers, and there would have been around 20 men involved in the whole process. The divers capture the fish individually. They catch them by the tail, roll them on their side, and that tends to nullify the fish, and then they steer them slowly to the edge of the pen, where they are placed on a conveyor belt that carries them up to the boat, where they are spiked, cored, wired, bled and gutted, and within a couple of minutes they are dropped into big tanks of cold sea water.

Sea water freezes at below zero, so the sea water sits at about zero degrees. The fish are dropped in it gutted and bled, as I said, and they are kept there for the period of time that the harvest continues; my guess is that it is around three hours. It is then steamed back to shore, unloaded, transported and frozen to minus 65 later that day. Minus 65 is a critical temperature because it is from that temperature that they can be thawed and be at their best.

About 20 per cent of the harvest occurs later in the year, when they are sold directly to Japan as fresh fish. Japan makes up almost the entirety of the market. In some ways, that makes the fishery a little vulnerable, but they are actively seeking other markets in Asia, but Japan is culturally suited to eating the sushi that comes from fresh tuna. One of the challenges going forward will be how to best manage and account for the recreational catch, certainly a little bit in South Australia but particularly out of Portland in Victoria. This is something that the industry and the federal fisheries minister are looking at closely.

### UNSUNG HEROES AWARDS

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:36):** Recently, I was fortunate to attend the City of Marion Unsung Heroes Awards 2017 event at the Marion Cultural Centre. This event, held annually by the City of Marion, recognises and celebrates those in our community who continually and consistently make a difference. It is always wonderful to celebrate the achievements of our amazing individuals, community groups and businesses who work and volunteer with such passion and dedication, strengthening and enriching our community and constantly contributing to making our community great.

The awards recognise achievements in categories of the arts and culture, business, community spirit, courage, environment, fair go, innovation, role models, sports and bravery. This year, 28 individual nominations and one group nomination were received by the City of Marion, and

all people nominated received an award. There was an electric atmosphere, as a crowd of enthusiastic supporters of family and friends gathered in support of the nominees. We honoured nominees in six categories, followed by a special mention at the end of the ceremony of Councillor Bruce Hull for his recent bravery, twice in quick succession, as he challenged illegal dumpers and intervened in an apparent domestic violence situation.

On to the awards: in the category of community spirit, the following were recognised: Lyn and Keith Dansie, with a combined 116 years of volunteering service to St John Ambulance; Rima Haddad, for organising and hosting lunches to generate donations of toiletries for female victims of domestic violence; Laurie Wallace, for his dedication to his tennis club, a volunteer for 56 years; Bruce Hunter, a dedicated volunteer with 25 years of service at Marion LIFE; and Elaine Murton, for her volunteering services of 10 years at Marion LIFE. Previously, Elaine practised as a community health nurse, so she has transferred her skills to this organisation. A community spirit award also went to Bill Black, a reliable Men's Shed volunteer, who customises wheelchairs and equipment for the disabled.

The winners in the category of arts and culture included Kerrie Polkinghorne, who runs Vocalise Community Choir for 75 members aged 30 to 80, and Zoe Ingram, an artist and illustrator enjoying international recognition. The business awards were won by Kelly Keates, the innovative owner of Zonge Engineering and mentor of women in science; Brad and Gaylene Clark, owners of expanding website builders, Company Hub; and Judy Forbes, who owns and runs the Once and Again Book Cafe, which passes on customer donations to good causes. She runs an innovative cafe of community conscience, supporting many community causes and offering suspended coffee. Next was Bridget Hogg, owner of HR Development at Work and volunteer for Wellbeing Foundation, helping organisations with staff wellbeing. Lastly in this category were Ben Heide and James Mungall, winemakers with Patritti Wines, and also winners in the London wine display with their grenache.

In the category of role model was Lamya Hazim, who helps new arrivals access services by encouraging them to ride bikes. She sources these bikes through donations, and she fixes and cleans them and then donates them to their new owners. Also recognised was another young man, Chance Ndune, a young migrant who volunteers with youth groups linking young Indigenous people to education; and Aidan Barry, who, even with his serious health challenges, is an inspirational speaker and founder of the No-Handicap Golf Club. He plays golf and rises above his disability challenges to advocate on behalf of people with disabilities.

In the category of environment, Alan Wilson and Chris Waugh were recognised for their work with Marino Conservation Park; and Chris Teale, Michelle Parsons, Gemma Farrow, Linda Thurlow, Rosana Cohen, Lorraine Pulsford, Linda Snyder for their work with the Marino Community Garden. They have turned land into a thriving garden for 50 residents and planning musical community events.

In sport, Georgia Bevan, Courtney Cramey, Deni Vernhagen, Danna Cox, Ebony Marinoff, Anne Hatchard, Justine Mules, Jessica Sedunary, Jenna McCormick—all players from Morphetville Park Football Club and also members of the Adelaide Crows women's team who played in the AFL inaugural season. Nine players from one club—now that is outstanding! Congratulations to all who received awards, and also to the City of Marion for ensuring that their recognition occurred. You are all inspirational and thank you for all you do.

#### *Motions*

### **MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN**

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:42):** I move:

That this house calls on Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull to stand up to protect the integrity of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and honour his commitment to delivering the plan on time and in full, by—

- (a) commissioning a fully independent judicial inquiry into the allegations raised on *Four Corners* to ensure the integrity of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan;
- (b) putting the river, and all those who rely on it, ahead of the profits of a minority of large landholders in New South Wales; and

- (c) complying with the legislative requirement to appoint independent experts to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I move:

That the time allotted for the debate be one hour.

Motion carried.

The events of the past week or so in relation to water policy, or the commitment or lack of it to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, should cause very significant alarm for not only our state but also for the nation. This is without doubt one of the most significant public policy issues that I have had to grapple with in my time in this office. Indeed, within weeks of assuming this role we commenced the campaign for the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, which was a critical issue that was facing us at that point and had been the subject of very significant debate and contention between the upstream and the downstream states.

The truth is that this state has always played a critically important role as the national guardian of this river for obvious reasons. Our interests are directly connected with it because we are the downstream state. But the way in which we have sought to prosecute our protection of the river has been to be the moral exemplar: capping what we took from the river in 1969, not taking an additional drop since and in fact cooperating in all the reductions that have occurred in our take from the river.

Despite that, in a period when the river was under pressure environmentally, we have seen significant overallocation of this resource. The millennial drought obviously drew the circumstances of the river to the attention of the broader community and it did provide the opportunity for us to act. Credit needs to be given to prime minister Howard who, together with the present Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, did pledge a very substantial amount of money to respond to that agenda.

But it was something that the South Australian government had already put on the agenda through its early contribution through establishing the River Murray levy, which gave us a sum of money which allowed us to commit to the Living Murray Initiative, which was the precursor to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. This was a very important public policy agenda that was powerfully advocated for by premier Rann. He made a signal speech at the National Press Club when he decided to launch the campaign to save this great river. The future of the River Murray has been a source of bipartisan support here in this state ever since, and I am pleased to say it continues to be.

But what we saw in the last week or so is alarming, starting with the revelations on the ABC *Four Corners* program, and we have now witnessed a series of other disturbing developments. We have heard suggestions that the New South Wales Department of Primary Industries is actually helping local people in New South Wales evade their responsibilities under the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, in other words, assist them to break the law. More recently, we have seen newspaper reports revealing that within the New South Wales cabinet no less, not just within the bureaucracy, a minister is seeking to undermine and subvert the plan. Specifically, in yesterday's *Daily Telegraph* the following was reported:

A Nationals Minister is pushing Cabinet colleagues to change irrigation laws to retrospectively justify a decision by his department to give a major political donor and cotton farmer more rights over the precious Barwon-Darling River.

Who can forget also the troubling and embarrassing remarks by Deputy Prime Minister Barnaby Joyce, at a pub in Shepparton last Friday, that he had put responsibility for water policy back into the Nationals' agriculture portfolio to 'make sure we don't have the greenies running the show'. Of course, we are included amongst the greenies here—the downstream states and, indeed, other irrigators within New South Wales. This is a very alarming concession by Barnaby Joyce, the Deputy Prime Minister.

I must say it begins to I think reveal some of the Faustian pact that was reached by the Prime Minister to become Prime Minister of this country. If the deal was that to become prime minister he had to give water to the Nationals, and the Nationals full-well knew that they were going to use the water portfolio to undermine the Murray-Darling Basin agreement, this is an alarming state of affairs and something that simply must be exposed.

Last year, during the ministerial council meeting here in Adelaide, the Deputy Prime Minister laid the groundwork to walk away from the provision of the final 450 gigalitres of water to the river, mandated under the plan. You will recall that was the meeting where our local Minister for Water, the Hon. Ian Hunter, used some slightly less honourable remarks in his prosecution of the case. Anyway, his sentiments—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** It was passion.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** His sentiments were certainly correct.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** He was colourful.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I remind members—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am standing up. I remind members that the bases appear to be loaded from question time and I would hate them to miss the remainder of this debate. All members are entitled to be heard in silence. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I think it was blue gelato he was ordering. It was a fruity conversation, I think we can say. In the past couple of days, there have been other revelations of great concern. The *Australian Financial Review* today reported that Ms Perin Davey, a former lobbyist nominated by Mr Joyce to sit on the Murray-Darling Basin Authority, asked to withdraw that nomination after it came to light that she had attended a meeting at which the New South Wales government official was recorded offering her and other irrigators sensitive data.

Remember on *Four Corners* that we had that recording of this discussion between a New South Wales bureaucrat and the irrigators. They were seeking to collude in some way to assist the irrigator through this difficulty that had emerged. She was on that phone call and she is also the person who said that the delivery of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan was impossible. Why on earth would you appoint to the expert independent body somebody who was a lobbyist for the irrigators and had declared themselves as being an opponent of the plan, unless of course you wanted to wreck the plan? These are decisions calculated to destroy the plan.

We know they resisted the plan. They did not want to put the plan in place, but plan B, when they could not stop the plan, is to wreck it now they are in government. This was all working fine while Labor was in government nationally, because they knew that they would hold the irrigators' feet to the fire, but now they have essentially a federal government that is cooperating with them in this regard.

*The Guardian Australia* reported yesterday that, according to farmers and water experts, rule changes approved by the New South Wales government could be causing more water loss to the Murray-Darling Basin than before the plan was put in place. You get some insight into New South Wales politics by going back to the rum corps: it is alive and well. The place is bent. They basically are not prepared to even obey the law.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Sure, and they belong in gaol. That is exactly where they belong, every single one of them. What all of this amounts to is a pattern of behaviour of people and organisations conniving, flouting the law and treating the downstream states and, indeed, all people who actually believe in a healthy river, with utter contempt.

We in this state have been working in good faith with other states and the commonwealth in relation to the basin plan. Our aim has always been to protect the river and to ensure basin

communities, irrigators and all those who rely upon the river have a sustainable future. We had a real challenge when we sought to construct our response to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan because we had done all the heavy lifting. We had covered all the irrigation channels. Many of our irrigators were using drip irrigation. They were using the best technologies. They were not wasting water, so when we were asked to make a further contribution, it was hard.

That was why we negotiated that additional sum of money—the \$250-odd million that was under the SARMS agreement—to actually assist our irrigators to go the extra yard to make the infrastructure changes so they could cough up the extra water. We did not actually say, 'We have done all that we need to do because we haven't taken any more out of the river.' We actually said, 'No, we are prepared to do more, but help us. We are in a different situation from the upstream states. Help us.'

Fortunately, the federal government, led on that occasion by Senator Wong, the then minister for water, gave us that accommodation, and our campaign for 3,200 gegalitres of water to be returned to the system ultimately was successful. It was a great victory and one that we should be proud of, but it is being undermined.

**Mr Whetstone:** That was Tony Burke.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** No, it was minister Wong. Tony Burke landed the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, but the fundamental agreement was reached with minister Wong because I negotiated it. In fact, the only jurisdiction that has ever truly stood up for the river has been South Australia.

The *Four Corners* program really has revealed what many South Australians have suspected for some time; that is, that the upstream states would use their control to undermine this agreement. What we need, of course, is to get to the bottom of this circumstance. We need to understand precisely what has happened here because the allegations, if they are true, strike at the heart of the integrity of the implementation of the plan because, by necessity, when the Murray-Darling Basin Plan was struck, it was impossible to have a federal authority entirely running every element of the system.

Because land and water management are so deeply insinuated into all the state institutions, you could not separate them out from the environmental or primary industries agencies in every state. We just could not do it. We would have liked to have done it, but it was impossible. By definition, you are at the mercy of the cooperation of the upstream states and their bureaucracies.

Now, of course, what they have done in New South Wales is they have really handed the implementation of the plan to their primary industries agency. That is problem number one. And of course there are people in there who just do not believe in it, and you have heard that on the telephone recording. They are basically saying, 'Look, we'll help you out. We'll help you through this little problem. We'll help you evade the law; if you break the law, we'll find a way of covering that up.'

This is a very deeply disturbing set of allegations and we need to know the truth of them because if they are true, it will form the basis for, I think, a greater level of commonwealth oversight in relation to the implementation of this plan because we simply cannot trust the upstream states and New South Wales in particular. Frankly, I think we would be naive to think that this was limited to New South Wales and we would be naive to think it was just confined to this one element of the basin.

**Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:55):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete all the words after 'house' and substitute the following words:

believes that a healthy River Murray is vital to South Australia's future and the basin plan must be delivered on time and in full. We as South Australian parliamentarians stand united for our river and in support for the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. We call on the Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, to commission a fully independent judicial inquiry into allegations raised on *Four Corners* in order to be sure that the basin plan is not undermined and will continue to deliver our share of water to South Australia.

I have moved an amendment to the Premier's motion because I believe that it is absolutely vital that South Australia puts forward a strong, united statement about the River Murray. The amendment I

have outlined amends the Premier's motion to align it with the motion that was passed yesterday by the Legislative Council.

That motion was supported by members of the government, the opposition, the Greens, Australian Conservatives, the Dignity Party and Mr Darley. It had cross-party support. We have already seen too many political games in relation to the River Murray. It is time we had a united, cross-party, bipartisan position, and aligned motions from the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly will send a strong message to Canberra and to the Prime Minister.

As the shadow minister with responsibility for the River Murray, I have been incredibly clear from the moment the ABC's *Four Corners* program aired that the state Liberal Party will work with bipartisanship, alongside the government and any other political party or interest group interested in and committed to securing the Murray-Darling Basin Plan on time and in full.

Given our unequivocal statements on this matter, we were disappointed when the government chose not to include the state Liberal team in its cross-party press conference on Monday. I have heard many excuses on this point from both the Premier and minister Hunter, but the fact of the matter is that the government chose—as it has done too many times—to put politics above practical and pragmatic delivery for our River Murray.

Today, I am reiterating the state Liberal Party's commitment and explicitly stating that this side of politics will not engage in political games at the expense of the River Murray. We have backed the government's call for an inquiry. We did so yesterday in the urgency motion put to the Legislative Council and we are doing so again today. The South Australian Liberal Party has a proud history of backing the River Murray.

Our MPs have represented the river's course for many years and those local MPs are unfailing voices for the river's health and sustainability. The members for Chaffey, Hammond, Schubert, Stuart, MacKillop and Finniss have variously represented the river's course for many years, advocating for its environment, its economics and the many rural communities that rely on a healthy, vibrant river for their future. Our MPs stood with communities during horrors wrought by the Millennium Drought, and they know firsthand the importance of sustaining our river. Some of the river's greatest champions sit in the state Liberal Party room.

The Murray-Darling system is 3,375 kilometres in length. It traverses some of the most productive landscapes in our country. It provides habitat to hundreds of species of birdlife, fish, mammals, reptiles and amphibians. It sustains agriculture, horticulture and viticulture, it provides a lifestyle and tourism destination and it is a huge economic artery giving life to thousands of businesses, creating tens of thousands of jobs in high-value industries, particularly in rural and regional Australia. The Murray-Darling basin contains 40 per cent of all Australia's farms and 65 per cent of all farms that irrigate. It is a fundamental plank of our nation's economy worth billions annually to our nation's bottom line.

In South Australia, the River Murray underpins one of the great food bowls and export regions of our state, the Riverland, while towns from Renmark to Goolwa attract thousands of tourists who enjoy the recreational and social pursuits that life along the river provides. Australia's environment and economy needs the river to survive and thrive, and South Australia in particular, finding itself at the end of the river's long and meandering course, relies on a river that is still healthy and viable when it crosses our border.

We saw during the Millennium Drought just how vulnerable our river communities can be when the river's health starts to falter. Environmental, social and economic problems will quickly take hold, leaving scars that can take a generation to recover from. Yet, as is often the case in a time of crisis, the tragedy of the Millennium Drought inspired resilience and drove innovation the length of the river, especially in South Australia.

South Australian farmers and irrigators have always proudly led the nation in water efficiency practices, and drought drove us to redouble our efforts on this front. Further innovations were achieved, water usage was driven down and today the Riverland is an international leader in cutting-edge practices that deliver efficient and productive water use. We should be immensely proud of this.



Again, we should be proud of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, a compromise plan no doubt, a plan which has detractors and critics and which we all know is far from perfect, but this is a plan forged in the wake of doing the wrong thing for a century and it is a large and significant step in the right direction. We should also be proud that as a state we have been a driving force behind the plan and that our adherence to the plan and our commitment to fulfilling it is also nation leading.

While we should be proud, we should also be angry—very angry—when we see our hard work and our best practice adherence to the plan trampled over, ignored and taken for granted by other jurisdictions. When we see this behaviour, we should be able to stand up and let people know how we feel, as a government, as an opposition and as a state, working together to fight for the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and for our river, the river that this plan aims to sustain.

Let's make no mistake: the allegations aired on *Four Corners* were damning. The theft of water from the river that was supposed to be given up for environmental gains is nothing short of abhorrent, and any rational person watching that program would be of the view that appropriate and detailed investigations must be undertaken by the appropriate authorities with the appropriate powers and the appropriate remedies to be able to hand down.

To date, the allegations are the subject of four separate inquiries and investigations: the NSW independent review led by Ken Matthews AO, former CEO of the National Water Commission, announced on 26 July; the Murray-Darling Basin Authority's review of compliance with state-based regulations governing water use announced by the Prime Minister on 30 July; the Australian National Audit Office's review into the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources' efforts in monitoring water usage in NSW; and not least the referral to the NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption. If the state government believes that a judicial inquiry should be added to this lengthy list, we support that call.

It is also worth stating that I believe that we have reached, perhaps unexpectedly, a critical juncture in the life of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. We stand at a precipice with regard to the viability of the plan going forward and, if goodwill is not maintained, relationships not restored and the plan not put back on an even keel, the whole thing—years of hard work, billions of dollars of investment and the attainment of genuine environmental and economic sustainability—will collapse. The impact of this will be devastating for the river and felt in the most pronounced way at the end of the system, here in South Australia.

The allegations on *Four Corners* should not be used to derail the Murray-Darling Basin Plan either for political or economic reasons, whether here in South Australia or by interstate interests. Make no mistake that there are irrigators in other jurisdictions who would like to see the plan fail. The very irrigators who are the subject of allegations raised in *Four Corners* are not champions of the plan. Its collapse serves their interests and we must not give them the pleasure of achieving this.

I join my parliamentary colleagues from both sides of this chamber in calling for the federal government to do all that is required to thoroughly investigate the allegations aired on *Four Corners* and also to put equal if not greater amounts of energy into securing the cross-jurisdictional relationships that must be in place to secure the viability of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. I also call on all jurisdictions in the Murray-Darling Basin to cooperate fully with any and all investigations and reviews that are undertaken, and for these to be completed as quickly and transparently as possible.

We must save the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. We must restore the goodwill that this plan has been founded on. We must confirm that environmental flows are doing just that: flowing for the benefit of our environment. Above all, we must engage with our colleagues across our political parties, and across the nation, to ensure that this happens. I commend the amended motion to the house.

**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) (16:05):** We have seen some form here, have we not? The Liberals opposite are kowtowing to Canberra once again, watering down a motion that deserves to be very, very harsh on the federal—

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am on my feet. I need to remind members again that, on your behalf, I seek that all members be able to speak in silence and be heard in silence.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The Liberal Party have form with the car industry. When the federal Coalition wanted to take the car industry away from South Australia, who stood up? The Labor government did. Where was the opposition? Nowhere to be seen. They were in bed with their federal counterparts. With the submarine project, when Tony Abbott—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Excuse me, Deputy Speaker, the member for Chaffey just used the most vile words and unparliamentary language.

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Did you have something to say, member for Adelaide?

**Ms SANDERSON:** Yes, point of order: we were accused of being in bed with the federal government. That is far more offensive than anything that has been said on this side of the house. Retract and apologise.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** However—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has taken offence at something the member for Chaffey has said. I give the member for Chaffey the opportunity to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I just remind everybody that I have the book out. We are going to hear people in silence. The minister can continue.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The Liberal members opposite have form in kowtowing to Canberra. With the submarine project, when Tony Abbott said that he was quite happy for all these submarines to be built over in Japan, the Premier came back and started a plan to make sure that South Australia would win that contract. When Nyrstar needed a guarantor, the federal government said, 'You can just rely on the South Australian government to do that.' It does not matter that they would have put that money up in other jurisdictions.

Of course, with energy, we have seen the Prime Minister of this country, the Deputy Prime Minister of this country and the federal energy minister come and kick South Australians in the guts in our time of absolute despair. When we had seven—

**Mr Bell:** Are we talking about the river, or are we talking about history?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier is warned for the second time.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** When we had seven tornadoes bear down on our state, including the only—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sit down. Stop the clock. We will be here all day if you do not remain silent.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, if we stay beyond six, that is entirely up to you.

**Mr Marshall:** Keep the class in.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is a possibility, isn't it?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** When we had seven tornadoes bear down on us last September and destroy energy infrastructure, we had the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and the energy minister kicking the guts out of South Australians who were trying to get back on their feet. Now, today, they come in and want to water down a motion that is critical of their federal counterparts: the members of the Liberal Party and the National Party at the federal level.

South Australia has worked hard, and South Australians have worked hard since the 1960s. We have moved away from open and unlined channels, which still exist in other parts of Australia, but that movement started here in the 1960s. In the seventies, the eighties and the nineties, those efficiencies continued. The farmers in our Riverland and right along the River Murray in South Australia worked hard to eke out every little drop they possibly could. They did not want to waste a drop. Then, when the Premier came up with a plan—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —to get more money—

**Mr Bell:** Who wrote this for you?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier, if he says one more thing, he will have to leave the chamber for half an hour, and his comrades will be very close behind if they keep speaking over the minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, it depends where you come from, doesn't it?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** When the Premier came up with a plan to fight for more money for these irrigators along the River Murray that would return more water to the River Murray, what did we hear from the member for MacKillop opposite? He wanted to go back to an earlier draft basin plan that just did not deliver for South Australia or for irrigators. Do you know what he said? He said, 'This is obviously not the Rolls-Royce, but it's a very good Mazda and we're quite happy to drive in the Mazda.' The member for Bright said that all these Liberal Party members opposite have done such a good job—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is called to order. The member for Adelaide is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The member for Bright said that all his parliamentary colleagues have done such a great job sticking up for the River Murray and the irrigators, but they were happy to settle for a Mazda, not the Rolls-Royce that the Premier got for us. I have been up to the Riverland and I have spoken to irrigators and farmers there and they are very pleased with what the Premier did. They are very pleased with what the Premier did. They admire the fact that he stuck to his guns and stuck up for South Australia. And guess what? He stuck up for South Australia on submarines, he stuck up for South Australia on energy, he stuck up for South Australia on cars, he stuck up for South Australia on Nyrstar. Here we have a Premier—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned for the second time.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Here we have a political leader who will go in and stick up for the people he represents, the people here in South Australia, whether they live along the River Murray or in metropolitan Adelaide or somewhere else in South Australia, because that is what we do. We do not kowtow to Canberra. We are not owned by our political masters in Canberra. We fight for the people who elect us. We put people before party, and the rest of South Australia wants the Liberal Party of South Australia to do the same.

I saw the images on TV the other night of the Premier standing there with Nick Xenophon, with Cory Bernardi, with all these people from across the political divide. I saw no-one there from the state Liberals. I saw farmers there. We have been working hard to help our farmers, including the

irrigators, along the River Murray. It is the engine room of South Australia's agribusiness sector, a sector that employs one in five working South Australians.

To see the *Four Corners* program a couple of weeks ago, it was an absolute disgrace when we know how hard our farmers work to make every little drop so productive. To see the water that is being wasted upstream by crooks, both out at the farm level and the crooks in the New South Wales government—

**Mr Marshall:** Alleged. Keep it alleged at this point.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Alright. There again, we want to water it down. We have the Leader of the Opposition wanting to water it down.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** So—

**Mr Marshall:** You're the judge and jury over there.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Well, for anyone who saw the *Four Corners* program, it was pretty poor behaviour.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** As a journalist, I know that putting the word 'alleged' in does not help you much when you get to court. You are either accused of being crooks—

**Mr Marshall:** You've already pronounced them crooks.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Well, they are crooks.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Anyone who steals water is not a law-abiding citizen, and those people who may have aided and abetted in that theft should also suffer the consequences of the law. I join with our Premier and our side of the house in calling on Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull to stand up to protect the integrity of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and to honour his commitment to deliver the plan on time and in full. What does he have to hide by not having a full and open inquiry into this? Who is he trying to protect in his own party or his own Coalition or the donors that they have for the Nationals and the federal Liberal Party?

If they have nothing to hide, why would they not just come out and have a full inquiry into the allegations that have been raised? This is meant to be a system that crosses state borders, and we should all be treated fairly. South Australians have been treated unfairly and that is something that the Liberal Party in Canberra do not seem to care about. As I have mentioned before, when it comes to the car industry, when it comes to energy, when it comes to Nyrstar, when it comes to water and the Murray-Darling, the federal Liberals and the federal Nationals just do not care for South Australians.

That has not been lost on the people of South Australia. Look at the recent poll results about how well the Liberal Party is going in South Australia; look at what happened to Mayo. We are going to see that played out again at the next state election and the next federal election because the people of South Australia hate being put down by people from outside this state, and that is all we have seen from the federal Coalition. When each of you opposite do not stand up against those people, the people of South Australia take notice. I stand with our side of the house in commending the Premier for bringing this motion before the house, and I support it.

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:16):** I rise to support the amended motion, which I think was put in a very credible way by the shadow minister for the environment, the member for Bright. We on this side of the chamber support an independent judicial review into allegations of the theft of water from the Murray-Darling Basin for one simple reason: the importance of the Murray to South Australia demands that the health and the future of the river should remain matters above party politics.

We made our position clear immediately when these allegations became public. Those comments were made directly by the shadow minister, they were repeated by me and nothing has been put forward that makes us move away from the position that we held immediately after the allegations were aired on the *Four Corners* program. The Liberal Party in this parliament has a proud history when it comes to the River Murray—unlike the Labor Party. After all, it was a Liberal premier who put his government on the line after the future of the River Murray was put in doubt in 1970 while Labor again played politics with the health of this river.

Steele Hall, premier of South Australia at the time, took the view that the Dartmouth Dam should be built as South Australia's best guarantee of future water supplies from the Murray. His view was based on sound engineering and on sound environmental advice. There was serious concern that an alternative dam at Chowilla would be more costly and would cause increased salinity downstream. That would have been disastrous for South Australia's horticulture industry in particular, but Labor, led by Don Dunstan, was not interested in any of that at the time.

As a result, an election was called when Labor would not support the Dartmouth Dam project but, within a year of that election, Labor did a complete somersault on this issue. Labor supported the agreement to build Dartmouth Dam, which Steele Hall had negotiated with the commonwealth and the governments of Victoria and New South Wales and which Labor in this parliament had opposed. History shows that Steele Hall's politically selfless action to insist that Dartmouth Dam be built saved the economy of the lower reaches of the river in South Australia. Without it, a Murray-Darling Basin Plan would not have been necessary because Labor's decision to put politics before the interests of our state would have killed the lower reaches of the river there and then.

In the history of the Murray, the next significant government action was the \$10 billion plan announced by Liberal prime minister John Howard in 2007. This required the Murray-Darling Basin Authority to develop the basin plan. The adoption of that basin plan received bipartisan support in the federal parliament in November 2012. It is important that all basin communities, and indeed all Australians, have confidence that the rules to support fair and lawful water use throughout the basin are being followed. There must be no doubt about this.

For that reason, we believe that an independent judicial review is justified, and we support this call because this matter needs to remain above party politics. For the same reason, the South Australian government should agree to the independent basin-wide review into compliance with state-based regulations governing water use proposed by the Prime Minister, the Hon. Malcolm Turnbull.

This review will require the cooperation of all basin states to look beyond the part of the river system where illegal practices have been alleged. We need to know that all parties to the basin plan are playing their full part in ensuring the maintenance of strong compliance regimes. The South Australian environment minister, the Hon. Ian Hunter, has called this proposal 'a toothless review'. That just goes to show that, when it comes to the Murray, Labor is still only interested in politics and not in doing what is right for South Australia and the nation. Yet again, we are seeing this this afternoon.

Earlier, we heard the Minister for Agriculture give his pronouncement declaring that the government would not be supporting the Liberal Party's amendment to the motion put forward by the Premier. In fact, we heard quite clearly on this side of the chamber that the Premier issued his instructions to his minister before the amendment was even fully read out. This just shows that this government has no interest in anything other than playing politics with this matter.

Our amendment captures each and every element of the urgency motion moved in the other place yesterday and supported by all members of that house—all members—including members representing the Australian Labor Party. Its acceptance by this house would be the strongest possible demonstration by this parliament of support for the health and future of our River Murray and, surely, that is what we are all after: the strongest possible message to Canberra, the strongest possible message to those states and those interests upstream. It would be a united demonstration of our determination to ensure nothing is done to undermine the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

The government's refusal to support this amendment shows the Premier is not interested in the River Murray, not interested in South Australia's future. He is only interested in setting up fake

fighters that do nothing to advance the cause of South Australia or the communities that live and depend on the River Murray.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (16:22):** I rise to support the original motion. We have heard how hardworking people are on that side, but their attention to detail is somewhat lacking. For your information, the motion that was put by the Greens was not supported, moved or carried yesterday: it was withdrawn. You want to have a look, when you say 'voted upon and supported by all in the other place', because that is not the case.

What we are seeing here today is a rewriting of history, and that was exemplified by the leader in his contribution. What we are after is bipartisan support. The motion that should be supported is that which has been put by the Premier. I remind those people opposite, especially those who were not here from 2006 through to 2014, that the opposition had to be dragged kicking and screaming to support the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and the number of gigalitres that were required. You palmed it off as being a pipedream, that we would not be able to get that level of water. Well, you are rewriting—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** You made your contribution earlier. Previously, you said that you were not even at school at that stage, and you were not hanging around too much in 2006, when these matters were progressing. Be that as it may—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** From 2006 to 2014.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** No; the person who was making up fake news was the Leader of the Opposition. I recall in 2012 being in a ministerial council meeting that was a defining moment in the quantum of water that was going to be delivered into the system.

**Mr Marshall:** What about the motion? Why don't you guys address your own motion?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** At that meeting, Tony Burke pushed everyone out of the room, except for the ministers and one adviser. We were having a bit of a blue because South Australia at that stage would not agree, and this is my point, on a quantum of water that was only going to deliver most of the river system to a poor level of health. Peter, the minister from Victoria—

**An honourable member:** What is his name?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Peter Walsh, a decent man and one of the best people from the National Party I have met, had asked, 'What number is required? What number?' I said, 'I don't know. I don't know.'

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Leader! You will have to leave the room for seven minutes if you say another word.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** He is rather rude, Madam Deputy Speaker. Be that as it may, it was a defining moment. The point I am making is that the National Party member who cared about the river, cared about the security of the river, cared about the people he represented, supported there being 3,200 gigalitres, (2,750 gigalitres with an extra 450 gigalitres to come from savings) because we know upstream the savings could be found and found far more easily than they could down here.

Those who went through the Millennium Drought will realise what dire circumstances we were in, and I am pleased that the government of the day decided to provide, quite rightly so, water that was necessary to keep permanent plantings alive in the Riverland. That is why the Riverland remains today one of the outstanding areas in the world with respect to what we were able to do to save that location and that region.

We are talking about a bipartisan approach to this. The fact that a motion was moved to amend shows they are not really interested. The fact that the leader started to talk about what it is that the people on this side are really interested in shows the people who are playing politics: it is not us. I was shocked, like everyone, to see that *Four Corners* report. To me, what occurred is absolutely corrupt, and the only thing that can remedy that is a full judicial inquiry. Am I surprised?

**Mr Marshall:** We're supporting that.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** No, you moved a motion, which is not different in the intent. You said, 'Our motion has all the necessary elements.' Well, this original motion has all the elements of that and more.

The reality is I was shocked by that like everyone else, but did it come as a surprise? Not really. What came as a surprise was the audacity of the bureaucracy in New South Wales deciding to do what it did to try to circumvent the Murray-Darling Basin Plan to allow for the theft of water, and for what? For \$10,000. That seems a pretty cheap contribution to the National Party to get over a billion litres of water and more. It is just outrageous and I think we all agree on that.

This original motion needs to be supported and will be supported. We are the custodians of the river, and it is South Australia that has on all occasions ensured that we have engaged in such a way that we looked at the welfare and the wellbeing of the river system as a whole, not just South Australia, because it is not mutually exclusive to having an effective working river and a proper environment in which to work that water in the most effective way.

We have seen some terrible things. I do not want to return back to the days of the drought but, as the Premier quite rightly said, on the information that has been provided at the moment it is quite likely that we will get less water into the system than we are going to get under the Murray-Darling Basin Plan because of the actions of those people upstream. I do not believe that all people upstream are like that, but I believe that there is certainly a very, very corrupt undercurrent that is to a very great extent condoned by the Deputy Prime Minister, and aided and abetted by the bureaucracy of New South Wales, either to circumvent the plan as best they can and as effectively as they can or to jettison the plan right out of the system.

This motion is about making sure that we as a state and we as a nation compel—and I say compel—the Prime Minister to make sure that an independent judicial inquiry is set up and that we return to a plan that is going to be properly administered, not an inquiry by the Murray-Darling Basin. That is like Caesar judging Caesar—you have to be joking. They are the people who are supposed to be on top of—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Well, you play politics, mate. You are amending it. It is a bit of grandstanding.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Well, they did not pass it, Steven: it was withdrawn.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The deputy leader will have to leave for three minutes. The deputy leader needs to leave for three minutes under the sessional order.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Deputy Speaker, I commend—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Stop the clock. You need to leave for three minutes.

**Mr Marshall:** You said three times, 'The deputy leader has got to leave.' There is no deputy leader here.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, the leader then.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, you can come back in the vote, can't you? Off we go.

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

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I commend this motion. I support the original motion. We as a state need to continue to fight for the River Murray.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:29):** I rise to support the amended motion. When every state in the nation signed the Murray-Darling Basin Plan in 2012 it was an iconic moment, a critical moment in our water management and a partisan agreement, the likes of which may never happen again. The Murray-Darling Basin drains one-seventh of the Australian continent and represents one-third of its agricultural production, being more than 3,000 kilometres long. More than three million people live and work within the basin and it is home to 16 Ramsar-listed wetlands.

Challenges around water sharing through the implementation of the basin plan are some of the most complicated policy issues this nation has ever faced. As part of the basin plan implementation, South Australian irrigators, and particularly those in the Riverland, have led the way in water efficiencies in order to work towards meeting the plan's water savings targets. So I can tell you that, upon the airing of the *Four Corners* program on 24 July, there was widespread anger at the allegations of water theft, water meters being tampered with and Public Service corruption in New South Wales. More specifically, the accusations are around water being illegally taken from the Barwon-Darling.

In South Australia, we have thousands of irrigators with world's best practice in order to comply with the historic partisan Murray-Darling Basin Plan and upstream some are roting the system. I want to make it clear that these allegations are not about whether the basin plan is working; this is about the law and those who uphold that law. As an irrigator for almost three decades, and as the member for Chaffey, representing a wide cohort of people on the land who rely on Murray water to survive, to say these allegations made my blood boil would be an understatement.

If these allegations are found to be true, I want the book thrown at those doing the wrong thing, and if the book does not work the kitchen sink will do. This is not only illegal, but it is undermining the very foundations of the basin plan, which all states agreed to. The last thing we can afford to see is any state walk away from this basin plan. In my view, these allegations cannot be left solely to New South Wales to investigate. The federal government must intervene. They must come down hard on those acting illegally, if these allegations are true. Anything less will severely impact confidence in the basin plan and undermine its implementation.

A press conference held this week to announce joint support, across a number of parties, for a judicial inquiry was missing any South Australian Liberal Party members. We were not invited. Why did they not invite the South Australian Liberals to be part of this announcement? I will tell you why. It was all about the Premier playing politics, once again, with the River Murray. We require a swift resolution to these allegations, as the last thing we need is for any state to consider abandoning their part in the basin plan.

One of the key issues that was missing out of the ABC's story was the water shepherding. No-one has talked about water shepherding and no-one is talking about flood plain harvesting. These are issues that need to be addressed. Again, I am calling on a national audit for compliance, a national audit for metering within the Murray-Darling Basin extraction. Under the basin plan, it is initiated that the 2,750 gigalitres be returned to the environment by 2019. Progress of the plan is underpinned by irrigators', and their communities', determination to make a difference, to do more with less water.

To date, the South Australian government has performed no action—none at all. SA Water has made no contribution. There are no efficiency gains or environmental outcomes below Lock 1. The Lower Lakes Scoping Study is an example; it is gathering dust on the minister's desk. That is an example of where an inquiry should be—an inquiry into why nothing has happened during that scoping study and an inquiry into the minister's behaviour. There have been no environmental works and measures below Lock 1.

What happens in the time of drought and low flows? About every 18 years we have a drought in the Murray-Darling Basin. That drought is getting closer, yet the South Australian government is missing in action. A further 450 gigalitres by 2024 and South Australia's contribution will be an extra 38 gigalitres. That is taking all of the Renmark Irrigation Trust out of production. That is a further



burden on the South Australian economy, yet we do not see the Premier, the minister or any of the South Australian government standing up and being accounted for. They have not found one efficiency gain to contribute one drop of water to the Murray-Darling Basin. Environmental outcomes are what the basin plan is all about. We look at Chowilla, which is a great achievement; we look at the Pike flood plain; we look at Katarapko flood plains; they are all environmental achievements which underpin this basin plan.

In Chaffey, the Riverland's economy is growing after dealing with the Millennium Drought, and after contributing most of South Australia's 183 gigalitres of SDL as part of that basin plan commitment. A new paradigm with new plantings and water-use efficiencies is bearing fruit. The Riverland is starting to show green shoots once again. Remember that Adelaide does not only rely on the River Murray for its critical water. Adelaide relies on the River Murray to put food on the table three times a day, 365 days of the year, every year for every decade, and that is something that every South Australian needs to understand.

South Australians need a healthy working river and without this our economic activity is not sustainable. The River Murray not only underpins Australia's food demands but provides safe food to the world. As of the end of June 2017, just over 2,080 gigalitres have been recovered through a mix of government purchases of water licences and funded infrastructure improvements, in return for farmers becoming more water efficient and surrendering the water saved to the commonwealth.

I commend irrigators and their communities for their dedication and tireless work to achieve South Australia's SDLs. Not one drop has been delivered from the South Australian government's efficiency projects—not one drop. The South Australian Labor Party is only in it for the politics. The health of the river should always remain above politics.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:36):** I rise to support the amended motion, to make sure that we do have a fresh healthy River Murray. It has always been my stand since coming into this place in 2006. In 2006, we saw the start of the Millennium Drought, and we are well aware of the meeting on Melbourne Cup day with John Howard and ministers talking about plans to keep the river in good condition. But guess what, Madam Deputy Speaker? We have people trying to give us history lessons here today. I am going to talk about a little bit of history.

Guess what the Rann Labor government were going to do? The Rann Labor government were going to build a weir at Wellington with hundreds of thousands of tonnes of rocks that were going to sink into the sediment, as would the pylons that would have gone into a weir that was proposed back in the 1920s and 1930s.

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

**Mr PEDERICK:** That is exactly what was going to happen, and the Premier was here, the member for Colton was here and the member for Mawson was here. This motion, and even the amended motion, is about supporting all who rely on the River Murray. But, no, the Labor government were quite keen to sacrifice thousands of people and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of production annually below Wellington. That is exactly what was going to happen, and it did not happen. I really thank the resilience of those people of the River Lakes Coorong Action Group, people like Henry Jones—and God rest his soul, what a champion of the river—for the work that they did.

I was stunned when I had meetings with the former member for Chaffey, who was the water minister at the time, because all the concern was about getting water to Adelaide. Sure, we had to have water to Adelaide, but we had to have water for other offtakes as well. The head of SA Water was there with the water minister of the time when I said, 'Just lower the pumps at Murray Bridge and Mannum. Just lower the pumps,' but they said, 'No, it couldn't happen.' That was the conversation I had, and guess what? Yes, in the end they did. They built the cofferdams. They built the cofferdams and lowered the pumps, but that was only after I was told it could not happen. How ridiculous!

It was an engineering solution that was that simple it was crazy. That is what happened in the end, and I certainly salute those people on the lower reaches of the river and those people around the lakes. I salute the people who own Wellington Lodge and the upper stations, who were put through hell and threatened with compulsory acquisition of their land. Roads were built to the weir,

and they went through the Public Works Committee, and there was that threat of the river being blocked at Wellington. It would have destroyed the lifeblood of the lower reaches of the river in South Australia.

So I for one on this side of the house, will not be lectured by this Labor government because the member for Colton, the Premier and the member for Mawson were all there, and all they were going to do was cut people off. We need those freshwater flows. I was so pleased that, when I pushed for a freshwater recovery in our party room, the party room came my way and we pushed for a 50-gigalitre desal plant that would have been more than enough, seeing that now there has been a 100-gigalitre desal plant built there that is just a white elephant about to have another white elephant put next to it, namely, a diesel generator.

What has gone on is just disgusting, the threats and the things that this Labor government did to those people. Apart from the weir that was going to be built at Wellington, there were bunds built at Clayton, Currency Creek and Narrung, cutting off communities, splitting up the river and destroying those communities, getting into the hearts and minds of those communities. So, yes, we all need to be angry about the allegations of water theft in the northern basin. I have toured through the northern basin and I have toured through the southern basin, and I have seen what goes on up there. There is still plenty of room for improvement, but we just need to be—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes. We all need to be proactive and push for a freshwater relief of the river and make sure that critical water needs, environmental needs and irrigating needs are met, but I will not be lectured to by a government that cut off our river communities and threatened to cut off the bottom of the river.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:40):** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for MacKillop has the floor.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Colton, the member for MacKillop has the floor. You have had a turn.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Madam Deputy Speaker, the clock kept going for that half minute.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, if you do not start you will miss out altogether, won't you?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** It galls me to come here and learn that the Labor Party in South Australia do not want the river fixed. They do not want it fixed because it presents them with a political opportunity. When I heard the nonsense coming from the mouth of the member for Mawson (the Minister for Agriculture), who demonstrated that he knows nothing about the river, it was crystal clear to me that this government see this as a political opportunity, just as they did in 2006 when John Howard called together the premiers of the river states and put \$10 billion on the table.

The Labor states made sure that nothing happened to the river until post the 2007 federal election because they saw a political opportunity. Labor has played politics with this nonstop. It galls me that this exercise here today has fallen down to base political opportunism, when the future of South Australia is at stake.

Is the basin plan flawed? If it is, it is the product of this state Labor government and a federal Labor government. Is it flawed? Was it sensible to leave the administration to the individual jurisdictions? We do not trust New South Wales, apparently, according to the Premier, yet he and his government, in cohort with a federal Labor government, built this plan, and this plan is what they put down and put through the various parliaments.

This is a Labor document; is it flawed? The Premier would have us believe that it is flawed. Maybe it is. One of the flaws that might be in this plan is that we do not have strong enough sanctions against people who steal from the taxpayers of Australia. I came into this place because of matters of water management, and I have a great deal of passion. When you have something like rainfall, which has such a huge value, and water flowing down our creeks and streams and into our aquifers,

which have huge value, and we do not have regimes that mean that they can be protected properly, we have flaws. We have flaws in the systems, and it appears that we have a flaw in this system.

If I were writing the water plan for the Murray-Darling Basin and somebody with a water licence stole from the basin, the way I would write it they would lose their licence. They would not be fined, they would not be sanctioned, but they would lose their licence. I think theft from the basin would stop very quickly, but the Labor Party that drew up this plan did not go that far. Now they are arguing that it is the Coalition government in Canberra that is at fault. Give me a break. If the plan is flawed it is the Labor Party's fault, because they drew it up.

I do not know whether it is flawed or not, but if I am asked to vote in this place to support an amendment to the plan which sees that people who cheat lose their licence and lose any entitlements they have, I would vote for it. Even though their hands are somewhat tied by this plan because the administration remains with the states, I call on the federal government to have a judicial inquiry to get to the bottom of this. It is so important, not just to this state but to this nation. Let's stop playing politics and let's get fair dinkum and sort it out.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (16:45):** I thank all members for their contribution, the burden of which is, at the very least, to support the sentiments in the motion if not the words. However, I cannot for the life of me understand why those opposite are seeking to promote an amendment. There is absolutely nothing offensive or political in the original proposition. It simply calls on the Prime Minister to protect the integrity of the plan, to commission an independent judicial inquiry, to put the river ahead of people who seek to profit from the river, and to comply with the legislative requirements to appoint independent experts.

It is a completely unexceptional and non-inflammatory proposition. It can only be the case that those who are seeking to amend it are seeking to play politics with it. I cannot for the life of me understand why the opposition would not offer full and bipartisan support for a resolution. It is strongly worded, but it is not inflammatory in any sense of the word.

Those opposite seem to be suggesting that this has been an act of political opportunism. We did not put *Four Corners* to air. We did not seek to flout the appointment process by putting some lobbyist on the independent expert panel, and we did not go to Shepparton and have a drink and get half tanked and actually give the game away about what our intentions were about evading the responsibilities of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. That was all the work of the Liberal Coalition. It was not the work of the Labor Party, and it certainly was not the work of the Labor Party in this state.

These circumstances have not been brought into existence by us. They have been brought into existence by those we are now charging with the responsibility for remedying the situation. If there is to be a criticism of the way in which we have constructed the plan—and it is not the plan but, in fact, its enforcement—I suppose we could be criticised for expecting people to comply with the law. We expected that people would obey the law.

I thought much of what the member for MacKillop promoted was absolute nonsense, but one thing he did say, which I think is worthy of consideration, was to think about a new and different regime of penalty for people who do actually engage in water theft. Perhaps it is time to consider the cancellation of water licences for people who engage in water theft. It is certainly something I may be prepared to promote nationally. It might be called the MacKillop amendment, or even the Mitch amendment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** He is trading up for a Mazda; maybe he wants to get inside the Rolls-Royce.

Amendment negated; motion carried.

*Personal Explanation*

#### MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:49):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** During the debate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I cannot hear what the member is saying; there is too much noise on my right.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** During the debate that just ensued, the member for Mawson attributed to me comments that I had made at some stage that it was not a Rolls-Royce but a Mazda, and I was happy for us to drive a Mazda. The Premier made a similar assertion just now. I have never made that comment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** So you feel you have been misrepresented?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I have been misrepresented. The comment was made by—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is all you need to say. It is on the record that you have been misrepresented. I am advised by the Clerk that that is all that has to happen.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I have not finished making the explanation, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Come and speak to the Clerk.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Everyone be quiet, please. According to my advice, you have said where you have been misrepresented and you now need to sit down. If you have a problem with that, come and see the Clerk; it is his advice I am taking.

**Mr GARDNER:** I encourage you to have a look at the precedent set by the current Speaker I think late last year when he suggested that it should be limited to saying what the cause for the misrepresentation was and a brief explanation of why it was wrong. I believe that the member for MacKillop was, in fact, just doing that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I think you both need to come and speak to the Clerk so that the house can get on with the next item of business.

### *Bills*

## **PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL**

### *Conference*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:51):** I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the sitting of the house to be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

## **ELECTORAL (LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VOTING) (VOTER CHOICE) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Final Stages*

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 2 August 2017.)

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I will be very brief. The circumstances of this matter are that this has been the subject of quite a bit of work over a period of time. I just want to make it clear that the government position has been that we have attempted to accommodate the Legislative Council by firstly, putting up the Sainte-Laguë method and, secondly, when they expressed some concern about that, putting up the voter choice method. They have responded to that compromise by no compromise at all, so we intend to send this back up there.

I would like to emphasise to members of the Legislative Council that it is absolutely critical we now resolve this matter. Members of the government and the house have actually attempted to compromise with the council in order to get this matter through. It is absolutely critical that it does get through because the option of it not proceeding would be, in my opinion, completely unacceptable to everyone.

Without getting any more elaborate than that, the government wishes the matter to go back to the council and the council to understand that we have moved an enormous distance in order to accommodate their concerns. We would like the council to cooperate and respond in a like way and accept these particular matters, which we are now forwarding back to them.

**Mr GARDNER:** Forgive me, but we do not often have this stage of the debate in bills that I am handling. Am I able to ask a question of the Attorney at this point, or am I only able to make a contribution?

**The CHAIR:** I think you can ask him a question.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** I am fine with a question.

**The CHAIR:** He is fine with a question.

**Mr GARDNER:** Then can I clarify that the Attorney is rejecting all the Legislative Council's amendments? Is that what he is proposing to do at this stage?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** What I am doing is saying that the matters contained in the motion, which is filed in my name, I do not believe is a reversal of everything the council put through; it is only a reversal of some of the things the council put through. For the record, we put up a bill originally with Sainte-Laguë. There were then discussions and the Leader of the Opposition and I spoke and whatnot and we attempted to find an alternate position, and we put that up in the voter choice bill.

The voter choice bill went up there, and that has been now modified in a way that is unacceptable to the government. There are other modifications that were made in the council which we are prepared to accept because we are trying to be cooperative in meeting people halfway.

**Mr Marshall:** So what are you saying below the line?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I think the position is 12 below the line and up to six above the line.

**Mr Marshall:** There is no difference below the line?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I do not think there is any difference below the line; we are talking about above the line. We are not refusing everything the council sent back here. We are just saying, 'Look, fair is fair. What about actually a legitimate compromise on this?' So that is what we are sending back. We are not sending the whole lot back; we are sending bits back. We have been very consistent about this from the beginning, and we have been trying to find middle ground. We are sending it back in the hope that they will accommodate that.

**The CHAIR:** So amendments Nos 1 to 5 are agreed to. Can we move those?

**Mr GARDNER:** Am I able perhaps to make one contribution in relation to all the amendments, as the Attorney just did, and then we can just deal with them all?

**The CHAIR:** We are happy to facilitate that.

*Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. J.R. Rau.*

**Mr GARDNER:** On behalf of the opposition, can I indicate where we stand on the matter and then we can perhaps deal with all the Attorney's amendments on the voices en bloc or as we go. I note that in a number of places the Attorney has agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council and in a number of places has not.

To put this into some context from our position, the Attorney in his remarks referenced the idea that, to assist the Legislative Council, the Labor Party (the government) put forward this Sainte-Laguë model. Nobody else supports this model, apart from the Attorney. I suspect that it was with whimsy that his party room even allowed him to put it forward, knowing full well that no other party in the parliament would possibly accept it as a part of what was going forward.

The idea that the Sainte-Laguë model was part of some compromise is nonsensical and not to be accepted. The Legislative Council members, to whom this bill obviously particularly relates, have debated this at some length but fundamentally come back to first principles. We want to do a number of things. We want to ensure that the people of South Australia get the parliament they wish for.

That the will of the South Australian people be reflected in the make-up of the people who sit in the parliament is of prime importance. The way that is constructed, whether it is through multimember electorates, single-member electorates, first past the post, preferential and, in particular in an upper house such as is familiar in Australia, where you have proportional representation, is a matter for some difference and debate as to what is the most representative model.

One of the things that is, perhaps, important and should not be lost (it is part of the debate, usually) is ensuring that in the Australian context—where we require everyone to vote because we want the parliament to be reflective of not just the will of the people who do turn up to vote but the will of all the South Australian people in this case, or the Australian people—we do not want people's votes to be wasted, so we have these vote-saving provisions. We try to get as many people's votes to be counted as possible.

The informal vote is unfortunately part of the landscape in Australian and South Australia politics, but we want to reduce the informal vote wherever possible. The Liberal Party therefore strongly maintains the view that the informal vote is best reduced partly by having a consistency in application of the law between state and federal jurisdictions. The way that the Senate is elected changed at the last election. As somebody who occasionally scrutinises votes being counted—I have to say that I once scrutinised a Senate vote count. I was 18 at the time and did not know better.

However, the people who do scrutinise Senate vote counts tell me that there were some challenges, and certainly when handing out how-of-vote cards at polling booths at the last federal election there were some challenges for people going in to vote, as they were trying to make sense of how-to-vote cards. Some people were trying to make sense of how-to-vote cards that they might not have been familiar with. Amongst other things, what I take from that is that change brings some challenges for people to become familiar with it, but so was the change in the 1980s when we had above the line voting. People get used to things.

What I am appealing to the government to consider is the value of consistency between the state and the federal upper house voting rules. Having a position where we have one set of rules in the state and one set of rules in the federal—the federal having just changed and then the state changing to something else entirely—I think will present challenges for people as they enter the polling booth.

Having the model presented by the Legislative Council which would, as I understand it, be as close to the way that the Senate is represented as possible, I think is in and of itself a good. This is a political judgement, but nevertheless I think it is relevant here. I cannot see the Senate changing their voting system again, having just gone through the upheaval of changing it. Anything we do that is inconsistent with what the Senate has done is therefore going to present challenges, which brings us back to our bill.

Of course, if the Senate voting system were unmeritorious, then I would understand that as an argument, but the Senate's voting system is not unmeritorious. The Senate's voting system is one that perhaps delivers results that the Labor Party from time to time might not like, but the point is that the will of the South Australian people must be, wherever possible, represented in its parliamentary make-up. I know that the South Australian Labor Party does not necessarily approve of that concept for the South Australian House of Assembly; when a redistribution commission tried to put that forward, they took them to court.

The will of the people should be represented in its parliaments wherever possible and as best as possible. Capturing that group of people who potentially might have struggled with changing from the last Legislative Council election to the Senate election with new rules, to the Legislative Council election coming with a further set of new rules, I do not think serves the purposes of the people of South Australia to that end.

I do, however, share with the Attorney-General, and most of the speakers in the Legislative Council whose speeches I have read, the desire that the idea of preference whispering be stopped because that, too, and profoundly in some instances, provides examples where the will of the people is not represented in the parliamentary members that they necessarily elect.

If somebody is given a how-to-vote card, for example, with a Students Against HECS proposition for a Legislative Council voting ticket, where the votes then flow to a party that supports HECS, as happened in the 1997 election, then potentially the people voting for that Students Against HECS ticket might have been disappointed. The Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council being a candidate for the Students Against HECS party at the time, preferencing the Labor Party, which of course was the party that invented and supported the HECS system, is a pretty good example.

There are perhaps less partisan examples that the Attorney-General and I might readily agree on. There are examples of parties with radically right-wing names invented for the Legislative Council election that then preference the Greens or other radically left-wing parties over middle-of-the-road parties such as the Liberal Party or even, dare I say, the Labor Party; and vice versa, parties with radical left-wing names have preferenced radical right-wing parties, that do not express the will of the voter.

I am pleased that we have been able to talk with the government about some shared goals. However, I do think that the government is taking the wrong steps in sending the majority of this bill back and not accepting the Legislative Council's amendments at this stage. I hope that there will be a resolution in the future where the government will move further and we will see consistency between the Legislative Council and the Senate so that people are not confused about differences between the voting systems, and indeed that we will see the will of all the people of South Australia reflected in the people they elect to the parliament through that system.

I therefore indicate that we will support the amendments that the government is accepting, and we will oppose, presumably without division, the amendments that the government is seeking to send back.

**The CHAIR:** Would you like to answer that?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Just very briefly. It may be that the member for Morialta and I are the only people who are especially interested in this, but just in case anyone else is—

**The CHAIR:** I am here. I listen to everything you say.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Thank you very much. The galleries do not appear to be chock-a-block presently.

**The CHAIR:** Maybe they do not know it is your turn to speak. Someone go out the front and tell everybody.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Madam Chair, if I can just respond to what the member for Morialta has said, first of all can I say there is a great deal of common ground between some of his remarks and the government position, and I welcome that, but there are three basic points. The first one is everybody thinks the Senate system is terrific. Not true.

In fact, I for one have to say my experience has been, having been being told on the how-to-vote card that I was having to vote for six groups in the Senate that, quite frankly, after I got to two or three, I could not work out whether I was in favour of the Marxist-Leninist Revolutionary Party or some other extreme group. The difference between the parties is basically this: we are saying that you should be able to go one or more above the line. The Liberal Party is saying you should have to do six above the line. That is basically the difference.

To address the fair comment that the member for Morialta raised, namely 'Wouldn't it be terrible if we rendered a whole bunch of people's votes informal by reason of the difference between the two voting systems?' the answer is: the savings provisions here mean that somebody who voted in the federal way in our state system would not be an informal voter, and somebody who voted our way in the federal system would not be an informal voter. So that problem is fixed: there is going to be no informality created as a result of the government amendments being accepted.

**Mr Gardner:** What about the next Senate election?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Likewise in the Senate, because what the Senate says is, notwithstanding the fact that they want you to vote for six, if you vote for less, to the extent that you have expressed a clear preference, it is counted.

**Mr Gardner:** I am confused. I am so confused.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** You are not really confused at all. The member is not really confused.

**The CHAIR:** Are you saying he is misleading the house?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No, he is not misleading, he is being a little querulous, I think is the word. Anyway, let's go back to this. That is the end of my response.

*Amendments Nos 1 to 5:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 to 5 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 6:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 6 be disagreed to and insert the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 5, line 12 [clause 11, inserted paragraph (b)]—After 'preference' insert:

and, if the voter so desires, by placing the number '2' and consecutive numbers in the group voting squares that relate to other groups of candidates in the order of the voter's preference for them (but not so as to be required to indicate a preference for all groups of candidates)

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 7:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 7 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 8:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 8 be disagreed to and insert the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 5, lines 16 to 28 [clause 12, inserted subsections (2) and (3)]—Delete inserted subsections (2) and (3) and substitute:

- (2) If 1 or more numbers, that are not disregarded under section 94(4b), are placed in group voting squares on a ballot paper in relation to groups of candidates (each group being a *preferenced group*), the ballot paper is taken to have been marked as if—
  - (a) each candidate in a *preferenced group* was given a different number starting from 1; and
  - (b) candidates in a *preferenced group* were numbered consecutively starting with the candidate whose name on the ballot paper is at the top of the group to the candidate whose name is at the bottom; and
  - (c) the order in which candidates in different *preferenced groups* are numbered is worked out by reference to the order in which the groups were numbered on the ballot paper, starting with the group marked 1; and
  - (d) when all the candidates in a *preferenced group* have been numbered, the candidate whose name is at the top of the next *preferenced group* is given the next consecutive number.



Motion carried.

*Amendments Nos 9 to 13:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 9 to 13 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 14:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 14 be disagreed to and insert the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 6, lines 25 to 29 [clause 13(1), inserted paragraph (b)(ii)]—Delete all words in line 25 and subparagraphs (A) and (B) and substitute:

indicate, in the manner required by this Act, the order of the voter's preference for candidates in the election; or

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 15:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 15 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

*Amendments Nos 16 and 17:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 16 and 17 be disagreed to and insert the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 6, line 34 [clause 13(4)]—After 'delete subsection (4a)' insert:

and substitute:

- (4a) A ballot paper for a Legislative Council election where there are more than 6 candidates is not informal under subsection (1)(b)(ii) if the voter has placed consecutive numbers (starting from the number '1') in the squares printed opposite the names of at least 6 candidates in total.
- (4b) For the purposes of this Act, the following numbers placed in a square printed opposite the name of a candidate, or placed in a group voting square, on a ballot paper for a Legislative Council election are to be disregarded:
  - (a) numbers that are repeated and any higher numbers;
  - (b) if a number is missed—any numbers that are higher than the missing number.

Motion carried.

*Amendments Nos 18 to 22:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 18 to 22 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

## **PARLIAMENT (JOINT SERVICES) (STAFFING) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (HEAVY VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES) BILL***Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**LAND AND BUSINESS (SALE AND CONVEYANCING) (BENEFICIAL INTEREST) AMENDMENT BILL***Final Stages*

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

No. 1. Clause 4, page 4, line 6 [clause 4(7), inserted subsection (10a)(a)]—Delete '60' and substitute '70'

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

This is in order to satisfy the member for Morialta, amongst others, that a genuine spirit of compromise has overtaken the government, which we are seeking in the context of the last bill to see reflected in the consideration of that important piece of work in the Legislative Council. Can I say to the rhetorical question, 'Do I agree to the proposal put forward by Mr McLachlan in the other place?', and I am not quoting a song, necessarily, but—I do, I do, I do.

**The CHAIR:** That's Abba.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes.

**Mr GARDNER:** The opposition, being in furious agreement with the Hon. Andrew McLachlan, as we usually are, commends the government for bowing to the pressure applied by the Legislative Council, the extreme pressure exerted by the Hon. Mr McLachlan, who is an excellent member of the Legislative Council, and we will support the amendment that we put up.

Motion carried.

**APPROPRIATION BILL 2017***Estimates Committees*

Adjourned debated on motion:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

(Continued from 2 August 2017.)

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (17:16):** We left off yesterday around Police, that we heard the extraordinary admission by the police commissioner that the inability of SAPOL to keep up with the volume increase in e-crime exhibits needing to be processed through the e-crimes branch had regularly caused delays to judicial proceedings and had, on regular occasions, earned the ire of judges in their judgements for failing to be able to provide evidence on time. He went on to say that things are being looked at with regard to a strategy to improve that, and we wish him well in his endeavours.

I have spoken about Marksman and the issue that existed there. We then went on to ask questions around a number of other things, including what will happen when Holden no longer makes Commodores for the police fleet to use. The answer from the commissioner was, 'Look, even though it is coming up in October, we haven't made a final decision yet as to what we're going to do, but we have plenty of time.'

We then asked a whole host of questions, especially around the fact that for Blue Light discos, which in 2015-16 engaged 40,000 young people in South Australia, in 2016-17 that figure was only 20,000. I wanted to know what those other 20,000 children were doing. Unfortunately, the minister was not able to provide any answers, but it seems that Blue Light discos are not as cool perhaps as they were even 12 months prior. We will get to the bottom of that burning issue in the

South Australia Police portfolio. We asked questions around psychological assessments and how our police are going in relation to dealing with the immense pressure they are often under, as well as a whole host of other issues.

We then moved on to Corrections, and each of us put on our different hats. I must say that a number of issues were identified in Corrections. For the first time, certainly in a long time—and I have tried to ask around to see when was the last time the government predicted that the prison population would drop, and nobody was able to give me an answer—the government is predicting a plateau or a small drop in the average daily prisoner population for the next 12 months. That is astounding, given that last year we saw a 3.2 per cent increase and the year before that we saw a 7.9 per cent increase. In fact, the five-year average of prison population increase has been just a touch over 6 per cent over the past five years. We went back, and in 2013 they first predicted what the 2016-17 daily average prisoner population year would look like.

It started off at about 2,475-odd prisoners, and the actual result was 2,998 prisoners. With each revision, as they put new capital projects through the Public Works Committee and as they provided new evidence to the Budget and Finance Committee, that prediction went up and up every single time. In fact, for the 2015-16 year where the final result was 2,870, in August of that year the government reported a number 100 prisoners underneath the actual result. They have consistently and repeatedly, over and over again, understated what our daily prisoner population average is going to be.

In this year's budget, when we saw that they were predicting a small decrease in the prison population for this year, my jaw dropped. On questioning, we were given some very vague answers about a very complex formula into which they somehow chuck a heap of numbers and it spits out the result. I have absolutely no confidence in that figure—absolutely no confidence. With a 20-year average of a 3 per cent year-on-year increase and an over 6 per cent increase over the last five years, how it is that somehow this year we are going to be able to reduce our prison population borders on the absurd to me. I hope for the budget's sake that they are able to achieve that; I just hold very little hope that they actually will.

The second bit of big news that came out of Corrections estimates—and it seemed as though minister Malinauskas inadvertently released this information—came when I benignly asked, 'How is the Port Augusta Prison project going?' He counted on his fingers: 'It will be open in four months' time.' I said, 'Hang on, that's November.' He said, 'That's right. It will be open in November.' I said, 'Actually, it was supposed to open in March, the CE of corrections previously told us that it was going to open in August and now you are saying November?' At that point, he very quickly backtracked and suggested, 'We are still hoping it will be open in September.' He went from saying, 'It is going to be open in November,' to saying, 'We hope it is going to be open in September.' He then very quickly, I think, tried to cover up the fact that he had told us.

I was lucky enough not that long ago, six to eight weeks ago, to go along to the opening of the Eyre Unit at Mobilong. I very much await with anticipation my invitation to the opening of the Port Augusta expansion. I can bet that that invitation is not going to come with a September date on it. Right at the time when our prison system is under extreme pressure, when only a few months ago we saw the peak of our prison population at 3,093—I think that was on either 1 or 3 February—we have another delay to the opening of the Port Augusta Prison expansion.

The expansion is desperately needed. It comes at a very inopportune time, especially when we know that the Port Adelaide and Elizabeth police holding cells are undergoing renovations. We need these new beds to come online, and they simply are not. That is a cause for concern. I genuinely hope that, over the next few months, we do not see a peak in the prisoner population that would put further stress upon that.

We went on to ask questions about a host of other issues within Corrections, especially around how 24-hour surveillance is undertaken, how prison guards and prison officers are dealt with, the 10 by 20 report and when these new programs—New Foundations and Work Ready, Release Ready—are actually going to come into effect. Again, a lot of the answers were quite vague. There was some question mark about spending in this year's budget, whether it is actually going to be

expended, because they actually need to develop the program, then they need to go out to tender and then they need to contract someone to deliver the program.

I commend the minister for new money being available in this space, and I commend the minister for looking at transitional assistance and housing assistance for people. I congratulate the minister on realising that, unless we prepare people to come out of prison and get back into the community properly, they are going to commit more crime and that will make our community less safe. They will be back in gaol in a short period of time, statistically 50 per cent of them within two years.

There is a lot of unravelling the government has to do to unravel the failed rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em policy. To my mind, we have now created a cohort of hardened prisoners who will not respond that well, given the way the system has operated to date. How we deal with this balloon of hardened criminals is something police ministers and Correctional Services ministers will have to deal with for a generation to come.

We then moved on to emergency services where we were very keen to unpack government spending on 38 new CFS trucks, as well as 137 upgrades to existing single-cab vehicles to ensure that they have better fire protection, hopefully upgrading them to dual-cab vehicles with sprinkle and burn-over provisions, so that our CFS volunteers are as safe as they can be when they are out on the fireground. A number of burn-overs had to happen during the Pinery fire, and it is an extremely dangerous and difficult situation. We need to make sure our volunteers are kitted-out with the best gear available so that they stay safe.

We then moved to road safety. It is interesting that fines revenue increases year on year and that the cost of fines increases. This year, the government announced that they are putting in 10 new fixed-speed cameras around South Australia, five of them at school crossings. That is quite a novel approach and we look forward to seeing where that goes. The minister was at pains to say that all speeding fine revenue goes into the Community Road Safety Fund. He was very clear in excluding red light cameras and unregistered drivers, which raise significant sums of money.

He said that the Community Road Safety Fund still sits well in excess of what we collect in speeding fines anyway. That is true, except that, even though speeding fine revenue has continued to increase—and in fact the government is looking at an extra \$14 million over the next four years of increase with its 10 new cameras—the value of the Community Road Safety Fund has stubbornly stayed at \$81,021,000 million for at least the last three years and is projected to stay the same for the coming year.

Basically, fines revenue is increasing, but the money put into the Community Road Safety Fund is not increasing. That is the message that South Australians need to take out of it. It is exactly the same as when the government increased the bills that South Australians have to pay for the ESL: there was no corresponding increase to emergency services funding in that hypothecated fund. The minister could not have been clearer about it.

We then went on and did health estimates on Tuesday morning. Health has been the subject of much discussion in this place and in the media. Once again, it was a fantastic estimates season, and I hope that next year we will be sitting on the other side of the table answering questions rather than asking them.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:27):** I, too, rise to talk about the Appropriation Bill and estimates for 2017-18. Having been in this place for a little while now, there were some highlights and lowlights. There are ministers who are across their brief and ministers who are not across their brief. I commend those ministers who are across their brief.

I am somewhat sceptical when I listen to ministers make more than a 10-minute opening speech and take Dorothy Dixers. In this day and age, a minister of the Crown has a portfolio responsibility. If they are of benefit to South Australia and they are not across their brief, perhaps they are not worthy of being a minister. There was an opportunity for me to understand different areas of portfolio responsibility. It gave me good insight into what is presented and how and why ministers deserve respect if they are across their brief: if they are not, they continue to overstate their presence in an opening speech and have staffers text messages from the gallery to the committee members so that they can ask questions to consume time and protect the minister.

All in all, I have heard many opposition members state that they think estimates is a waste of time. I think estimates is a worthwhile process. Yes, it is frustrating, but it is about holding the government to account and giving the taxpayer some form of assurance that the government is not squibbing away their hard-earned taxpayer dollars, that they have the representation they think they deserve, and perhaps they would like to think that, if they had a change of government, that they might get better value for money.

In saying that, the process is relevant in today's age of politics. I think that there could be change and that there could be refinement. Information from Dorothy Dixers is usually in the public domain anyway and something that taxpayers should deem a waste of their money. I look at ministers and their staffers, and I congratulate a lot of those staff because they have to spend countless hours preparing those big fat folders full of information so that the minister can open them up and give an answer. But it is more than that: it is about the team. If the minister has a competent team, that portfolio is in good hands.

I sat on a number of estimates committees. My portfolio responsibilities of trade and investment and health industries produced some good information, and I was quite happy with how that all came about. I commend the Minister for Trade that his opening statement was brief, that he had one Dorothy Dixier and that he was happy to take questions. He did his best to give me answers, albeit that a lot of answers were extended conversation. It is heart-warming when we have a minister who is prepared to take on the questions and the challenges that are put to him.

Health industries, under the Minister for Health, is a relatively new program that was established in the 2015-16 year. The health and biomedical sector is a key industry for opportunities relating to the state's exports and investment and I think that area will continue to grow. We have our health precinct on North Terrace, the SAHMRI building and the ever-increasing buildings going up down there towards West Terrace.

The budget is \$8 million, supporting nine FTEs. The majority of that budget is spent on grants and subsidies, that is, \$4½ million with \$4 million of that being the Health Industries Fund. We did not get a lot of new information, but it did show me that health industries will continue to be a very important export for South Australia. We have some fantastic people within that area, and I think that South Australia will be a beneficiary. As an industry, it will grow and promote our exports as well as some of the new technology that South Australians will enjoy when it comes to dealing with the health industry.

Trade and investment was interesting. Straightaway, the minister's plan of attack was that his opening statement justified why South Australia was doing so poorly. Rather than looking at ways in which he could commend his team and the state's initiatives, he targeted what other states are doing to increase their trade and exports to justify why South Australia's trade and export numbers have flatlined. That is very disappointing. I have had a number of healthy debates with the minister about why it has flatlined, and the minister continues to deny it. We continue to see a lot of the key targets moving. The trade targets have moved over and over again and South Australia desperately needs a change of strategy.

I have watched the current government doing the same things for the last seven years, and over the last seven years, or over a more of an extended period of time, we have seen our national footprint go from 7.5 per cent of the national exports to dithering down around the 4 per cent. It worries me that South Australia could get to those lows, particularly with a minister who has been there teetering on four years.

He was given the opportunity in opposition to travel with the then trade minister. He was given the opportunity to have his input, but he is not prepared to put the shoe on the other foot and offer that bipartisan approach and look at ways we can make South Australia's trade bottom line better and look at new initiatives. We see the same old, same old with a minister who keeps on trying to justify why he is doing the same things the government was doing seven years ago. That is a concern.

One of the shining lights of the state has been the growth in international student attraction, although as part of the national stage our share should be much higher. We questioned the Export Partnership Program, which provides grants to exporters of up to \$50,000. After about \$1.7 million

of extra money was put into the program in the 2015-16 Mid-Year Budget Review, there is now no new extra funding. We found out that the 2016-17 budget was \$2.6 million and that only \$1.05 million had been provided to grant recipients to May. Obviously a lot of money is going in administration and a lot of money is going into business offices. I would like to think that we could put further effort and support into exporters, particularly looking at how we can get would-be exporters ready and how they can be supported.

I know that over the last couple of years there have been many outbound trade missions from South Australia doing the rounds around the globe. A number of exporters have come back very disappointed that they did not get the support they thought they needed. They were not export ready. They had spent a large amount of time and money on those trade missions, yet they saw no benefit, so they walked away and continue not to be part of those new SMEs in South Australia that would be of benefit to our economy.

Remembering that when the current government came into power in 2002 we had 7.5 per cent export share of the nation, if we had kept in sync with the rest of the nation we would have an extra \$9 billion in exports. If you do the sums, that is about 90,000 jobs. What happened? Where did we go wrong? Those are the questions, and if we can put answers on the table then South Australia will be a much better place to support those SMEs.

The Export Partnership Program has been successful. I did ask about MOUs. They are fluffy bits of paper, nice agreements that governments sign to governments. Do we get any benefit from them? That is the question I asked. I did not get the answer. A number of big dollar MOUs were signed almost two years ago now, yet we have not seen any fruit. It is about getting the deal done. Exports are about getting businesses over there, doing negotiations, getting the deal done, getting those products into containers, onto ships and into planes, any way that they have to go over there. The value will certainly determine how they travel abroad, and it is about making sure that you get a deal and you get paid for it so that you can actually go again and continue to grow the value of our exports.

There is still plenty of work to be done. We learnt that SinoSA House in Qingdao, a collaboration with Bio Innovation and the current government—and the minister gave an almighty spruik a few years ago—did not have any official government status. When that funding was handed over to the minister's area for that initiative, he decided to use the resources of the newly moved Jinan office. Essentially, that is how the SinoSA House closed: as the state government funding stopped, the minister did not apply for it to continue.

I am a little concerned that South Australia has one real stand-alone trade house. The British High Commissioner is over there doing an outstanding job, but we have one stand-alone office in Jinan. The minister told me that it had been there for 10 years—and I understand the minister has been in the job for four—so I was quite bedazzled that it was not suitable. The paint was falling off the walls, and it was in a high-rise building. It had been there for 10 years, yet it had only been moved this year.

South Australia's only real stand-alone office was totally unacceptable because it was in a shambles. As the minister said, it was run down, the paint was literally peeling off the walls, there was no storage, there were occupational health and safety concerns and it was an embarrassment to the state. So it is good to see that it has moved, but I am concerned that there is a lot of work that needs to be done, after the Hartley review recommended our offices close. They were barely staffed, so is it any wonder that they were not working? With one person working in a trade office, you have to ask yourself: how do they motivate themselves? How do they get the support to make it work?

My recent trip through South-East Asia and into Japan with the Leader of the Opposition showed how some states do it well and how some states do not. One of the concepts I saw in Tokyo was the Queensland trade office—they do it exceptionally well. It benefits Queensland that the trade minister is also the Treasurer, and as Treasurer he would fund his trade initiative.

What I saw over there was that the trade commissioner was driven, and he had staff who were driven. He had a number of staff. If you unpackage the trade initiatives within the Queensland office, they were separate from the investment office and they all had KPIs. They all work and they

are all driven by targets. The way that he explained it is if they do not reach their targets, they do not go home happy. I think they are meeting their targets, and they have government support.

The trade minister has the Treasurer's support (because they are the same person), but I saw that it was a presentable office. It is an office where I would be very happy to take any of my customers. It had areas where you could have negotiating rooms, presentation rooms and function rooms, and it is something that Queensland are benefiting from. They are actually reaping the rewards of an investment in a trade office.

All in all, I think that the questions still need to be answered as to why the current government continues to try to justify why the Austrade offices are the only answer and stand-alone offices are not. I look around the globe. I look at the way New Zealand market their country. New Zealand's advantage are that New Zealand is a one-government country and they do not compete against each other.

In Australia, we have Victoria competing against New South Wales competing against Queensland competing against South Australia, to a degree. I really worry about how we are going to get the targets and meet the targets in South Australia to make South Australia a force in exports and to make our economy grow.

As I said, imagine if we could have kept South Australia's 2002 export footprint when this government came into power. If we had the current strategy—the current footprint in place—that extra \$9 billion in trade would have been achieved. So I think South Australia has a long way to go. I think the initiatives are few and far between. The South Australian Liberal Party has put some initiatives on the table, but we have more to come.

As an exporter for over 25 years, I was given opportunity to see what worked and what did not work. It is about face-to-face contact. It is about South Australia having a presence, and it is about South Australia committing to a country they want to do business with. It is not just about turning up on someone's doorstep and saying, 'I have wine under my arm,' or, 'I have food under my arm,' or 'I have services.' You actually have to show that you have a commitment to that country so that they know you are fair dinkum.

We moved on to the \$200 non-refundable business administration fees to register on those outbound trade missions. About \$33,000 was received in 2016-17. It is an interesting cost recovery exercise, particularly when you have those businesses that are trying to be exporters and trying to get into the game, and you have this little \$200 fee. It is a pittance in the big picture. I think the key is having a business that is concentrating on exporting, is serious about it, is given support and is export ready—they have to be export ready.

I have said already that a number of businesses that have been over on these trade missions were not export ready. They got over there and had no interpreters and had presentations in English. They would swap business cards, have a drink and expect things to flow, and it is just not as easy as that. Exporting is a tough game. Exporting has a large amount of strategy, a huge amount of trust and an outcome that every business would like to realise. They would like to realise an outcome, the hard work they have put in, and, in most cases, every dollar that they have ever worked for—all raised through their business.

To venture out from a domestic market into an international market is a huge leap of faith, it really is. A lot of the marketing we do is somewhat lacklustre in South Australia. The government likes to market to itself. Look at the fantastic Barossa ad. That was played more in South Australia than it was played anywhere else in the universe. Why are we doing that? Why are we trying to sell ourselves? It is about the government trying to show the people of South Australia that they are actually doing something.

It is very good to see the strategy, but what we would like to see is that strategy put into place in the markets where we want to do business. It is about doing business in those markets. It is about getting the deal done, and to get the deal done we have to be fair dinkum about not playing to our own people; we have to play to our potential customers and marketplace.

All in all, I think the estimates process delivered some winners and some losers. It is another year, and I would like to think that in March 2018 this side of the house will win the election. I am

quite confident, and I think that being in government is an exciting proposition. I look forward to being part of an export team.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

At 17:48 the house adjourned until Tuesday 8 August 2017 at 11:00.