

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 4 June 2014

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley)** took the chair at 14:17 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The **Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:18)**: I bring up the second report of the committee.

Report received.

Ministerial Statement

HEALTH BUDGET

The **Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:18)**: I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the South Australian Rally Against Health Cuts made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Jack Snelling.

CHINA TRADE

The **Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:19)**: I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the China trade mission made by the Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith.

AIR WARFARE DESTROYER PROJECT

The **Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:19)**: I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the air warfare destroyer project changes made by the Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith.

Question Time

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20)**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Science and Information Economy, the Status of Women, and Business Services and Consumers questions about FOI.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY**: Yesterday the South Australian Ombudsman's report was tabled into the audit of the implementation of the Freedom of Information Act within government departments. Mr Richard Bingham's executive summary explains that a minister is permitted by the act to direct an agency determination but that those directives should be clearly set out in the agency's written determination to the applicant. He also explains that there was strong evidence throughout the audit that ministerial or political influence has been brought to bear on the agency's FOI officers. It was revealed that agencies often provided a draft determination to their minister to get the green light prior to finalising access requests. My questions to the minister are as follows:

1. Has the minister ever directed an agency, or delegated any of her staff to direct an agency, to withhold information which would have otherwise been released under the agency's draft FOI determination?
2. If this is the case, has the basis for giving this direction been anything other than those exemptions that are provided for in the act?

3. Following any ministerial decision or direction which caused a change to the agency draft determination, has a written determination been sent to the applicant which did not clearly state the minister's decision or direction?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:21): No.

WOMEN ON BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question on gender asbestos to the Minister for the Status of Women.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Sex Discrimination Commissioner, Elizabeth Broderick, has recently given a speech about representation on private and government boards in which she says:

We now see gender asbestos. Bias built into the wall of business.

She goes on to say:

...where attitudes that discriminated against females were hidden but still embedded in the workplaces of many organisations.

My questions are: does the minister agree with the Sex Discrimination Commissioner's comments and what does she think are measures that can be taken to address this problem?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions. This government has a strong track record for its commitment and action around initiatives to increase women's participation on boards and committees, women being represented in leadership positions, particularly the executive of our Public Service, and encouraging women across a wide range of areas to assist them in developing themselves in leadership roles, because we know only too well that women remain underrepresented in senior positions and leadership positions.

This government has an extremely good track record, not only in relation to achievements in all those areas but also in terms of leadership in terms of women's representation here in parliament. I know that we have a much better representation of women in the South Australian government and in our cabinet team than the Liberal opposition so, like I said, we have put our money where our mouth is and we have a well-established track record and credentials in this spot.

We have worked on other initiatives, like the Premier's Women's Directory, which now has, I think, around 800 (it may not be 800, but I will check)—a large number of women—now represented. We have maintained very close links with various women's groups, including industry-specific organisations that focus on women in leadership. These include things like women in agriculture, women in superannuation, and women living in regional areas. Staff from the Office for Women have attended various meetings and training facilitated by these organisations.

In February this year—Mr President, I know you would remember this—I announced 25 board training scholarships for South Australian women. These are fully funded scholarships and they are offered by the South Australian government for women to attend introductory level governance training delivered by the Australian Institute of Company Directors. Applications for those scholarships close in June (this month), so you need to hurry if you are still interested. Last year, we provided a further 25 scholarships. I have spoken to some of those women directly and many of them have written to me and expressed how grateful they were for the opportunity to attend such a course and the significant difference that it has made to their lives.

We have a well-established track record. We have STEM initiatives as well, women in science technology and maths. We have done a lot of work in that space as well to develop women's participation in those high-growing areas. As I said, this government truly has a well-established track record.

WOMEN ON BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:26): I have a supplementary question arising from the answer. If this government is so keen to see women appointed to senior positions, then why did it recently appoint two male members of parliament from opposing parties to its cabinet, rather than look at its own local pool of female talent?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:27): As I said, this government has an extremely good track record when it comes to women in parliament. At the 2014 state government election, 27.7 per cent of candidates were women, just under a third. As I said, this goes to our credentials, which are established right across the board. After the 2014 election, the percentage of women in the House of Assembly is 25.5 per cent. The percentage of women in the Legislative Council is 22.7 per cent. The government now comprises 33 per cent female members. The government now comprises 33—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: What, on the Labor side it's 22 per cent? It doesn't say much for the rest of those blokes over there. Is that 22 per cent of the intellect?

The PRESIDENT: The honourable Leader of the Opposition will allow the minister to complete her answer.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The government now comprises 33 per cent female members. The opposition, Mr President, can you guess what the opposition is? A measly just over 16 per cent. This government has a 33.3 per cent representation of women. The Liberal opposition has 16.7—and they dare sit there and open their mouths. They should hang their head in shame, hang their head in shame.

The South Australian cabinet comprises 31 per cent females. The shadow cabinet—Mr President, can you imagine?—has 17 per cent. Again, this Labor government comprises 31 per cent women in cabinet; the Liberal opposition 17 per cent. They should hang their head in shame, hang their head in shame.

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:29): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Business Services and Consumers a question about Riverland services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I refer the minister to her assertion in this place on 20 May 2014 that the Berri Office of Consumer and Business Services was closed last year due to a lack of inquiries. Freedom of information documents reveal the office did not keep phone and counter statistics for the year and a half leading up to its closure. The latest data that the minister gave this council on 20 May was for 2011 and, therefore, is consistent with this indication. My questions are:

1. Can the minister advise the council of the total number of phone calls and counter inquiries to the Berri office of CBS in December 2012?
2. With all in-person services formerly provided by CBS now being managed by Service SA, following the closure of the office, were any extra staff employed and was staff training provided in these areas of service?
3. What steps did the government take to consult and inform the community of the closure, including advertising?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for his important question. Indeed, he has raised this issue before in this place, and my answer remains fairly much the same. The closure of the Berri office has not affected the high level of service CBS provides to country customers. The CBS customers residing in Berri and the surrounding areas continue to have access to services in person through Service SA. Service SA provides a one-stop shop for customers where they can complete CBS-related transactions for a range of different services.

I am advised that the CBS has not received any complaints about this office closure. I am not too sure what date that was; around the 30th of the fifth, I think, I was advised of that. I understand that there was no noticeable spike in inquiries to the Adelaide office caused by the closure of the Berri office. I understand that the counter services provided by the Berri office, including referrals to other agencies and specialists in the CBS, averaged two per day in 2009, 1.5 per day in 2010 and 0.5 per day in 2011. The CBS continues to regularly visit the Riverland and can have a team of investigators up there the same day if required.

I understand that there was an FOI request by the member for Chaffey seeking to identify the number of people who sought assistance at the Berri office for each financial year, going from 2008-09 through to 2012-13. I am advised that records were provided to Mr Whetstone and that he was advised that there were no records made for the periods 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009 and 1 January 2012 to 30 June 2013 that matched his inquiry.

Statistics of work performed by the Berri office staff were kept, I am advised, for the period 1 January 2012 to 30 June 2013, but these included work referred from the Adelaide office and didn't only relate to the customers in Berri. Although these statistics obviously didn't fall within the scope of the wording of the FOI applications, I am advised that copies were also provided to Mr Whetstone with the customer's personal information removed, of course.

Although detailed monthly reporting on local inquiries ceased at the Berri office, I am advised, in December 2011 with the change of reporting arrangements at the CBS head office, both discussions with staff and observations during management visits, I understand, confirmed that the low level of demand had not increased before the decision was made to close the office. Work previously performed at the Berri office is now performed, as I said, by Service SA or by CBS Adelaide office staff.

The statistics of phone inquiries to the CBS Adelaide office show that the total calls taken for fair trading and tenancy matters increased by 9 per cent from September 2013 to October 2013. However, in the previous year, calls increased by 15 per cent for the same period and overall calls were higher. As I have said, I am advised that there were no noticeable spikes in inquiries to the Adelaide office caused by the closure of the Berri office.

It would appear that, using the best information we have, there was very little traffic through that office, certainly not enough to justify the expense (I think it was \$100,000-odd a year) of keeping that office open. We have not received complaints from locals, only from the Hon. Stephen Wade, and there appears to be no influx in calls coming from that area into our central office.

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:35): I have a supplementary question. Given the minister's assurance that the closure of the office will not affect the high level of service, has that been achieved by the employment of any extra staff in Service SA or any training to those staff to provide the services previously provided by CBS?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:36): I can't answer those questions; they are operational questions. But I can absolutely assure the honourable member that the office runs in an extremely professional way, and they always ensure that adequate training is provided to their staff so that they are able to meet their service demands. They are a very professional organisation.

PREMIER'S COUNCIL FOR WOMEN

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about the Premier's Council for Women.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: A survey has been launched which gives women the opportunity to let the Premier's Council for Women know what affects them. My question is: can the minister tell the chamber about the launch of the Premier's Council for Women survey?

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: There's a tough one!

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:37): Much tougher than any question the opposition has given me yet. I thank the honourable member for his most important question. The government is committed to providing for the needs of women. The Premier's Council for Women last week launched a survey which asks women in South Australia to identify the key issues affecting them.

The 'What matters to women in South Australia' survey gives women an opportunity to let the council know about the sorts of issues that affect them: things like employment, money, family, health, safety, wellbeing or whatever the issue might be, whatever is important to the women of South Australia. This survey will provide the council with direct input from women in South Australia and guide the council's choices of issues to focus their attention and efforts on.

Established in 2002, the council provides leadership and advice to ensure that the interests of women are at the forefront of government policies and strategies. The council is comprised of influential women from diverse areas and targets the efforts in areas where they have knowledge, experience and ability to advocate on behalf of women. The council's work plan focuses on five priority areas: women's employment and economic status, women in leadership, women's health and wellbeing, violence against women and safety, and women and disabilities.

The council continues to be committed to redress inequalities between women and will continue to advocate on particular issues of importance to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and women from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

As one of the government's key advisory bodies, the council was actively involved in the review of South Australia's Strategic Plan, and the council members were on the SASP Audit Committee and continue to maintain a focus on women and gender differentiation with respect to SASP.

The council is also working to ensure that women's interests and gender equity receive adequate attention in the government's strategic priorities, and early in 2013 met with the chairs of senior officer groups to discuss the issues that council identifies as important for women. It also developed a number of strategic relationships and alliances in the private sector to assist with the promotion and importance of increasing women's representation in senior executive and board positions in the corporate sector.

In partnership with the Office for Women and local industry, the council developed a guide to best practice for attracting, retaining and promoting women at executive levels called, 'Words into Action: A practical guide to achieve gender equity and improve your company's performance'.

Now, more than ever, it is important to listen to women talk about the issues that affect them. We clearly have a federal government which has a proposed budget where many changes will disproportionately affect women because they make up a significant number of low income earners, health service users and carers. Women who are pensioners (women tend to live longer than men) will be slugged when changes are introduced to the pension age and the low income superannuation contribution and they lose the seniors supplement.

Women with families will be adversely affected by the introduction of a GP tax, increases in co-payments to PBS prescriptions and changes to the family tax benefits. Women who face the greatest disadvantage are disability pension recipients, the homeless, those affected by domestic violence and Indigenous women. They will all find it much harder to access services as the federal budget slashes funding for services and targeted programs. Now, more than ever, this government is committed to listening to the concerns of women in South Australia and providing them with accessible ways to raise their issues.

PREMIER'S COUNCIL FOR WOMEN

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:41): Supplementary: the minister may have touched on this in her answer, I am sorry. I am just finding it a bit hard to hear at different times. Where can people access the results of this survey, and what were the major issues that got the most feedback from the survey? I think you did list them but I couldn't quite hear.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for

Business Services and Consumers (14:42): The survey is only just being sent out and it will be open until 13 June 2014. It is anonymous. It takes about 10 minutes to complete. The survey will be online on www.saplan.org.au/yoursay, or just pick up a copy from the Women's Information Service in Grenfell Street. The results from the survey and other information about the council will be available online at www.officeforwomen.sa.gov.au.

SEAFOOD INDUSTRY

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question relating to seafood processors in Port Lincoln.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Seafood processors in Port Lincoln have indicated that they could face financial ruin in some cases under new requirements imposed on them by SA Water in relation to saline waste. It has been alleged that SA Water does not have the capacity to treat saline water at their treatment plants in the area and, as such, have effectively asked the industry to foot the bill for this activity.

Stephen Moriarty, the chairman of the action group which has been formed to fight this issue, has publicly stated that the new restrictions related to saline discharges and monitoring requirements have gone too far. Under the newly introduced framework, saline discharges have been classed as an unauthorised trade waste. Unfortunately for the industry, best practice for transportation of fish for production involves slurries made up of sea water and ice, thus creating a situation where a processor has an excess of saline to discharge but is not able to do so in order to meet the strict new regulations.

In order to meet these regulations, businesses have had to purchase costly monitoring equipment which, as it has been reported, is somewhere in the vicinity of \$30,000 up to \$100,000, once installed, depending on the particular model. This cost burden to business is said to be too high on their part and many smaller operators simply will not be able to survive under these circumstances. Further to that, it has been alleged that the equipment used is, in fact, very unreliable in determining exactly what the reading is in many cases. My questions to the minister are:

1. What criteria were used to determine which monitoring systems industry should purchase?
2. What efforts did the government make to ensure that the compliance with regulations would not cause an unscrupulous cost burden on business?
3. What, if any, period was given for compliance before business incurred the punitive costs associated?
4. What capacity does SA Water have to treat saline water at their Port Lincoln plant?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. They are to the Minister for the Environment, rather than the Minister for Agriculture, and I am sure he will respond to that as soon as he can.

WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (14:45): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question regarding improving the participation rate for women in key employment industries in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: Based on the Australian Bureau of Statistics labour force data, it is evident that men are outnumbering women in key industries in South Australia. In fact, according to the ABS data, as of February 2014 there were 95,000 male technicians and trade workers, compared with 8,000 female technicians and trade workers; 69,400 male managers, compared with 34,800 female managers; and 51,200 male machinery operators and drivers,

compared with 5,300 female machinery operators and drivers. In fact, the only industry group where woman outnumbered men was in the sales and personal services work.

Will the minister explain why there is continuing to be such an ongoing disparity between the number of men and woman engaged in these industries in South Australia?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:46): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. This is very similar to a question I answered previously, or it certainly relates to it. A report back in 2009 from Sachs and Were on gender productivity and employment participation, called 'Australia's hidden resource: the economic case for increasing female participation', estimates that closing the gap between men and women's employment in Australia would boost Australia's GDP by 11 per cent and, according to that report, other economic benefits of improving women's productivity include things like alleviating labour market shortages, lowering interest rates, raising income and demand, and improving public finances.

The report suggests a number of policy initiatives to address the potential of women's economic participation. It looked at things like more flexible work arrangements and education programs, greater pay equity, encouraging career paths in non-traditional industries, maintaining links with training and employers during parental leave, introducing quotas at board level, funding education programs within schools to debate stereotypes of women, choosing low paid/low hours clerical or social service-type roles, and finding workplace education programs that actually target discrimination, pay equity and the stigma attached to using flexible work arrangements.

We know that women are employed at substantially lower rates right across the board, and certainly in the higher paid positions. Recent figures show that only 67 per cent of women aged between 15 and 64 years are currently in paid work, compared with 78 per cent of men; 45 per cent of these women work full time, and in September 2013 there were approximately 460,000 women working part time and wanting to work more hours.

So, we see that women are underrepresented in some key industries and also in management and leadership positions, which I have just talked about here today. Industries that have the greatest representation of women at all levels include health, education, training and, of course, retail. Females are underrepresented in mining, utilities, construction and a wide range of other areas.

This government has committed to a range of initiatives that address many of those areas, including our STEM initiatives. I have talked about STEM in this place before, so I do not need to go over it again, but these initiatives assist in attracting more women into the science and maths area, areas of potentially high growth and high wages. So we have a number of things in that area.

In relation to work-life balance, or improving workplace flexibility, we have put a number of things in place, including introducing policy into our public sector. It was incorporated in the latest Public Sector Act, which entitles public servants to access flexible workplace entitlements, and we see it as part of this government's election commitment. Just recently we strengthened this by linking access to flexible workplace provisions to chief executives' performances, so they will be required to demonstrate that they are, in effect, putting measures in place to encourage both men and women to access more flexible workplace arrangements to assist in childcare provisions. Unfortunately, we know that although those provisions have now been around for a number of years, the ability of men and women, in particular, to access those are limited for a range of reasons, usually cultural. That is why we made changes to the chief executives' performance outcomes.

As members can see, there is a range of initiatives that we have put in place. I have talked about initiatives in terms of our leadership, encouraging women into leadership programs and developing them in that respect, and, as I said, we have also invested efforts into encouraging more young people to consider STEM careers through Skills for All. That has led to \$25.4 million in funded training to support students in those particular courses for the 2012-13 year. We have also recently launched a STEM Australia web portal, an interactive website aimed at attracting students and workers to pursue STEM careers. There is a women's component of that, in particular, that is designed to attract girls and young women to access those initiatives as well.

ANNA STEWART MEMORIAL PROJECT

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:53): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question regarding the Anna Stewart Memorial Project.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: The Anna Stewart Memorial Project commenced in Victoria in 1984 to commemorate the achievements of Anna Stewart, a former journalist and Victorian trade union official, who worked tirelessly and passionately towards pay equality and improved working conditions for women. The program is held annually by SA Unions, and I can say that when I was a union official I had the pleasure and privilege of mentoring a number of young women who spent a week in our office. My question is: can the minister inform us about this year's program?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for his most important question, and the commitment of his former union—and his current union, I imagine he is still a member—to supporting that program and women in their union.

I have been hosting the Anna Stewart Memorial Project for a number of years now, and it is a great pleasure for me to do that because it is a wonderful program that I have been associated with for many years. I cannot believe that I actually first participated in the project in 1988. It was the second Anna Stewart Memorial Project to be run in South Australia and I was actually a participant at that time. I was a nurse at the time and a workplace rep, or workplace delegate, and keen to know more about my union. Of course, now I have the opportunity to provide support to the program as Minister for the Status of Women, which is indeed a great honour, and as a member of the Legislative Council.

The Anna Stewart Memorial Project recognises and honours a remarkable woman who achieved many rights and entitlements for working women. Anna Stewart joined the union movement in 1974. Coincidentally, that was the same year as International Women's Day was first officially recognised by the Australian government. At that time, women had very few workplace entitlements, particularly in industries where there were few women in positions of power. She worked in a blue collar union.

Anna was instrumental in securing many of the conditions that we now enjoy and take for granted, like paid parental leave and childcare facilities for, particularly, blue collar workers. She was also integral in increasing women's involvement in the union movement, a place that even today is still, unfortunately, male dominated in many areas. Tragically, Anna passed away in 1983 at the age of 35, but the Anna Stewart Memorial Project continues to honour her in the best possible way.

The program is designed specifically to give women an insight into how unions operate and how women can be more active in their union. As part of the program, a group of women union members are placed in different unions for a two-week experience. During this time participants see how the union is organised and its relationship to other unions. Participants can become involved in issues which are important to members in union offices and meetings, officials, other unions and, of course, SA Unions.

I was very pleased to be invited to speak to this year's participants and enjoy lunch with them here at Parliament House. As a former participant of the project I was able to convey my own work experiences with the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation and reflect on how my union principles have guided me through my career. I informed participants about my role as the Minister for the Status of Women and how, as a member of the state Labor government, my role allows me to ensure that the rights and needs of women are recognised. I was able to discuss my passion for ensuring that women are given the opportunity to act as leaders in the workplace, in their communities, boardrooms and in all aspects of life.

I truly believe that it is through that collective action, unity of purpose and strong support networks that gender equity in our society is achievable. There are 17 women, this year, participating in this great program and I certainly wish all of them every success in their future endeavours. It was an absolute pleasure to be able to continue my longstanding association with the project. I have no doubt that this year's participants, like many other women before them, will use their experiences

from the program to become aspiring leaders in the union movement, their professions and their personal lives.

UNCONVENTIONAL GAS

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government representing the absent Minister for Water a question on the subject of unconventional gas exploration and mining on the groundwater resources of the South-East of South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Last Friday, I met with a number of South-East regional mayors and elected local government members in Mount Gambier to hear their concerns about energy companies operating in their region and, in particular, the potential impacts of hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, for unconventional gas.

The overwhelming concern expressed by local communities has been around the impact of gas activities on groundwater, including the potential for both depletion and contamination of groundwater resources which are used for domestic stock and irrigation purposes. As a consequence, the following councils have called for action by the state government and this parliament:

- The District Council of Robe wants a two-year moratorium on fracking, as does the City of Mount Gambier and the District Council of Grant;
- The Tatiara District Council wants a parliamentary inquiry, as does the Kingston District Council;
- Wattle Range Council wants tougher federal and state controls including landholder rights to exclude gas companies from their land; and
- Naracoorte Lucindale Council is still debating whether to call for a moratorium or even a complete ban on unconventional gas.

I acknowledge the work of the South East Local Government Association (SELGA) in facilitating debate in their communities. This is a huge issue in the South-East. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will the minister undertake to meet with local communities in the South-East to hear their concerns directly about the impact of gas mining on their communities?
2. As minister responsible for the Natural Resources Management Act, will the minister uphold the objects of the act, which include safeguarding the life-supporting capacities of natural resources such as groundwater?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for his questions and I will refer them to the Minister for Water. I am confident that he will bring back a response expeditiously.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:01): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse a question about the government's commitment to mental health and suicide prevention programs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: On 6 May this year during the opening of this parliament, His Excellency the Governor said that improving mental health and developing resilience were central to the work of the current government. His Excellency briefly mentioned some steps the government has taken in relation to mental health and suicide prevention programs, including the establishment of a new independent mental health commission. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will the minister advise how the establishment of the new mental health commission will assist in delivering and implementing suicide prevention strategies in South Australia?

2. To what extent will the mental health commission assist the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist in the development of suicide prevention networks?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. I will refer them to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse and bring back a response.

RESPONSIBLE GAMBLING AWARENESS WEEK

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Business Services and Consumers a question about gaming venues and Responsible Gambling Awareness Week.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA: At clause 48 of the Gambling Codes of Practice Notice 2013 gaming providers must establish and keep current and implement written procedures addressing children aged 10 years or less being left unattended. I also note that last week was Responsible Gambling Awareness Week.

Will the minister update the Legislative Council on Consumer and Business Services' recent compliance operation in relation to unattended children in gaming venues and the government's recent announcement acknowledging Responsible Gambling Awareness Week?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and I am pleased to advise members about Consumer and Business Services (CBS) and its recent compliance operation to ensure that gaming venues are complying with their responsibilities in relation to children being left unattended.

Parents who leave their children unattended while they are at the pokies have been targeted in the government's latest crackdown on gambling venues. This crackdown followed reports by some venues of children being left alone. In May 2014 CBS inspected about 40 licensed gaming venues in the metropolitan region, including car parks and adjacent areas, looking for children left unattended by parents playing gaming machines. I am very pleased to inform the chamber that this operation detected no unattended children.

However, several venues reported previous issues where minors had been left alone while their parents were at the pokies. In those instances venue operators most commonly ejected the parents from the venues, to return to their children, and in some cases venues referred the family to support services, notified police or pursued barring orders. This is about ensuring the safety of South Australian children in and around gaming venues. Gaming venues have a responsibility for the safety of children on the premises, and it is crucial that there are procedures in place should a child be detected alone in or around the venue.

During the CBS operation, the on-duty manager at each licensed venue was asked about their policies and procedures regarding the issue of unattended young children. Inspectors from CBS worked with these managers on best practices to identify and address issues of children left alone. These include regular checks of the venue and car park and how to approach parents when an unattended child is detected. Our community should feel confident that the government and the gaming industry are ensuring responsible attitudes towards the use of gaming machines.

I am also pleased to advise, as the Hon. John Gazzola acknowledged, that last week was Responsible Gambling Awareness Week and, in recognition, over 700 venues in South Australia featured increased signage to help inform problem gamblers of the risk they are taking under changes commencing from 1 July. The government announced these changes to the Independent Gambling Authority's gambling code of practice at the launch of Responsible Gambling Awareness Week. This demonstrated the government's commitment to ensuring responsible gambling in South Australia.

Under the changes, venues across the state offering on-site gambling will be required to ramp up their signage containing responsible gambling messages and also information about

gambling help services. This will include hotels and clubs as well as, obviously, the Adelaide Casino. The government signage will be displayed more prominently, more frequently and closer to where patrons actually gamble. Our aim is to increase awareness of problem gambling and promote responsible gambling.

The signs must display information about problem gambling help services, including the phone number for the National Gambling Helpline which operates 24/7. The quantity and size of materials displayed by venues will depend on the gaming activity and the number of machines in that venue. Venues can also choose to display their own additional responsible gambling signage. The eye-catching signage features the helpline number and other confidential help services. A new gambling awareness campaign featuring posters and coasters was also rolled out in venues last week.

As we know, most people gamble responsibly, but we know that for every person who has a gambling issue between five and seven others are negatively impacted, so it has potentially a very serious social and economic impact. Existing multicultural signs are also being refreshed and expanded to incorporate more languages, and the gaming industry has worked in partnership with the Independent Gambling Authority and the government to assist in implementing these important changes.

MACULAR DISEASE

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:08): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the minister representing the Minister for Health about South Australia's eye health crisis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: As we heard yesterday from my parliamentary colleague the Hon. Rob Lucas, there is a current and future capacity crisis with the South Australian public hospital system for the treatment of macular degeneration and other macular diseases. Following comprehensive briefings provided to me by the Macular Disease Foundation Australia, I, like other people in this place, have become very concerned about the lack of action being taken by the Minister for Health on this issue. There has also been media attention pointed in this direction on ABC TV news and FIVEaa radio in recent weeks.

Aside from the politicking that occurred in this chamber yesterday in the Hon. Ian Hunter's answer to the Hon. Rob Lucas's questions, Dignity for Disability would like answers from the state government. These eye health issues required investigation and answers long before the federal Treasurer, Joe Hockey, decided to gut the health and education sectors in the budget in May. We don't want to hear about it being someone else's fault that we are not making wise healthcare expenditure choices to preserve good eye health in South Australia. We need the government to take responsibility and take action.

The services required involve timely access to diagnosis and treatment to avoid irreversible vision loss. Yesterday, we heard that the matter has escalated and become critical, with sight-threatening delays in new patients being seen, but also with follow-up treatments for existing patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. My questions are:

1. Has the minister been made aware of the serious nature of the crisis facing the outpatient eye services at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, specifically treatment of primarily older Australians with macular degeneration who cannot get access to initial diagnosis and treatment, and those requiring ongoing sight saving treatment failing to get scheduled injections to avoid vision loss?
2. Have people contacted the minister's office alerting the minister to access issues with delays in their treatment (i.e. their injection schedule) and their concerns as to what to do? If so, what have they been advised to do?
3. Can the minister reassure South Australians that he will have considered all the options thoroughly, including the viable and common-sense proposal from key stakeholders to establish the SA eye hospital at the current RAH site by using the McEwin Building to create a dedicated public hospital with sufficient capacity to cater for current and future needs of South Australians?

4. If the minister will not guarantee the establishment of a specific public eye hospital in the McEwin Building, could he explain how he intends to keep meeting increasing demand for macular degeneration treatment?

5. Given the critical nature of eye health in South Australia, is the minister willing to engage with a stakeholder forum with key groups to discuss the short-term and long-term solutions to this crisis and to discuss the eye health hospital proposal?

6. Is the minister aware that moving patients to additional clinics at other hospitals will not deal with the primary concern of the inability to get patients seen in the first place, as these other clinics are already at breaking point, with waiting lists of greater than two years, and that this would surely be a bandaid solution failing to address the primary problem of access?

7. If the minister does not intend to improve access to urgent public macular disease and eye health services, will he commit additional resources to the Royal Society for the Blind and other low-vision services when increased numbers of South Australians find out that they are blind or have low vision and require extra support to go about daily life?

8. Does the minister understand that many people with deteriorating eye health are over 65 years of age and so will not be eligible for services under the National Disability Insurance Scheme?

9. Is the minister aware that it costs more than \$25,000 to train each guide dog for people with low vision or blindness?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for her many questions and will refer those to the Minister for Health in another place and bring back a response. I will remind all honourable members that the recently announced federal Liberal government's impact to South Australia over the forward estimates is going to be \$898 million—\$898 million over the forward estimates. That's the impact it is going to have, including on our health services. I hope the Hon. Kelly Vincent was out at the front of Parliament House this afternoon helping those other healthcare service providers protest against—

The Hon. K.L. Vincent: I just told you I was.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Well, I just didn't happen to see you there; there were so many thousands of people, I am not surprised. I am very pleased that the Hon. Kelly Vincent has indicated that she was out in front of Parliament House today supporting the protest action of those healthcare workers against federal budget cuts.

We see the cuts to health in the year 2017-18 alone are going to be equivalent to an almost 600-bed reduction, or, for instance, closing down the entire Flinders Medical Centre. The \$7 GP tax will obviously drive people away from GPs putting increasing strain on emergency departments.

There is the removal of \$440 million across the forward estimates in health by reneging on the National Health Reform Agreement, including \$217 million in 2017-18, and, of course, the elimination of the health national partnership agreements, which equates to \$162 million over the forward estimates, including \$52 million in 2017-18.

We see things like the funding for 39 GP registrars in regional communities will be cut. We see things like the dental flexible grants program will have cuts of \$229 million starting this year. This program was to help dentists set up, particularly in outer metropolitan and rural areas. Adult public dental services will have cuts of around \$390 million starting this year.

The National Partnership Agreement on Preventive Health will have cuts of \$367 million starting this year. This agreement was supposed to fund preventative health education programs, such as anti-smoking campaigns. The list goes on.

Visits to GPs will now incur a \$7 co-payment. Diagnostic imaging, such as X-rays, and vaccinations and pathology services will also attract a \$7 fee. GPs will be required to collect this fee for consultations in nursing homes. As we unpick this thing, we discover the full extent of these draconian measures.

Changes to the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme will mean prescription medicines under PBS will now cost \$5 more per prescription. Women's health and reproductive health will be affected by these changes, with 60 per cent of visits to GPs being made by women and 64 per cent of those receiving mental health treatment being women. Hospitals will also be allowed to charge for visits to emergency rooms by patients with ailments that might only require a visit to a GP. These changes, these savage cuts to our vital health services, will impact on, I believe, every South Australian but particularly on those of low income, such as pensioners and those families with children.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, Ms Vincent.

MACULAR DISEASE

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:17): Given that I specifically stated in the explanation to my question that I was aware of federal cuts and that that wasn't what I wanted to hear about, will the minister ensure that the answer she receives from the health minister specifically deals with what the state government is doing and what they can do to help South Australians at risk of irreversible blindness?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question, and I would urge all honourable members in this place, including the Hon. Kelly Vincent, to be lobbying the federal government against their savage federal budget cuts to our health services that will have a profound impact on every South Australian for generations to come, possibly. It's fundamentally dismantling Medicare, and it's hitting those who are the most vulnerable and can least afford it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Do you have another supplementary?

The Hon. G.E. Gago interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable minister, let's move on. The Hon. Mr Lucas.

HEALTH BUDGET

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:19): I seek leave to make an explanation prior to directing a question to the minister representing the Minister for Health on the subject of health budgets.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As we have heard, there has been widespread opposition from a number of health groups in relation to proposed federal budget cuts and state budget cuts as well. As the minister will know, the federal budget cuts to health have been opposed by the state government and by the state Liberal Party from the Leader of the Opposition down. There was a rally today held outside Parliament House. My question is: can the minister assure the house that no public servants were paid for any time spent travelling to or from the rally today and for time spent in attending the rally and, if not, what were the total costs to taxpayers?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his questions, and I will refer them to the Minister for Health in another place. But I do remind honourable members in this place of the profound impact, the devastating impact, that the Liberal federal government's cuts to particularly health services will have, no doubt, on every South Australian but particularly, as I have stated in this place today, on those who are the most vulnerable, those on low incomes and particularly large families.

I remind people that the total impact to the state budget over the forward estimates is \$898 million, that the cuts to health in 2017-18 alone will have the equivalent impact of slashing 600 hospital beds (about the size of the Flinders Medical Centre). The \$7 GP tax will have, no doubt, a significant impact on driving people away from GP services and increasing, potentially, the strain on emergency services, and we know that that particularly impacts on women because we know that women are often left to attend to the care needs of their children. There is also the removal of the \$440 million across the forward estimates in health, through the renegeing of the National Health

Reform Agreement, including, as I have mentioned, \$217 million in 2017-18, and, of course, the elimination of the national partnership agreement, which equates to \$162 million over the forward estimates.

These cuts will have a savage impact on the health and wellbeing of many South Australians. I urge every member in this place to be lobbying the federal Liberal government to wind back these savage measures, and I call on every member here to do their bit to stand up for South Australians and to ensure that we retain good health services here in this state.

Matters of Interest

UNCONVENTIONAL GAS

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:23): In question time earlier today, I asked a question of the Minister for Water in relation to fracking for unconventional gas in the South-East. The basis of my question was the concern that has been expressed to me and to the government by local communities and, in particular, local councils in the South-East.

Last Friday, I attended a number of meetings down in Mount Gambier and at Kalangadoo with elected local members, including mayors, and also with local farmers. I attended with Senator Penny Wright because, clearly, there are both state and federal regulatory issues involved with the debate over unconventional gas.

I want to put on the record some of the views of the councils, as expressed through formal motions they have passed in the last couple of months. There are seven local councils that make up the South East Local Government Association. The first council to express a view on this was, as I understand it, the District Council of Robe, and they have called for a moratorium. They want a two-year moratorium for all hydraulic fracturing for unconventional gas. I refer to their background information to their successful motion, where they say:

Council believes that a moratorium on further exploration for unconventional gas deposits is required to ensure the economic viability and the social fabric of the South East region of South Australia is not adversely affected by this industry.

The City of Mount Gambier, similarly, wants a moratorium. They have written a letter to the Premier, and they have provided copies to other members of parliament, in which they state:

There has been considerable community concern and unrest about the commencement of exploratory drilling by Beach Energy for unconventional gas in the South East. All South East regional Councils, including the City of Mount Gambier, have received a significant amount of correspondence from residents expressing their concern regarding the risks to the environment and community resulting from the drilling process, particularly hydraulic fracturing (commonly referred to as 'fracking').

The letter goes on:

The South East relies almost completely on groundwater; there are no significant bodies of surface water that are not connected to an aquifer. This includes the city of Mount Gambier (the largest city outside of Adelaide) that derives its drinking water from the local aquifer via the Blue Lake.

The biggest risk of hydraulic fracturing in the South East is the contamination of groundwater, a process that could not be reversed.

The district council of Kingston has called for a proper inquiry. In fact, in their letter to Premier Weatherill they basically say that they want a parliamentary inquiry into 'the impact and interaction of unconventional gas mining on other industries within the state's more intense agricultural districts'.

The next council is the district council of Tatiara. They also want a parliamentary inquiry, as does Kingston, and they resolved that at their meeting in April. Wattle Range Council want tougher federal and state controls. At the federal level, they recognise that the EPBC Act (Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act) does not adequately deal with the impact of shale gas on groundwater. At the state level, they want to ensure that gas companies obtain both a water licence and the permission of local landholders. They also want adequate separation distances from townships, dwellings and tourism facilities, none of which currently exist.

Naracoorte Lucindale is still debating whether to call for a moratorium or even a complete ban on unconventional gas, and I expect that will be dealt with by council later this month. One local councillor, Malcolm McLean, says:

The trouble with a moratorium is that it only delays the fracking, whereas we don't want it at all. It should stay away from the [South East] in my view.

Last, but not least, the District Council of Grant on Monday night backed Mount Gambier's call for a two-year moratorium, and I know that some members of that council would have liked to have gone further.

So, there you have it, Mr President: the people of the South-East (whom we all represent in the Legislative Council) are calling for our help. They want to maintain their economic base, which is reliant on groundwater. They want to protect their community health. They want to protect their environment. People in the South-East are paying attention. They are telling us what they think and they deserve to be listened to.

FINANCIAL SERVICES

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:28): Many in this chamber will recall that before I came to this place I worked at the University of Adelaide at the International Centre for Financial Services. Prior to my residence at the North Terrace campus, I enjoyed a career in financial services, and today I rise to speak about the importance of the financial services sector as a potential growth industry for South Australia.

By way of background, I should mention that the financial services sector in Australia is a significant economic contributor to the generation of wealth in the federation. Further, the wealth management sector, as it can also be described, is a source of export and employment in its own right. Funds under management in Australia total an estimated \$2.1 trillion, which is the fourth largest asset pool in the world and, more importantly, it is still growing. In fact, funds under management are expected to triple in size to reach \$7.6 trillion by 2033.

The Deloitte publication entitled 'Positioning for posterity: catching the next wave', identifies the growth opportunities that exist in the wealth management sector. Disappointingly, the potential for growing the industry in this state has been consistently overlooked by the government. Of the seven strategic targets outlined by the Labor government, there is no aspiration to nurture new economic drivers in the state. We continue to focus on the traditional food and wine, growing advanced manufacturing and realising the benefits of the mining boom for all.

While these are important, I submit that South Australia has the potential to achieve more than just the current government's obsession with creating a vibrant city. South Australia has the potential to create a unique, diversified and vibrant economy that will secure and sustain it in the coming decades.

All good investment managers know that to keep a client's money growing with a sensible level of risk, diversification of the asset base is essential. As with investment portfolios, we must seek to mitigate the risk to our economy by continually seeking to diversify into new industries. South Australia has an opportunity of developing a strong financial services sector focused on niche areas in which the state already enjoys some national leadership.

On the national stage, Adelaide is identified as being the centre of gravity for self-managed superannuation. Since the 1990s, self-managed superannuation funds continue to be the fastest growing sector of the Australian superannuation industry. Our state not only has resident firms that are expert in the provision of self-managed superannuation but also one of the leading professional bodies is headquartered in this state. The SMSF Professionals of Australia Association (better known as SPAA) was founded in this state and now has well over 2,000 members. The association endeavours to be the pre-eminent professional body leading the sector. It is committed to raising industry standards and looking after the needs of self-managed superannuation fund professionals across Australia.

We have credit unions and friendly societies of all sizes. One of the largest credit unions in the country, People's Choice, has its home in this state, as does the friendly society Lifeplan. In banking, Rural Bank governs its national operations from Adelaide. In addition to the strong base that already operates in the state, there are a number of government agencies that conduct wealth management or related activities.

We also have the advantage of world-class universities that teach the disciplines required by the industry. Further, there is an ever-increasing number of students from Asia learning at our

universities the skills to take them into the commercial and financial marketplace. As each year passes, our reach into Asia grows. South Australia is therefore well placed to capitalise on the strong growth in the Asian financial markets.

In the Asian region an estimated three billion people are predicted to join the middle class by 2030. By 2050, the Asian region will account for half the world's financial assets. It is acknowledged that to build a vibrant and niche wealth management sector will not be without its challenges. There are significant hurdles to overcome. I submit to the chamber that they are not insurmountable, nor should these challenges discourage us from pursuing the growth of participation in the industry in this state. The market is highly competitive.

However, changing technologies and travel options mean that the provision of services, including advice, effectively can operate out of regional centres. Location is a diminishing factor in determining whether opportunities can be captured. A lack of focus on the local industry has meant that many government funds management contracts that could otherwise have been managed locally have instead been sent interstate. This means we have missed the opportunity to incubate and nurture local capability and talent, but this can be corrected.

There is no reason Adelaide cannot be like Boston, which has a vibrant industry alongside New York, or like Edinburgh alongside London. However, for this aspiration to be realised the government must take the lead. We must build upon our existing talent pools to create a critical mass in the skills required to attract the wealth, not only within Australia but also in the Asian marketplace. I urge the government to take a more active interest in the wealth management sector in this state.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:33): I rise to draw attention to the axing of pensioner and senior concessions proposed in the federal budget. While this is a federal measure—and a callous measure, too—like so many in this budget these cuts will have an enormous impact on the elderly, poor and vulnerable in all states and territories, including many thousands of South Australians. That is why I am focusing on this important issue today.

Until now, a wide range of concessions have been available to pensioners and seniors through state and local government authorities. Among these are land, water and sewerage rate concessions, energy cost concessions and public transport concessions. Under the 2013-16 National Partnership Agreement on Certain Concessions for Pensioner Concession Card and Seniors Card Holders, the commonwealth agreed to fund states and territories to support these concessions. But, now the federal government intends to terminate the agreement on 1 July this year, with \$1.3 billion in savings estimated over four years. The Australian parliament's own budget review 2014-15 index acknowledges that:

It is likely that, without this financial assistance, many concessions currently available will be withdrawn or reduced.

It adds:

Any changes will raise the cost of living for pensioners and retirees, particularly in terms of energy and transport costs.

It seems that the federal Coalition is supremely comfortable with the outcome predicted. As Treasurer Joe Hockey (or should I call him Smoking Joe?) said lately, when asked about this very issue, the federal government is not in the business of subsidising visits to Hoyts and Myer.

If only visits to Hoyts or Myer were part of the scenario for the average pensioner. There is not a lot of pleasure to be had when every dollar has to be stretched that little bit further. Under this budget dollars will need to be even more elastic. A rise in fuel excise means a rising cost of living not only for those pensioners and seniors who have cars but for all who buy food that is trucked across the country—using, you guessed it, fuel—to fill our supermarket shelves. That is, if they can afford to get to the supermarket with no public transport concession, to buy food on a pension that is set to be indexed to the lower CPI, and to cook that food using full-priced electricity or gas under a roof that they might well be struggling financially to keep over their heads.

It is estimated that axing these concessions will mean council rates could increase by up to \$200. Water bills could increase by up to \$295 and energy bills could increase by up to \$275. It is enough to make you feel sick, so let us talk about the proposed \$7 co-payment to go to the doctor.

Mr Hockey might equate that to a couple of middies or a few cigarettes—though not to the cost of one Cuban cigar, which I gather can be up to \$70—but trivialising the cost of health for pensioners and seniors like that just shows the contempt of this federal government for a cohort to whom we, as a community, should be showing our appreciation and our gratitude.

I empathise with those in our community who are doing it tough, particularly our pensioners. As a councillor at the Port Adelaide Enfield council I actively supported council's initiative to provide a concession to pensioners on its own council rates, something that many other councils do not do. If the federal government's cutting of this national partnership agreement passes into law, the hole in our state budget will be \$30 million a year, every cent of that a hit to older South Australians. That, Mr President, along with this cold and pitiless budget, I reject.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:37): Government ministers, in particular the Hon. Mr Hunter and others, continue to make statements in this chamber and elsewhere that are inaccurate and misleading. For example, on 3 June the minister continued to indicate that the state Liberal opposition in this chamber has said nothing in relation to opposition to federal cuts to health and education. He said:

You don't hear the Hon. Mr Lucas standing up...The Hon. Mr Lucas doesn't, not a peep, nothing out of this side on the opposition benches about this vicious attack on health and education.

Further on he said:

As I said, Dr Duncan McFetridge, in the other place, has had the courage to stand up to these federal attacks, but not the Hon. Mr Lucas. I have not seen him on the public record criticising the federal Liberal government for ripping cash out of health and education...But no, the Hon. Mr Lucas is forming part of the cheer squad for those cuts.

As I have indicated before, the state Liberal Party position, as enunciated by Steven Marshall and myself, has, for a long period of time, been to oppose the federal budget cuts to both health and education, as well as the \$18 million cuts to local government road funding and other areas as well.

I refer the minister to statements on the public record, made in this place on 21 May, I think, in the Address in Reply debate, where I put the position of Mr Marshall and the state Liberal Party on those issues. Mr Marshall has also made a number of public statements, including on 22 May and any number of other days, last night in the Supply Bill debate and, again, today, in various radio interviews. So, the Liberal Party's position is quite clear and it is misleading and untrue for any member, such as the Hon. Mr Hunter, to continue to make the statements that he does in this particular chamber.

I also note that in my Address in Reply speech, expressing an individual view as opposed to a state party view, I expressed some personal concerns and reservations about the changes to unemployment benefit arrangements for under 30s and I went on to explain in some detail some of the issues and concerns that there might be in that particular area as well. So, Mr President, we will call out the Hon. Mr Hunter and, indeed, anyone else who seeks to misrepresent the state Liberal Party's position—it remains quite clear.

The second issue I want to address quickly is an issue I raised in my Address in Reply speech, and that related to the comments the Hon. Mr Gazzola had made about the Hon. Mr Maher. I note now, some two or three weeks later, that there has still been no response from the Hon. Mr Maher on the public record or, indeed, anywhere else in relation to the very significant criticisms the Hon. Mr Gazzola made of the Hon. Mr Maher's behaviour and actions. He indicated that the Hon. Mr Maher was a member of the left faction and would have to be quite creative in how and with whose support he becomes a minister.

As I indicated in that speech, it is quite clear there that the Hon. Mr Gazzola has fired a shot across the bow of the Hon. Mr Maher, saying, 'You might have had my support and our support in the past, but if you want to move to the next step, from parliamentary secretary to minister, don't count on it, you're going to have to be pretty creative.' But the most damning criticism, to which he has not responded, is that, in essence, he said the Hon. Mr Maher was not old Labor, he was new Labor. Old Labor was characterised by loyalty and collectivism, but the Hon. Mr Maher, being a member of new Labor, was not someone who valued loyalty and collectivism: a no more damning indictment or criticism can there be of a leftie member of the Labor caucus in this chamber. One

would hope that at some stage the Hon. Mr Maher will put his position in terms of at least some attempt at defence of that criticism.

I also put on the public record the fact that, in a most un-Australian act similar to the member for West Torrens—you would be familiar with someone who has a bet and does not pay up. You will recall the details I put on the record of the member for West Torrens having a bet of \$50 in 2001 and, in a most un-Australian way, refusing to pay up on that gambling debt. The Hon. Mr Maher has done the same thing. He has had a bet with a Labor colleague, a member of his caucus, for \$1,000 that he would not win back his position as No. 4 on the Legislative Council ticket, and when he did get re-elected has now refused to pay. Let us hope he is not also going to be a welsher from the West like the member for West Torrens.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hood.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND BULLYING

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:43): Thank you, sir. I would love to know what that bet was with Tom Koutsantonis, but we will find out one day, I am sure. I rise today to talk about something that is very important, and I am sure all members of this chamber would agree, and that is schoolyard bullying, which has been brought to my attention by a number of constituents in recent times. I can imagine little that would be more soul destroying than that happening to your own child. As a father myself I cannot imagine the difficulties that would be faced by parents in that circumstance, not to mention the negative impact on the child and the potential for long-term damage to be done, both emotionally and potentially physically depending on the type of bullying we are talking about.

This is a matter of grave importance. It is something that Family First urges the government to have a very close look at. I understand the government has a series of programs and we are aware of those programs, having had a look at them closely on a number of different occasions through various constituents that have come forward with the specific details of their individual cases. The bottom line, however you want to word it, is that it is not working. That is not really a criticism of the government, to be frank, because it is a difficult area, but it is something that deserves greater focus and greater attention.

There have been individual circumstances where parents have come to my office—and I am sure all members have encountered similar situations over their time in parliament if they have been here for any stretch of time—regarding really difficult situations, where children have ended up moving schools and where parents have felt inadequate because they were not able to protect their own child, which I would think is one of the most primary instincts of being a parent.

It is a difficult situation that deserves certainly more focus from the government, and I think it is even worthy of cabinet discussion. It is the sort of thing that needs to be handled at the top level in a very serious and focused way, and then cabinet can send a message that this is something that will not be tolerated under any circumstances. That sort of message filters down through departments, then through schools and, ultimately, to the parent and, ideally, the child level. It is always going to be a problem, and I am not suggesting it is any worse under this government than it would be under any other government. I do not know that, but what I do know is that it is something that is very serious and that we are seeing far too much of it.

Not surprisingly, the American Psychological Association reports that physical and verbal bullying can be a very serious problem for children. I have various studies that reference the harm done over even short periods of bullying. It is quite surprising how substantial the impact can be. I think it is one of those things that we may tend to trivialise a little bit.

The truth is that our generation—that is, those of us in the chamber who are over 40, and I think that probably includes all of us except the Hon. Ms Vincent, of course, but she is not in the chamber at the moment so I was somewhat correct—used to laugh it off a little bit and it was seen as less of an issue, but I think those days are well and truly gone. I have had parents in my office and it has really changed them for the worse. As a parliament, and certainly as a government, we have a responsibility in this place, but especially the government has a responsibility to act on this once and for all.

A study undertaken in 2006 found that children who were rejected by their peers, which could be a simple form of bullying—that is, 'You are not playing with us; we're not talking to you' or whatever it may be—were more likely to withdraw from classroom activities and, in fact, were more likely to try

to avoid school altogether. In some cases, they went on to self-harming behaviour and even, in some extreme cases, attempts at and even successful suicide.

This is a serious matter, and the point of my matter of interest today is to highlight how significant it is. It deserves the attention of this chamber. I think we can all be guilty of viewing these things as fairly trivial at times, but it is not trivial and it deserves parliamentary focus, it deserves government focus, and I believe it deserves cabinet focus.

CYBERBULLYING

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (15:47): The extent to which mental health issues permeate through society is staggering. It is estimated that one in four Australians will suffer from anxiety or depression. It is in this context of mental health and, in particular, depression that I want to talk today about cyberbullying. The Australian University Cyberbullying Research Alliance made the following point:

Bullying in itself, is an age-old problem, but has morphed according to the times, the social mores and social context...while much is now known about the nature, prevalence, and impact of conventional bullying that occurs 'offline' in school settings, research is only beginning to help us understand 'online' bullying and the overlap between the two.

The Mental Health Council of Australia has defined cyberbullying as 'wilful and repeated harm through the medium of electronic text'. Despite all this, it is shameful to see a member of this house using social media to parade and grandstand on issues political while bullying members of the government.

This member consistently uses pitiful, childish and churlish names when referring to ministers of the Crown, members of this house and members of the media. That member is none other than the Hon. Rob Lucas, the shadow minister for health and mental health, the shadow minister for suicide prevention, the man who the Leader of the Opposition has entrusted with developing policies to ensure mental health rates in this state are lowered and alleviate the burden of mental health on the state's health facilities.

The Hon. Rob Lucas and his Liberal colleagues may laugh and jeer and say that I am being precious. Politics is a tough game. The Leader of the Government in this place (Hon. Gail Gago), the Treasurer in the other place (Hon. Tom Koutsantonis), you, Mr President, and others, including *The Advertiser's* Michelangelo Rucci, are big enough, strong enough and professional enough to take what the Hon. Rob Lucas has to say with a pinch of salt.

But let me make it very clear: the Liberal Party, the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Rob Lucas himself need to think very carefully about the message they are sending to young South Australians when the shadow minister for mental health engages in pathetic bullying using social media as the medium. Perhaps we should ask the Hon. Rob Lucas exactly what he thinks the thousands of South Australian students who have suffered the torment inflicted by online bullying think about his antics.

Perhaps we should ask the families and parents of those young people who have had to help their loved ones pick up the pieces. Perhaps we should ask South Australia's health workers, youth workers and counsellors what they think about Rob Lucas's online bullying. Perhaps we should ask Rob Lucas, as a member of this house—let alone as the shadow minister for mental health—whether he feels as though he is setting a positive example, whether he is showing care or empathy for those who have suffered or continue to suffer at the hands of online bullies, whether he is putting the health interests of South Australians above cheap political attacks on Twitter.

This Labor government is committed to the physical and mental health of South Australians. The Hon. Rob Lucas has been in this house for a very long time—some might say too long—but he has also been in opposition for the past 12 years, and it would appear that he has forgotten how to govern. For that very reason, he will spend the next eight years in opposition. Governing is about leadership, not bullying, and leadership is what the Weatherill government continues to provide, especially in the area of mental health.

WISHBONE DAY

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:52): I rise today to speak about Wishbone Day. Each year, 6 May is Wishbone Day and is held to raise awareness of osteogenesis imperfecta (OI), also known

as brittle bone disease. Osteogenesis imperfecta is a genetic condition which is characterised by brittle bones which break or fracture easily. It is caused by the mutation of one or two genes that are responsible for making type I collagen. Collagen is the major connective tissue of our bodies, and those with OI have brittle bones as they have less or poor quality collagen.

OI can be caused by a genetic defect inherited from a parent or by a genetic mutation. There are different types of OI, ranging from those experiencing mild symptoms who may go undiagnosed, to those who experience severe symptoms and who are unable to participate in contact sports or may experience a fracture from just standing up. OI is a condition that stays with a person for life, and those with severe OI may have a shortened life expectancy due to the condition. In addition to fractured bones, OI sufferers may experience muscle weakness, hearing loss, curved bones, scoliosis, restrictive pulmonary disease and cardiac problems.

Having a child with OI can be extremely difficult, as everyday actions can result in fractures. Some cases of OI can be detected in the womb, and there can be a risk of fracture to the baby during birth if care is not taken to handle and deliver them appropriately. Incidences of fractures peak from the age of two, when children become mobile and are still developing their motor skills. Once bones stop growing, the number of fractures generally decreases, with fewer incidences in adulthood. Women with OI usually experience an increase in fracture incidences through menopause due to the decrease in bone quality. Whilst there is no cure, medication which helps to strengthen bones and stimulates cell growth can be used to manage OI for some.

In South Australia there are 10 parents who are full-time carers to their children with OI. One such child is 3½-year-old Maddison Lane. When Maddison was two, she broke her leg in two places after little activity. Once recovered from this break, she broke her ankle four times back to back. After blood samples had been sent to America, Maddison was diagnosed with OI. Over the last year and a half, Maddison has experienced 14 more bone fractures of her leg, arms and spine. She spends many weeks in a wheelchair and must try to understand the limitations she has with standard play compared to other 3½-year-old children.

Maddison is currently receiving monthly treatment at the Women's and Children's Hospital. Unfortunately, Maddison's mother, who is her full-time carer, does not receive a carer's payment and she is currently advocating for a change in this area. Wishbone Day originated from the Australian OI conference in 2008 and has been embraced internationally, with Wishbone Day events being held in North America, South America, Europe and Asia.

The day is not about fundraising; it is about raising awareness, with their motto being 'Because awareness makes a difference'. Participants are encouraged to wear yellow, as yellow shines with optimism and carries the promise of a positive future. I hope that people will now remember 6 May each year as Wishbone Day and wear yellow to increase awareness of osteogenesis imperfecta.

Motions

JONES, MR HENRY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:56): I move:

That this council expresses its deep regret at the death of Mr Henry Jones and places on record its appreciation of his long and tireless commitment to the River Murray and the Murray-Darling Basin.

Mr Henry Jones passed away on 15 April, aged 72, at his home at Clayton Bay. The outpouring of acknowledgements, including the ministerial statement delivered by the Minister for Water and the River Murray when Henry's family was present on 20 May in this place, is testament to the number of people Henry's life touched and to his relentless advocacy for the River Murray, which led to the culmination of the signing of the protections for the Murray-Darling Basin into law in 2012.

I think at the outset of my contribution it is important to acknowledge Henry's family: the love of his life, Gloria, whom he married in 1962, his three daughters Christine, Julie and Susan, his five granddaughters and his grandson. His funeral on Easter Saturday in his hometown of Clayton Bay was attended by between 600 and 800 people, with a large number of eulogies which went for several hours. I also acknowledge that this motion was instigated by the member for Hammond, Mr Adrian Pederick, and his contribution and the contribution of other members on 22 May in the other place cover a lot of Henry's fascinating story.

Henry Jones was a fourth generation fisherman who moved to Clayton Bay in 1961 and was joined the following year by his wife, Gloria, after they married. They were pioneers. There was no telephone, no electricity and poor roads that bogged from winter rains and in the summer from sand. This led to high levels of self-sufficiency, the consumption of local bird and seafood species, growing vegetables and keeping chickens.

Henry Jones was a community man through and through. He captained his local CFS, he started boat clubs, organised building for the local hall and served on the local council for 10 years. At the time that he first moved to Clayton Bay and was fishing in the river system, the condition of the environment was that it was full of diverse native species and teeming with life.

Henry Jones was the president of the Southern Fishermen's Association and, through that role, they developed the first environmental management plan for a whole of fishery approach. They were also the first fishing community to receive a Marine Stewardship Council certification.

I am grateful to his good friend Peter Smith OAM, who sends a number of people his 'Snippets' document, which is quite lengthy, particularly the one that he sent out following Henry Jones's funeral, including Ian Doyle's eulogy. I would just like to quote from that because I think he has put it in words that probably express it very well. These are Ian Doyle's words at Henry's funeral:

The Murray mouth closing in April 1981 caused him to focus on the big picture questions about the river system.

The whole area was rapidly dying in the blink of an eye in the life of the Coorong. He knew as a nation we had finally tipped over the limit of extraction of water upstream. Henry realised that like greedy idiots we just kept taking and not giving anything back to the environment.

Sure, there was enough for critical human needs. Sure, there was some for irrigators but there was only a bit left for the environment, not enough to make a difference.

Species after species became extinct to the area below Blanchetown.

Fish and birds, in fact every living thing was very seriously affected.

In 1981 at the Adelaide University he started his crusade to save the Murray. Apart from a few scientists, he didn't have many mates.

After speeches in universities, public meetings, to politicians, to local councils to anyone who wanted to listen he made his own lectern that he would throw in the ute and cart all over the Murray-Darling Basin.

People began to listen but that was not a challenge to powerful irrigators groups. He knew he needed to go onto committees.

What followed were The Murray Darling Native Fish Strategy Committee, the Murray River Natural Resource Management Advisory Board, the Murray Darling Basin Community Reference Committee and lastly and most importantly the MDB Community Committee.

I will just add to that, from other records, to note that Henry was a member of the Living Murray Community Reference Group, the Lower Murray Reference Group and River Murray Advisory Committee, and he was the spokesperson for the River Lakes and Coorong Action Group. Returning to Mr Doyle's eulogy:

Through these committees that consisted of leaders of their communities, the message of the River's plight was revealed in no uncertain terms.

What followed was 31 years of lobbying, debating, encouraging, addressing, being threatened and abused, mullet BBQs and trips to Canberra and the Murray mouth—largely at his own expense—and for too many times to remember.

Towards the end of the fight for the Murray, staff of the Murray Darling Basin and Henry copped abuse that you would not give to your dog, but they kept on fighting. Meetings were so hostile in places like Griffith, St George and Leeton that he felt like he was in a war zone.

I think we remember those times of angst and how difficult it was. Mr Jones was certainly very accommodating in terms of hosting any member of parliament who wished to come down and visit. A number of us in this place have done so. He was often accompanied by his friends Neil Shillabeer and Clem Mason. They would also come to Adelaide and have meetings, and they clearly were quite prepared to head to Canberra as well.

In March 2012, Henry Jones was quoted in the Adelaide *Advertiser*. This was at the time that the Murray-Darling Basin Plan was about to become law, and these were his comments:

Over-allocation was there for all to see, but no one was looking—from 1981 to 1995 allocations rose by 50 per cent.

Two-thirds of the Coorong is still four times saltier than the sea and Lake Albert remains too salty to use.

Dozens of animals and plants are now extinct in our area. Murray cod, silver perch, catfish, Yarra pygmy perch, leeches, spiral snails, all are extinct in our area.

From 2007 to 2009 the Lower Murray lakes and the Coorong were at the point of collapse.

The 2750 gegalitres the Murray Darling Basin Authority proposes to return to the system is not enough to bring health back to our area.

The plan has been squeezed by hungry upstream irrigators and surely is not enough to heal the whole Murray Darling basin, let alone keep the Murray Mouth open, to get rid of the basin salt and freshen the Coorong.

We all remember the so-called march to Canberra, which was part of the I Love Murray campaign. At that time, Henry, with his tinny and with his fresh mulloway from the Coorong, was joined by irrigator David Peake, conservationist Don Henry of the Australian Conservation Foundation, and *The Advertiser* journalist David Jean. At that time, Julia Gillard was the prime minister and, as Ian Doyle says, 'She was coming, which meant that everyone turned up from both sides of the house, including Greens and Independents.' He goes on to say that Nick Xenophon introduced Henry as the 'old man of the Murray', and he was allowed to talk for 10 minutes.

Henry believed that this was the peak of the mountain as opposition began to wane, that is, to the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement. The plan was never going to happen. He believed that had they pushed any more to the limit, the states would not accept it and they would have had to start the plan again, and I will have some quotes further on which also demonstrate the sentiments at the time.

Both prime minister Gillard and opposition leader Tony Abbott replied to their speeches, giving them great hope. South Australian federal Liberal members swung the opposition around and both parties allowed it to pass without objection. The bill was passed in October 2012, some six months later, which was a time of great celebration for Henry.

Henry was the first community recipient of the River Murray Medal from the MDBA.

The library has provided me with newspaper clippings, which run into some 45 pages, and about 30 electronic clips. Given that that takes into account that the records go back only to 1999 and 2009 respectively, when Henry had been campaigning since 1981, I think is fairly indicative of the amount of work he did. I will not obviously read all of this into the record, but some of it I think is worth noting.

If we start from 1999, the innovative fishing methods they had developed for his region to take into account the particular conditions they faced were noted. In fact, he said at the time that they had to hitch their catch to their vehicles otherwise it would get taken away in a rip. In the early 2000s, he was being interviewed in relation to what was termed the 'river rabbit' or the European carp. He was also asked to comment about fish bridges between the Murray and the Coorong, and I note that yesterday the minister talked about fish ladders from the barrages. In 2002, Henry predicted that 'up to half the 35 native species of fish in the Murray-Darling Basin will be extinct within 50 years due to a lack of water flow'. He said:

We all know if we are honest that the river will die if we continue water extraction at the present level. The Coorong is a major disaster waiting to happen.

In 2003, as the drought was taking hold, he said, 'Things are looking bad for river irrigators and communities.' I think that the balance of Henry's message was that all aspects are important, irrigators are important. I think that he once said in relation to fishing, 'Fishing isn't about me, it's about the fish, and we need to continue to have fish into the future.'

In 2004, he was participating in public forums alongside conservationists and members of parliament when conservation groups were calling for 1,500 gegalitres to be returned to the basin within 10 years. In 2006, he was talking about how the Lower Lakes were facing low levels, and we remember the acidity and concerns about acid sulfate soils. In 2007, he said, in talking about the proposed weir:

I cannot stress strongly enough my opposition to engineering solutions to fix problems in the River Murray. Everyone knows we have over-allocated the Murray Darling Basin's water and the only solution is to buy water from willing sellers, put that water back in the river and let our rivers run.

But if there has to be an engineering solution, at least let it be based on good environmental practice. At this point, it looks as if the Government is about to make a decision based on half-done homework at best.

He was critical of the federal minister for the environment at the time, Malcolm Turnbull. In fact, he also criticised Senator Wong, and he certainly was not afraid to criticise the current government on its handling of the matter. In February 2007, in relation to the weir, he said:

But if the drought continues and the weir is built, it will lead to devastating consequences for our environment...irreversible damage...Species unique to the area would become extinct and 'you couldn't script a greater environmental horror story. The weir must be stopped.'

He also said in that year that, as a fourth generation professional fisherman on the Coorong, when he wants to show his grandchildren a Murray cod he has to show them a picture book because the fish have disappeared.

The following year, we saw the horrific situation of the tube worms attacking short-necked turtles because of the rising salinity and they were migrating to the freshwater areas between Goolwa and Clayton. Later on, we had the near decision of the flooding of the Lower Lakes with sea water, and I quote from an article in *The Australian* on 6 August 2008, entitled 'Sea water flooding likely for Murray':

State Water Security Minister Karlene Maywald said yesterday cabinet had signed off on \$30 million for site preparation to build a weir walling off the acidifying expanses of Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert as well as the Coorong wetlands at the Murray Mouth. While Ms Maywald insisted that the move was only precautionary, to safeguard Adelaide's drinking water, it signals that the Murray crisis has entered a decisive phase. Construction of the weir at Wellington, above the receding lower lakes, which are being threatened by exposed soil beds turning acidic due to exposure to the air, means they would be transformed from largely freshwater to saltwater ecologies.

Further, it says:

Ms Maywald said acidification would be triggered at negative 1m—
that is below sea level—

occurring next June unless [New South Wales] and Victoria reversed decisions to release reserves into the parched river or rains flushed out the system. Fourth generation Lake Alexandrina fisherman Henry Jones, 65, reacted with dismay to the move yesterday. [He said] 'It is devastating to people down here. You can see it in their eyes...we have been living in dread of this.'

Early in the following year, the federal government stepped in. The environment minister Peter Garrett commissioned an environmental impact study as the South Australian government was preparing to spend \$130 million on a weir that was going to become a white elephant. Henry Jones was quoted as saying that he was 'confident the EIS will find against the saltwater option', and he said, 'Salt water will be like an atomic bomb and just kill everything.'

Water returned to the system the following year, and Henry said that extra flows were a godsend but should not weaken resolve for long-term reform to prevent a return to conditions experienced during the worst of the drought, and I quote:

We have to keep looking into the future past these extra flows because if we do not the river will slowly die...It will be like a cancer working its way from the mouth up the river.

There was the book burning of, I think it was called the initial draft plan, that took place in the middle of 2011, and Henry Jones was quoted later that year:

People in the eastern states refuse to accept responsibility for the river. I don't believe it's enough for South Australia. However, I can see if it's too much—

that is, too much water taken away from irrigation—

the eastern states are just going to walk away.

I think he was right in his assessment. Then we ended up with the march to Canberra. I think he articulated it very well in his contribution to an article in the *Adelaide Advertiser* on 29 May 2012. He said:

Unbelievable pressure has been placed on the authority to come up with a plan that is acceptable to all, and in doing so the environment loses. No stakeholder admits that they are part of the problem, from St George to the Murray Mouth. The finger is always pointed upstream or downstream.

Ain't that the truth! For any of us who go across the border, someone may quietly say to you over a soda water at the bar, 'Why don't you just flood the lakes?'

Henry was a huge advocate that it was a freshwater system and that it should remain that way. He was a realist and he recognised that the River Murray was a working river and therefore that it was no longer pristine, but believed that the environment also deserves its share.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (16:16): I rise in support of the motion moved by the Hon. Michelle Lensink, and I congratulate the honourable member on bringing the motion to this house. Many people in this place and the other place have already paid tribute to Henry Jones and his extraordinary contribution fighting for and raising awareness about the health of the River Murray and the Murray-Darling Basin.

There is no doubt that Mr Jones was a man who cared deeply about his part of the world. As a professional fisherman for many decades he observed the river and the wildlife over time, and was incensed by what he saw. In Henry's own words:

Local species that you take for granted...all now threatened by white man. I really miss the very loud splash of the alpha musk duck, usually just before dawn, as he determines the pecking order and calls to his females. Some of these unique species are extinct locally, but could be extinct forever, and we do not have the right to do that.

Henry understood the river well enough to know that something had to be done. From that moment on Henry never stopped fighting. He spoke at community gatherings and with other fishermen. He met with politicians from all levels of government and all political persuasions.

On top of working and raising a family Henry become a crusader. He did not do this alone because he had the support and help of his wife, Gloria, who fought alongside him. Henry was very active. He became a long-standing member of both the Native Fish Strategy and Basin Community committees. He also sat on the Living Murray Community Reference Group and he was enormously generous with his time, providing countless hours to share his knowledge and perspective on important environmental issues.

Henry's contribution was honoured when he became the first community member to receive the River Murray Medal, awarded by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority. Henry's hard work paid off. Politicians, the community, farmers and irrigators all took notice, and slowly a movement was formed around Henry Jones. In the end Henry's contribution helped shape the basin plan, and he and Gloria were invited by the government to be present in the parliament when the plan passed into law. As Henry Jones said himself:

I can see a rosy future for the river. It's never going to be pristine, it's a working river, there's still going to be irrigation, there's still going to be things growing because there has to be. But at least there's a cap on it now, and there's water set aside to look after the environment and there's a chance that we'll have something to pass on that we're proud of.

All South Australians should be grateful that Henry Jones was so distressed by what he witnessed that he felt compelled to act. We can all learn a great deal from Henry Jones. We can learn that we should not give up, that sound arguments and engagement in debate can sway opinions and, most importantly, that one person can make a difference.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G.A. Kandelaars.

Bills

SEXUAL REASSIGNMENT (RECOGNITION CERTIFICATES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:19): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Sexual Reassignment Act 1988. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:20): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill, the title of which does not indicate its full intent, is an amendment to the Sexual Reassignment Act 1988. However, I will refer to this bill as a bill to end forced to divorce in South Australia; that is, forced divorce for a person who registers a sex change in this state.

My bill is very simple. It removes one line from the current act, and that line, which is currently at section 7(10), provides:

A recognition certificate cannot be issued to a person who is married.

This bill will obviously be part of the marriage equality debate in this country—and, indeed, in this state—and I believe it is a bill whose time has come, because it does not respect the current lives of South Australians, particularly those who are married couples who are forced to divorce if they wish to undertake a sex change. I know that the numbers are very small, but those marriages are very important to those few individuals who are directly affected by this legislation.

The current Sexual Reassignment Act was debated in this place in the late 1980s and, at that time, there were many parts of that legislation which I think were quickly outmoded. At the time, at the Flinders Medical Centre we were seeing four or five sex change operations undertaken in that facility; that was reviewed, I believe, after the number of 30 of those procedures had been undertaken. Indeed, at the current stage we do not see a single sex reassignment operation happening in this state, yet the legislation does not reflect that. However, I will get to those points about the current overall inappropriateness of the act later on. We here simply to stop the forced divorce of those couples who are in love and married; indeed, in some cases who have been happily married for decades.

I have a story that has been shared with me by one of those couples. That person has generously chosen to provide me with their life story, although I have changed the person's name to protect their identity. It goes like this:

Hi Tammy, here is my story, perhaps you can use it.

In early 2012, I saw a psychiatrist for the first time, at the age of 42, regarding my gender issues. Long story short, on June 13 2012 I began HRT and started my journey to womanhood. Incidentally, by the end of August that year, I had weaned myself off double dose antidepressants that I had been on for over a decade. I simply no longer felt the need for them.

April 2013, perhaps sensing hope for a fulfilling life for the first time, I entered college, to study a diploma in counselling. I had been known there as River—

not this person's real name—

since May that year.

October 21 2013, I entered hospital to undergo irreversible gender-confirming surgery, and since then, my transition has really taken off. I have had numerous facial laser hair removal treatments, and will still need several more. The day before the Easter holidays this year, I received my new/updated birth certificate in the mail. I have since received a new Medicare card with my chosen name on it, am discussing my name change with the Australian Electoral Commission, and have made enquiries with my bank regarding changing my name there.

Indeed, since they wrote with this letter they have successfully changed their bank details. They continue:

My point in sharing all this is to hopefully convey some of the hope and desperation I have experienced which led me to undertake this journey, and to impart my belief that I had no choice in this matter, and how seriously I view it.

Now, here's the issue. I am happily married, and on 25th of May this year my wife and I will celebrate our 20th wedding anniversary. She has adapted to my changes remarkably well, as have our four children, who are quite happy with their new Mada. But, to complete this journey, and be recognised as the woman I have become, the government tells me I must destroy this happy marriage of 20 years, and break up my family, which is not going to happen. So, until this law changes I will be known as Mr River. Kind of silly, in my opinion.

Regards, River.

Kind of silly in my opinion as well, but also kind of cruel. How can we be saying to a couple who have been married for over 20 years, who have four children and who are loving and happy, that for one of them to fulfil their gender identity and be recognised as the person they have become they have to get a divorce? That is a cruel and, indeed, inhumane piece of legislation that we currently have in this state.

We are not alone in Australia in having legislation similar to this. Indeed, my Greens colleagues and the Independent member for the seat of Sydney will be moving similar legislation, certainly in the New South Wales parliament but I expect also in other parliaments around the country. In Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania I understand there are similar

provisions in their particular acts and indeed in the Northern Territory, but in the ACT the legislation is silent on this issue; however, the practice is to require a person to be forced into divorce should they wish to undergo transition.

The law outside Australia, however, is more progressive. I would say there has never been a requirement in New Zealand for somebody to have been forced into a divorce. Indeed, in that country people can get married to the person they love regardless of their sex, gender or sexuality, and I believe that should be something to be replicated in South Australia.

The European Union gives many examples of countries that have allowed people to be recognised whether or not they have undergone a sex reassignment, or a gender reassignment. Indeed, in Finland in 2012 the European Court of Human Rights acknowledged that a forced divorce constituted an interference into the private life, a verdict that was passed down in the case of *H v Finland*. However, in some countries, including Lithuania and the Netherlands, people are allowed to stay married after changing their gender.

A publication in 2010 from the European Parliament Policy Development Department noted that most member states that required a married transgender person to divorce before their new gender could be recognised were potentially in breach of articles 7 and 9 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights (Respect for private and family life and Right to marry and right to found a family). Indeed, I note that in this country there is the potential that requiring a person not to be married to record a change of their sex may be inconsistent with the federal Sex Discrimination Act 1984. Indeed, the SDA, as many members would be aware, does prohibit discrimination on the ground of marital status in a wide range of areas.

With those few words, I will seek leave to conclude my comments at a later stage because there is a lot of movement on this issue around the country. As I say, other jurisdictions will be pursuing similar legislation, but we are awaiting legal advice from various sources and I will be happy to share that with this council. Indeed, I am happy to take stories from those in the South Australian community with whom the broader workings of the Sexual Reassignment Act 1988 are currently not reflecting the realities of their lives.

Most starkly, I point to those provisions where it was expected that surgeries would take place in this state. No surgeries take place in this state and yet the Minister for Health has been deemed as having to require to authorise those who undertake the surgeries as part of the process for recognition certificates to be assigned. That is clearly an example where the reality and the workings of this area of our state law does not reflect the reality of these people's lives. With that, I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT (RIGHT TO DAMAGES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:30): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2014. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am reintroducing this bill today as a measure to protect South Australian farmers from being placed in the invidious position of having to sue their neighbours if they are in the unfortunate position of suffering economic loss as a result of having their land contaminated against their will by genetically modified crops that escape from other farms.

This is exactly the circumstance that arose a couple of years ago in Western Australia where a farmer, Stephen Marsh, lost his organic certification over 70 per cent of his farm following contamination by wind-blown genetically modified canola from a neighbouring property. That court case was decided last week and Mr Marsh lost. The case was decided in favour of his GM canola farming neighbour.

It is important to understand, however, that this case was not about whether growing GM crops is a good idea, but it was confined very closely to its particular facts. The judge (Justice Kenneth Martin of the Western Australian Supreme Court) ultimately agreed that, yes, GM material had escaped and entered Mr Marsh's land; that, yes, he had lost his organic certification as a result; and that, yes, losing his organic certification had cost him money—from memory, around \$80,000. However, what the court was not prepared to do was say that it was his neighbour's fault.

Ultimately, the court sheeted home the blame for Mr Marsh's loss to the National Association of Sustainable Agriculture Australia (NASAA), which was the certifying authority. The court effectively accused NASAA of being too fussy about its requirements for what is an organic farm. His Honour said that it had behaved unreasonably in withdrawing Mr Marsh's organic accreditation as a result of what the court believed was a fairly minor contamination. It was, in effect, a case of shooting the messenger.

I think that decision is a very disappointing one, but we would be fooling ourselves if we think that this is the final word in the inevitable conflict that will arise between GM farmers and organic farmers or even traditional non-GM farmers. As other states succumb to the power of the multinationals and allow GM crops, other farmers such as those here in South Australia, where a moratorium prevails, will still face a very high chance of contamination, particularly from across the border in Victoria, as well as escapes from so-called trial crops already being grown in the South-East.

Getting back to Mr Marsh in Western Australia, his situation was very different from the one that South Australian farmers find themselves in. For starters, he was not a canola grower so, according to the court, he should not have been affected by the escaping GM material from his canola-growing neighbour. Mr Marsh grew wheat and rye and grazed sheep. In the South-East of our state, however, you do find farmers growing canola right up to the Victorian border. Over the border, GM crops are allowed to be grown and there will not be a buffer of any substance.

The Greens strongly support the continuation of the moratorium on GM crops in South Australia, but contamination from over the border is a certainty and escapes from so-called trial crops in South Australia are also likely. So when escapes happen, and if economic loss occurs, what is to be done? We know what we do not want and that is what happened in Western Australia. It is a terrible situation to find farmer suing farmer. That is why South Australian farmers need legal protection and a clearer pathway to redress if they do suffer economic loss.

This bill tries to avoid the situation that Mr Marsh faced where his only avenue for justice was to go to the courts and sue his neighbour. The bill before us—the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Right to Damages) Amendment Bill—will enable a person who suffers damages as a result of genetically-modified plant material contaminating their land to sue companies who own and sell the technology, and that includes multinational companies such as Monsanto and Bayer CropScience.

In short, the buck should stop with these big multinationals that profit most from GM crops. Our farmers have a right to some level of security and protection and I believe they do have a right to compensation if they are invaded by GM crops escaping from elsewhere. This bill places the responsibility on these big multinational companies that push the technology to make sure that they are responsible for ensuring there is no contamination of neighbouring farms, and it does this by hitting them hard in the pocket when things go wrong.

This bill effectively creates a right of action in the name of a South Australian farmer against the technology owner of these GM crops. I do not need to go through all the detail of the bill because, as I have said, I am reintroducing this bill. For those members who want more information and those reading the *Hansard*, I refer them to the debate on 2 May 2012 and I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

Motions

MEMBERS' VEHICLES

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:37): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes—
 - (a) the practice of the government over many years to provide taxpayer-funded chauffeur-driven cars to ministers, opposition leaders, presiding members and various other party-political appointees;
 - (b) the vast bulk of these vehicles and their drivers sit idle most of the time and are not required for work purposes; and
2. Calls on the government to replace all chauffeur-driven cars for members of parliament (other than the Premier) with a pool of vehicles and drivers that are available to all members of parliament on a cost-recovery basis and which can be booked for use on parliamentary or electorate business.

This motion is self-explanatory and it draws our attention to what I believe is one of the greatest rorts and wastes of taxpayers' money that exist in this parliament, and that is the practice of providing in many cases consolation prizes to members of parliament in the nature of chauffeur-driven cars and drivers.

The wording of the motion notes that this practice is longstanding and the recipients of taxpayer largesse in the form of chauffeur-driven cars include the Premier, the whole ministry, leaders of the opposition in both houses and, I think, the deputy leader as well in the other place. There are also a number of parliamentary standing committees where the chairs of those committees are given chauffeur-driven cars, not to mention the presiding members of both houses.

What I find most galling about this situation is that the provision of chauffeur-driven cars is entirely a matter of status and it is not in any way connected to the need of the holders of those offices for a private chauffeur-driven car. That is not to say that all members of parliament, from the Premier down, do not need to be able to travel in a secure environment where they might, for example, be making confidential telephone calls.

I think we all understand that and we understand why for the Premier, for example, a public taxi hailed in North Terrace might not be the appropriate form of transport. But having said that, the amount of money that is involved in providing this service is quite staggering and there are millions of dollars in savings to be had.

I should say at this stage that I am not critical in any way of those members of the Public Service who find themselves as drivers of parliamentary cars. They are just doing their job and when in the motion I refer to the fact that the vast bulk of these vehicles and their drivers sit idle most of the time and are not required for work purposes, that is no reflection on any of those people. It is just the reality that when you get someone whose only job is to go from, say, Mitcham or Prospect, drive into the city, deliver someone to work and then effectively wait around all day to deliver them home again at the end of the day, I think it is quite outrageous.

Some members might think that the system is more efficient than that and that they are out and about doing a whole lot of other important government work, but the reality, as we all know, is that they are not. We know where they are. It is not their fault; it is the work conditions that they have been given, but it is an incredibly inefficient way of spending taxpayers' money.

This is not a particularly original concept. In fact, those of you who remember the Sustainable Budget Commission report from four years ago would know that one of the recommendations there, which would have saved close to \$2 million per year, was simply to reduce the number of chauffeur-driven cars from 26 to 17. To quote the Sustainable Budget Commission, this involves the removal of chauffeur-driven vehicle services to the President of the Legislative Council, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, the chairman of committees, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the chairman of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee and the chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee. The Sustainable Budget Commission recommended that the Premier, the Deputy Premier, cabinet ministers and the Leader of the Opposition would continue to have access to a chauffeur-driven vehicle. That was their particular recommendation.

I think we could actually go further than that, and that is why the motion that I have before the council draws the line at the Premier. That is not to say that those other people, if this motion was successful and if the government accepted it, should not be entitled to a quality transport service. What my motion recommends is similar to the system that applies in other parliaments, including the commonwealth parliament, where a pool of vehicles are available to members to use on official business, parliamentary business or electorate business. I have no problem with such a system being

on a cost-recovery basis and no problem with it being on a bookings basis. It seems to me that we could save many millions of dollars of taxpayer funds if we simply removed the exclusivity of these chauffeur-driven vehicles.

I also note that another recommendation made by the Sustainable Budget Commission was for ministers' drivers to be required to fill out logbooks, because apparently we were, and I assume we still are, paying about \$1 million more than we need to in fringe benefits tax, simply because ministers' drivers did not complete Australian Taxation Office compliant logbooks. That was a minor saving, but this motion calls for something far more significant. I think that, whilst all members here might harbour notions that one day we might aspire to the ranks of those who get the chauffeur-driven white car, I think if we did reflect, we would realise that there are alternatives, that the status symbol that that represents is not required and that we could all get about our business in a safe and secure environment without it costing taxpayers as much as it currently does.

The other point to note is that, especially when it comes to the chairs of committees having cars, there is no requirement that the car be used for committee work. For example, a former chair of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee's use of the car involved driving to and from home—in Whyalla—simply because that person happened to be a chair of committee that had a car attached to it.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: It used to go all over Giles, actually.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Well—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: Yes, it did.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: The Hon. John Dawkins interjects with a longer memory of how these things worked. The point I am making is that the system at present is elitist, it is arbitrary, it is wasteful, and there are better ways of moving members of parliament around that do not cost taxpayers as much. So, with those words, I commend the motion to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

STATE ELECTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.L. Brokenshire:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the following matters related to the general election of 15 March 2014—
 - (a) the workings of Part 5 of the Constitution regarding electoral redistribution and the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission, including but not limited to the interpretation and application of the considerations in section 83 for electoral fairness and other criteria;
 - (b) other aspects of the electoral system relating to marginal seats, the electoral pendulum and electoral fairness;
 - (c) the laws and rules relevant to electoral advertising and taxpayer-funded advertising in an election period, including but not limited to questions of truth in political advertising;
 - (d) the handling of complaints about conduct that may affect the result of an election, and sanctions available and applied thereto; and
 - (e) any other relevant matters.
2. That standing order 389 be so far suspended as to enable the chairperson of the committee to have a deliberative vote only.
3. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.
4. That standing order 396 be suspended to enable strangers to be admitted when the select committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

(Continued from 7 May 2014.)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (16:46): I obviously have decided to further adjourn private business No. 7 standing in my name. I would indicate to members that, subject to their consideration of this motion and my amendment to it, it would not be my intention to progress with motion No. 7, and that

is because the concerns the Hon. Robert Brokenshire raised in his motion, which he moved on 7 May, are concerns shared by me and the Liberal Party.

Our concerns also encompassed other matters, so what I propose, in terms of efficient use of the committees of this council, is that the motion of the Hon. Mr Brokenshire be amended to integrate the terms of reference that I put before the house. In that regard, I move:

Leave out subparagraph 1(e) and insert the following subparagraphs—

1. (e) the effectiveness of measures to ensure that electors are not misled;
- (f) access to and use of government service provision records for election purposes;
- (g) provision of voting services, including voting by post, pre-poll voting, services to people with disabilities and residents of declared institutions;
- (h) the integrity of the roll, including the identification of voters presenting and measures for subsequent verification;
- (i) management of the 2014 state election by the Electoral Commission, including the powers and resources available to the commission;
- (j) management of the 2014 state election count to facilitate timely, reliable and adequate information;
- (k) progress in implementing the recommendations of the Select Committee into Matters Related to the General Election of 20 March 2010; and
- (l) any other relevant matters.

After subparagraph 4 insert new paragraph 5 as follows—

5. That members of the council who are not members of the committee may, at the discretion of the chairperson, participate in proceedings of the committee but may not vote, move any motions or be counted for the purposes of a quorum.

The first amendment is to increase the terms of reference and the second is to give members who are not, shall we say, quorum members of the committee the opportunity to participate in the committees. Again, this is picking up on the practice of the council which has proved so effective in the Budget and Finance Committee, led by the Hon. Robert Lucas.

I believe it is a great innovation, and I think it is particularly relevant to a committee such as this because it would be fair to say that every member of this council has a particular interest in the electoral system and, to be frank, often a distinctive interest. In that regard, I can well remember the work of the 2010 committee which had a particular focus on the access to democracy for people with disabilities, and the discussions I had with the Hon. Kelly Vincent in relation to that matter. I commend both motions to the council, but I would suggest that the second motion particularly honours the diversity of this council and the capacity to get the breadth of view to a range of issues.

As we come out of the election, I would characterise the tasks in relation to the electoral system in three bundles: the first is to review the 2014 election; the second is to redistribute the electoral boundaries and, in that context, consider whether our current redistribution process is the best it can be; and, thirdly, to consider electoral reform more broadly.

Members will well remember the discussions we had at the end of the last parliament in relation to the possibility of introducing optional preferential voting for this chamber. I would characterise the Liberal Party position on that bill as agnostic but open to reform. We believe that is one of the items of unfinished business we have in this parliament.

If the three tasks are the three Rs—review, redistribute and reform—the issue facing this council and this parliament is how best to take on those tasks. If I properly understand the ministerial statement of the Attorney-General in the other place, he believes that all of those tasks can be effectively done by a standing committee, and that is what the government's position is.

I put it to the council that there is benefit, in relation to all of those three tasks, for them to be separated; in particular, I put that the review process, the process of reviewing what happened at the 2014 election, would be best done by a select committee of this chamber. The reason I say that is that I think that it is very important that a select committee to review the 2014 election be early, focused and independent. It needs to be early, it needs to be timely, in the sense that we need to get

the review underway and completed as soon as possible. Progressing it through a standing committee would significantly delay it.

I am sure that a standing committee of this parliament in relation to electoral matters will not be established this side of the winter break. We have only 10 sitting days left before the winter break. I well expect that the government has tabled the bill that was foreshadowed in the previous ministerial statement in the other place today, but the House of Assembly has not yet progressed off the Supply Bill; it has a number of other bills that need to be considered.

I think that it is highly unlikely that the standing committee bill will be considered before winter, let alone the bill being proclaimed, let alone the committee being formed, let alone the committee getting on with the tasks and, if the committee is to have a broad scope, as proposed by the government, there may well be a range of views about the tasks that should be undertaken. Because of the need for timeliness, the Liberal Party is of the view that a select committee of this house is the best way to progress the review of the 2014 election.

Secondly, in terms of independence, we believe that a select committee of the Legislative Council is the most appropriate way forward. It is our view that the committee should not be controlled by either the Liberal Party or the Labor Party. We have already said that we believe that it would benefit from having an Independent chair and, let's be frank, the Legislative Council is the only house with true Independents who are currently available to serve on committees. All our thoughts are with the Hon. Bob Such, as he fights illness, but he is the only Independent in the House of Assembly who is not currently sitting at the Labor Party cabinet table. In that context, we believe that the Legislative Council is in a better position to provide independence.

Thirdly, the crossbenchers have been good teachers. They have reminded me that bipartisan is old-fashioned; multipartisan is the fashion of the day, and the fact of the matter is that we have six political groups in this chamber. It is all well and good for the Attorney-General and the Premier to assure us that electoral reform needs to be bipartisan, but in a house where the Independents match the members of the government—they do not quite match the Liberal Party but, still, they match the members of the government in this house—we need to accommodate the diversity of views in the political environment in South Australia.

In that regard, we believe that a Legislative Council select committee which uses the Budget and Finance-style mechanism of allowing all members to participate is a good way to make sure that not only a diversity of factors are considered (for example, the democratic rights of people with disability) but a diversity of perspectives. The Hon. Mark Parnell's motion when we last sat which highlighted the particular burden registration fees which were used at the last election had on smaller groups I think is a strong point. Let me put it this way: a Liberal/Labor controlled committee might not give it the same focus as a select committee with the, shall we say, all-in approach of the Budget and Finance Committee.

Fourthly, with all due humility, I beg to differ from the Attorney-General in terms of his comments about the quality of the work that you could expect from a Legislative Council committee. On yesterday morning's radio the Attorney-General suggested that a standing committee was a better approach because it is the best chance of getting 'an intelligent conversation about this rather than the sort of usual schoolyard behaviour you get from an upper house select committee'.

I am sure that the Attorney-General was not trying to insult the Hon. Bernard Finnigan and the Hon. Russell Wortley but I, for one, remember their contribution to the 2010 select committee on electoral matters. That was a committee that I chaired. It had two Labor members, the Hon. John Darley, the Hon. Dennis Hood and me. That committee, rather than being a political circus or being characterised by schoolyard behaviour, came up with 20 recommendations. Of those 20 recommendations, only two were not supported by the Labor members. If these upper house select committees are merely vehicles for political grandstanding, a waste of time and do not produce recommendations of value, I ask the Attorney-General: why did your colleagues the Hon. Bernard Finnigan and the Hon. Russell Wortley, endorse 18 of the 20 recommendations?

Let me remind the house of a few. Obviously, a major focus of the 2010 election was in relation to the dodgy how-to-vote cards. Members will remember that there was already a government bill called the Electoral (Publication of Electoral Material) Amendment Bill. The committee recommended that the government not progress that bill because we did not believe that

it would prevent dodgy how-to-vote cards. Obviously, the government was persuaded by that because they did not progress the bill.

There were a number of other proposals put forward by government and the third recommendation of the committee was to pursue a disclosure approach on how-to-vote cards. That recommendation was picked up in the changes to the Electoral Act in the last couple of years. How-to-vote cards now need to be disclosed before an election.

A number of recommendations were made in relation to postal vote applications. Part of that was that we recommended that the date for the issuing of the writ be fixed to facilitate planning for postal votes. That, again, was a recommendation picked up and put into our electoral legislation by this parliament. We made recommendations in relation to electoral services for people with a disability. I find it insulting that the Attorney-General considers the work of the committee to be mere political grandstanding.

To be fair to the Hon. Russell Wortley (the now President), the two recommendations that the Hon. Russell Wortley demurred from were in relation to electoral identification. I do not believe it is merely political grandstanding to raise that issue. In fact, I just remind the house that in recent months the Australian Electoral Commission, at the federal level, said that they were investigating 19,000 cases of multiple voting at the federal election. This is a matter for serious consideration by electoral administrators right around Australia, and I believe that the committee in 2010 had an appropriate focus on that issue. We also highlighted issues about web-based rolls in polling booths, information technology, staffing and resourcing for the Electoral Commission, and so on.

I would reiterate that I believe that a select committee of the Legislative Council, with a very focused goal of reviewing the 2014 election, is the preferred approach in terms of timeliness, in terms of independence, in terms of multipartisan input and in terms of quality.

I want to stress to members that the Liberal opposition is not saying, in supporting the Hon. Robert Brokenshire's motion and seeking to amend it, that we oppose a standing committee. There are a range of tasks that need to be done in relation to electoral matters. We believe this select committee is the best way to get on with the job and get a review of the 2014 election. In relation to the other matters, we are happy to have a conversation with the government. In that regard, I am still waiting for a call.

On 21 May the Deputy Premier told the House of Assembly, 'I will be having discussions with members of this place and the Legislative Council in the coming days about this committee.' I certainly understand that the government has been trying to do deals with the crossbenchers; they have not chosen to engage the Liberal Party. We certainly believe that that is not consistent with the assertions by both the Premier and the Attorney-General that the government does respect the need to have bipartisan reform in this area.

In spite of that disregard, we remain open and keen for electoral reform. After all, we are the party that has, at the government formation level, suffered most from the electoral system. We are the party which, at three of the last four elections, has won the majority support of the South Australian people and not been given the privilege of respecting their wishes and forming government. At the last election 90,000 more voters preferred a Liberal government to a Labor government, yet the will of the South Australian people was denied. If an electoral system exists for anything, it exists to reflect the will of the community it serves. We will be very keen to make sure we make key and fundamental changes to the electoral system to make sure the system in South Australia is fair for all participants.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:02): I will be very brief because we have had two very similar motions on the *Notice Paper*. In speaking to the other motion last week, I said that the Greens were supporting the establishment of a committee to look into electoral matters. For the record, we will support this motion. We will support the proposed amendment to this motion, but we also support the concept of a standing committee looking into electoral matters. I do not believe it is in any way mutually exclusive and that support for one precludes support for the other. As the Hon. Stephen Wade said, we know that the government has committed to a standing committee. It may or may not have been a bill tabled in another place, we have not seen it. I certainly have had correspondence from the—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: It has happened now, apparently.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Okay, I understand it has just happened now. I thank the Hon. John Dawkins for his irregular but valuable interjection. I certainly received a letter from the Attorney-General overnight saying that they would be introducing legislation. So, I look forward to seeing the fine detail of that. We have said that we will be supporting a committee.

Mind you, what we have not yet received from the government (and I look forward to seeing the bill that was tabled) is whether it has the participating member approach that we have not only called for but succeeded in getting other members of the Legislative Council to agree to. The upper house select committee certainly will be a forum open to all members of this chamber. Unless there is an amendment to the government's proposed standing committee, such an opportunity might not be offered by that committee, but that is a debate we will have a little later on. For now all I need to do is put on the record that the Greens are supporting this motion and that we support the Hon. Stephen Wade's amendment to it.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:04): I rise to oppose this motion. I do not know why members of the Legislative Council are looking into election outcomes from the House of Assembly. If the Liberal Party is unhappy with the election results because they did not win enough seats, then it would be more appropriate for there to be a joint standing committee established to look into the lower house's business, rather than forming a select committee of only upper house members. This is exactly what the federal parliament did and what the other place has also proposed.

The election is over and the government is formed. Like with the footy, some teams have fewer scoring shots but still win the game because they are more accurate in kicking goals. Just because the Liberal Party still cannot work out what they should focus on in their campaigns in marginal seats does not mean that the electoral system needs to be changed. To continue with the footy analogy, some teams may be disappointed when they lose a game because they had more scoring opportunities, but they move on to the next game and try to kick more goals instead of points. They do not try to change the rules so that a team that has more scoring shots wins the game. This could completely destroy the game.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Just wait. Mr President, the fact remains that the Liberal Party had more votes but less seats. Our electoral system dictates that you have to win a majority of seats to form government. Everyone knew these rules, which fundamentally respect our Westminster traditions. Proposing change to our electoral system strikes right at the heart of those very traditions, something I thought conservative members opposite would appreciate.

It has been suggested that a top-up MP should be used to ensure that the party that wins the majority of the votes also wins the majority of seats, but I ask: exactly who will these top up MPs be responsible to? Just as ministers are responsible for their portfolios, so are local members to their electorates.

Clearly, the Liberal Party is overlooking its own weakness in not being able to convince the people of Newland or Colton, for example, that they should vote for a new government. Both local members obtained a higher primary vote than their Liberal counterparts—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Can honourable members allow the Hon. Mr Ngo to read his riveting speech, please?

The Hon. T.T. NGO: —so first past the post would not have got the Liberal Party home in either of those two seats. Neither seat could hardly be described as Labor heartland, particularly Newland.

The Electoral Commission adjusted boundaries to the appropriate extent to allow for fairly contested campaigns in marginal seats. Its role was never, and never could be, one to decide an election outcome. All members should be aware of this, and I find calls questioning the Electoral Commission's integrity quite saddening. Marginal seats were there to be won, and the Liberal Party utterly failed.

There is no way in the world that the Electoral Commission could adequately address the so-called fairness provision, because it is impossible to predict how each and every voter will vote in a subsequent election, regardless of their vote in previous elections.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Don't react; just continue on with your speech.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Let me use the example of Newland: Fairview Park and Surrey Downs were redistributed into that electorate before this year's election. If you consider the entry of those suburbs into Newland alone, it brought down the margin that the Labor Party enjoyed in that seat. Both suburbs subsequently enjoyed significant swings to the Labor Party at the 2014 election. Many residents of Surrey Downs and Fairview Park who voted Liberal in 2010 in the seat of Little Para subsequently switched to the Labor Party in 2014 in the seat of Newland. This is the fundamental problem that the Liberal Party should be looking to address.

If things are going as badly as the Liberal Party says they are in South Australia since 2010, how is it that they are losing a swag of votes that switched to the Labor Party in a seat that the Liberals had to win to form government? I will leave that for their brains trust to ponder.

The Legislative Council 2014 election results saw the Nick Xenophon Group obtain 130,289 votes, and they only got one member elected. Family First obtained 44,015 votes, yet they also got one member elected. I recently put an advert in all local Vietnamese and Chinese newspapers to thank the people who supported me and the ALP and I printed the Legislative Council results. Many people asked me why the Nick Xenophon Group, with 85,000 more votes than Family First, only had the same number of members elected. Where is the fairness in that?

I have told people that this is the electoral system we live in where preferences do play a role in getting someone elected. You do not have to have more votes than other candidates and you can still be elected. Maybe the Nick Xenophon Group should be moving a select committee to look into whether the Legislative Council electoral system is fair, instead of our council setting up our own committee to look at the business of the other place. Perhaps even a joint select committee looking into the electoral system of both houses would be appropriate. I would certainly support that because it looks at our own council as well.

I make these remarks with the knowledge that there have been many calls for the upper house to be abolished, or for the length of terms to be reduced to four years. I believe it is important that this council has a position on this question. Since the government has already announced the establishment of a joint standing committee derived from members of both houses to review the election, it is vital that members here participate in that committee to represent the interests of this council. This is where our energy should go. It is for these reasons that I oppose the motion.

The PRESIDENT: I am going to put the motion. All those in favour? Against? Carried.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Point of order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Well, those were the only speakers I had.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Point of order, Mr President. I believe I have the right to sum up.

The PRESIDENT: No; I agree. You look a bit embarrassed about the numbers that you were elected on, so I think you really need to do a bit of speaking. The Hon. Mr Hood.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:12): Thank you, Mr President. I assure you, sir, we are not at all embarrassed. That is four elections we have contested and contested them successfully—20 straight years in the parliament. Furthermore, and I say this with due respect to the Hon. Mr Maher, but our surplus was greater than the fourth Labor seat, so we believe we are fully deserving to be here and were elected under the system completely legally and appropriately. Anyway, that is a matter for another day.

In fact, that brings me to the central point: that is actually a matter for this committee because where I disagree with the Hon. Mr Ngo's contribution is if he looks at the terms of reference of the committee as proposed by my colleague the Hon. Mr Brokenshire it specifically says, under (b), 'Other aspects of the electoral system relating to marginal seats', yes, that is obviously a reference to the House of Assembly; 'the electoral pendulum', largely to the House of Assembly; but, 'electoral fairness', which could be interpreted to be an issue for the Legislative Council. Then, section (e), of course, is, 'Any other relevant matters.' So, there is plenty of scope in these terms of reference as

amended by the Hon. Mr Wade to include discussion of the Legislative Council if the committee sees fit.

I would like to take the opportunity to make a few brief remarks. Family First does accept the amendments as proposed by the Hon. Mr Wade. We endorse them and will support them when the vote is put. My colleague the Hon. Mr Brokenshire gave a fairly significant contribution when he introduced this a few weeks ago, so I will not dwell on the merits of the committee, whether to or fro, it looks like it has the numbers to be supported. But I would like to thank the Hon. Mr Wade for his contribution, the Hon. Mr Parnell for his contribution and, although I disagree with a lot of what the Hon. Mr Ngo said, I thank him for his contribution.

It is something that Family First feels passionately about. I think it needs to be noted that we were the political party in 2010 that was subject to the so-called dodgy how-to-vote cards. I believe it did do us damage on the day. It is something that can never be proven, of course, but it is something that we will certainly never forget. With those few words I thank the members for their contributions and I commend the motion to the house.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:17): I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. R.L. Brokenshire, the Hon. T.J. Stephens, the Hon. S.G. Wade, the Hon. K.J. Maher and the Hon. T.T. Ngo, and that the Hon. R.L. Brokenshire be appointed chairperson.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: I move:

That the select committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to adjourn from place to place and to report on 19 November 2014.

Motion carried.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins:

That this council—

1. Notes the significant and unfortunate increase in the rates of suicide across the nation;
2. Notes the motions of the member for Adelaide passed in the House of Assembly on 6 April 2011 and the Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins passed in this council on 24 November 2011 respectively;
3. Notes the subsequent development of the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy;
4. Encourages the efforts of all community organisations that are already working hard in this sector to continue their valuable contributions to suicide prevention throughout South Australia; and
5. Urges the government to build on the work of the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist by increasing support for the ongoing establishment of suicide prevention networks in local community.

(Continued from 7 May 2014.)

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (17:17): I rise on behalf of government members in support of the Hon. Mr Dawkins' motion. The government shares a deep concern at the rate of suicide in South Australia with all South Australians. The impact on individuals and the community left behind is devastating.

I wish to acknowledge that page 5 of the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy 2012-2013 under the title of 'In Memory' that 'This strategy is dedicated to the memory of those who have taken their own lives. We acknowledge the struggle, turmoil and hopelessness they experienced.'

The Australian Bureau of Statistics warns us to be cautious in our understanding of the increasing numbers as this is likely to be due to improved reporting. We have known for many years that there has been an underreporting of suicides. The government is committed to the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy 2012-2016: Every life is worth living. The strategy was developed out of extensive consultation involving over 750 South Australians in the process. The strategy calls for a whole of community response to suicide prevention.

The personal circumstances and experiences that lead a person to attempt suicide are very complex and not contained in one government sector. The solutions are indeed diverse. The seven goals within the strategy articulate the elements that emerge as important in preventing suicide in this state. Those seven goals are:

1. To provide a socially inclusive community of resilient individuals and supportive environments.
2. To provide a sustainable, coordinated approach to service delivery, resources and information within communities to prevent suicide.
3. To provide targeted suicide prevention initiatives, activities and programs.
4. To address as a priority the issues that affect regional South Australians.
5. To provide targeted post-intervention activities and programs.
6. To improve the evidence base and understanding of suicide and suicide prevention.
7. To implement standards and continuous practice improvement in suicide prevention.

The decision to take one's life can be within minutes of an attempt and it is important that each one of us knows how to recognise and respond to a call for help. Raising awareness, breaking down the stigma and increasing community education increases the community's ability to respond.

A heightened awareness can be life saving for those contemplating suicide and for those bereaved by suicide. To this end, SA Health, through the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist, is working closely with all stakeholders to establish suicide prevention networks in local council areas. These community development activities start the conversation, as it is in the talking about suicide in day-to-day life that resilient communities will be forged to support individuals and save lives.

The networks bring together a diverse group of individuals from business, community groups, such as church groups, senior citizens, service groups and sporting clubs, industry, agriculture, the non-government sector and the public sector. I understand networks are in varying stages of development in Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Clare and Gilbert Valleys, Gawler and Playford, and will soon begin in Naracoorte and Whyalla. Wesley LifeForce facilitated networks are also located in Port Adelaide, Strathalbyn and Port Augusta.

The networks are supported by the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist and encouraged to share their action plans and activities with fellow networks promoting shared learning and empowerment in their work. The government is committed to this community development work and will be resourcing the development of further networks in South Australia. I commend the motion and I congratulate the Hon. Mr Dawkins for bringing it to the council.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:21): I rise to speak in support of this motion put before us today by the Hon. John Dawkins and I commend him for his ongoing support for raising awareness about suicide prevention and his personal support. As members may be aware, I had a close family member who committed suicide in the past months, so I thank him for 'walking the walk' as well as 'talking the talk'.

I want to draw members' attention to one particular area, however. In the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy, certainly on my search, there was only one mention of refugees and that was with regard to unaccompanied minors and there was only one mention of asylum seekers. Yet I do believe this is a mental health time bomb ticking in our community and indeed a mental health time bomb of our own creation.

Members would be well aware that we have seen cuts to refugee services in this recent federal budget and indeed we have seen cruel and inhumane policies implemented federally and in this state in past decades, in particular with mandatory detention and now with offshore processing. With mandatory detention, we do know that we have created this mental health time bomb for ourselves and certainly there are a lot of implications there for mental health professionals, and mental health professionals are stepping up.

Indeed, medical professionals are stepping up and I was very pleased to meet last week with Tom, a young doctor in training, from the Australian Medical Students' Association. He is certainly a part of those mental health professionals who are stepping up, not only once they become

established in their profession but even before they enter the profession. I commend the work of the Australian Medical Students' Association in putting together quite a comprehensive document in terms of alerting members of parliament to the mental health implications and the health implications of our nation's treatment of asylum seekers.

Indeed, I note that mental health professionals in this state—and I will make particular mention of Dr Nicholas Proctor and a paper in *Australasian Psychiatry* written also by Louise Newman and Michael Dudley—have remarked on the remote facilities that we have had in this state that saw mandatory detention of asylum seekers in Woomera and Baxter in the early 2000s.

The behaviour there included riots, self-harm and suicidal behaviour. It reflected the detainees' distress, frustration and despair at their powerlessness. These are people who have come to our shores seeking asylum, seeking help, people who are fleeing persecution. We know the overwhelming majority of them are founded in those well-founded fears of persecution. We know that by detaining them indefinitely we do not give them a sense of welcome and a sense of hope; we drive them further into despair, and in some cases that despair becomes suicide and self-harm.

We also know that having unaccompanied children, and children in general, in those detention centres puts them at greater risk of witnessing other detainees self-harming, committing suicide or attempting suicide. I worked with Amnesty International in the early 2000s. I heard horrific stories of what was going on in Woomera and Baxter, and I was ashamed to be Australian when I heard those stories. At first I could not actually believe that we were undertaking such cruel and, I believe, disgusting treatment of our fellow human beings who were simply asking for help. There is no greater plea for help than the plea from somebody who is looking at self-harm or suicide, and I think that the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy should be answering those calls for help. With those few words, I commend this motion to the council.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (17:26): I of course speak today in support of the Hon. John Dawkins' motion that refers to the increase in the suicide rate across the nation, notes the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy and urges the government to build on the ongoing work that the Chief Psychiatrist's office is doing through suicide prevention networks. Like other members, I would like to acknowledge the very longstanding and passionate commitment the Hon. Mr Dawkins has to the issue of suicide prevention and mental health generally. It is indeed a passion that we both share and that we should all share.

Dignity for Disability, like all members of this chamber, I am sure, acknowledges the ongoing tragedy of suicide in Australian society, and indeed anywhere else for that matter. The damage suicide does to the people it affects—not just the person who commits suicide but their families, friends, workplaces and local communities—is immeasurable. I would also acknowledge the particularly vulnerable groups in our community when it comes to suicide, as supported by statistics.

Firstly, people who identify as non-heterosexual have a much higher attempted suicide rate, and I imagine that this is connected to bullying and lack of social acceptance. Of course, our parliamentary colleague the Hon. Dennis Hood was talking about the effects of bullying just today in this place during his matter of interest speech, as he, like all the rest, acknowledged that this is a serious problem in our schools and workplaces in particular. Bullying about sexuality and appearance is all too common amongst adolescents in both public and private schools, and I personally am aware of several suicides in Adelaide in recent years after young people were bullied, particularly on social media.

Young people, and in particular young men, are overrepresented in suicide statistics. While women are more likely to report depression and anxiety, attempt suicide and express suicidal ideations, unfortunately young men tend to use more permanent or violent methods to suicide and have a higher suicide death rate. Suicide continues to be a leading cause of death in under 45 year olds in this country, particularly in country areas, and this is a great tragedy in itself. It is essential that people, particularly young men, in rural and regional areas are given the support they need to talk about the life challenges they are facing at any time. They need to know that they can access services, whether it be over the phone, online or face to face, from health professionals and helplines.

It is also important at this point that we acknowledge the great frustration that I certainly feel and that members touched by mental illness and related challenges feel; that is, often it is only when somebody is experiencing negative mental health, attempting suicide or experiencing depression and anxiety and all those things that we start to talk about mental health as a community. In fact,

mental health is something we all have, just like physical health, and it can be good or bad, or somewhere in between.

It really is time to stop only talking about mental health when it reaches crisis point and talk about it, again, in the same way that we would talk about physical health or any other kind of health, so that we have an ongoing conversation and checks when it comes to mental health to hopefully prevent people from reaching that crisis point in the first place. I would like to touch briefly on the fact that I worry that the foreshadowed changes to costs of visits to GPs is just one example that could cause a spike in suicide attempts and the overall suicide rate, given that in regional Australia GPs are often the only local access people have for help with their mental health.

That is why the sooner we can demonstrate that we support all marriages in Australia the better. Whether it is a man and a woman, a woman and a woman or a man and a man, we should accept it and legislate to make it so. In fact, there can be two people who are non-gender specific identifying or who have changed their gender, as the Hon. Tammy Franks was talking about today. I think we should be legislating to acknowledge this and acknowledge all marriage types and relationships between two consenting people.

Again, one major thing that we can do to help improve mental health is to stop perpetuating the idea that there is one particular standard that people should adhere to. Whether that be to do with gender, sexuality, disability, ethnicity and so on, we need to start acknowledging what has been a fact for many years now in Australia; that is, we are a diverse, multicultural society, and we need to accept all people for what they are, as long as they are bringing positive attributes to our society.

I also note that Lifeline signs with the appropriate phone numbers have been placed on a number of train station platforms around metropolitan Adelaide. Is the mover of the motion aware of this, and does he know about this campaign of Lifeline signs going up at train stations? Perhaps someone on the government side might know about them, too, and could comment. Anyway, I would be interested to know the strategy behind them and what comprehensive services have been put in place to support the campaign, but perhaps that is for another day.

I think it is important to acknowledge that, while it is fantastic to see more awareness of services like Lifeline getting out there, because it is certainly a very valuable service that I myself can vouch for having used the service a number of times, I also know that those services are greatly underfunded and greatly underresourced. It is all well and good to put up a placard giving a number for someone to call if they are feeling a little bit desperate or needing someone to talk to, but we actually need to make sure that there is someone there to answer the phone in a timely manner. The resourcing of those services is just as important, if not more, than spreading the awareness.

On behalf of Dignity for Disability, I support the passing of this motion, but I feel I also need to implore members of this chamber to look at the broader social attitudes and the lack of access to much needed services, especially in more conservative and rural and regional areas, that can lead to suicide attempts and, unfortunately, successful suicide attempts in the first place. This is something that government certainly needs to take the lead on, but it is the responsibility of all of us as members of the South Australian community to help break down the stigma and make sure that supports are available for people experiencing crises, whether that be with a professional or just with an understanding friend. It is the responsibility of all of us to help break down those barriers. With those brief words and for those reasons, I certainly commend this motion very highly to the chamber.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (17:34): Suicide does not discriminate; it can affect any family at any time. I thank very much those members who have spoken to this motion today: the Hon. Mr Gazzola, the Hon. Ms Franks and the Hon. Ms Vincent. They, among many others in the parliament, have been extraordinarily supportive of my work in this area and my passion for doing everything we can to reduce suicide in the community. Each of them particularly demonstrated to the council the broad extent to which suicide is a major issue right across all demographic and geographic areas of this state and beyond, of course.

There are many other people in this chamber, the parliament and the community who have been extraordinarily supportive of me in that work, and I am very grateful for it and I will continue for as long as I feel is needed. I would be grateful one day to come in and say that our efforts have been broadly successful. At the moment, while the community are prepared to talk about these matters far more than they were, I think we all know that the issue is still one that needs an extraordinary

community-wide effort, and I thank those who support those efforts as we develop them across the political divide, across all communities.

For those who might be reading this in *Hansard*, the elements in Nos 4 and 5 of the motion in relation to encouragement for community organisations that are already working hard in the sector and urging the government to build on the work of Office of the Chief Psychiatrist by increasing support for the ongoing establishment of suicide prevention networks, I refer them to the Address in Reply speech I made on 20 May, where I gave significant detail about many of the large number of groups I work with, have worked with and continue to work around South Australia.

Of course, as I said on the day, the danger of listing those groups is that you miss someone. I am very sorry that there was one very important group I missed in that speech, which is called Mates in Construction. I know that my colleagues on the other side who have been involved with unions dealing with the construction industry would be aware of the very good work that that organisation does, both in concert with the unions and with the relevant employer organisations.

I remind the chamber that I am very grateful that the government did develop its suicide prevention strategy as a response to the motion which I moved in this chamber some years ago and which was also moved in the lower house by the member for Adelaide and their successful passage. As I have said, I am sincerely grateful for the development of the strategy and the involvement of some terrific people in that area. I have always commended the strategy, and the strategy and the development of networks was very adequately described by the Hon. Mr Gazzola. But I do say that we need to step up the effort. There is a significant need for extra resources to be given to the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist.

The Hon. Mr Gazzola accurately reflected the networks that have been developed or are in the process of being developed, but there is one public servant doing that work and that lady, and I have mentioned her name before, Lynne James, is a dedicated individual, but she is one person. I do bring that plea to the government.

I also say to the Minister for Mental Health that I think he does need to be more active in this space. The minister is the Minister for Health and Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. I think there is a cry (and I will not name them) from people on the Labor side as well as all sides in the community for more leadership in this area. I do say to the Minister for Mental Health that I think it is time that he stepped up his efforts in public about suicide.

In conclusion, I will respond to the Hon. Kelly Vincent's question of me in regard to Lifeline. I understand her concern. Lifeline has been around in South Australia for almost 51 years and it is well regarded around Australia as a wonderful organisation that has helped many people over many years, but there is that concern that, if you advertise something and then you cannot cope with the level of calls or people seeking help, is that the right thing to do?

I am very grateful that the government came up with a commitment of funding for Lifeline in Adelaide, late in the state campaign, for the first time. Also, I will put on the record that I think that only happened because the Liberal Party some six or eight months earlier made a commitment to Lifeline across South Australia. At the time, the government said it would not be doing that but it certainly did at the tail end of the campaign. I am not playing politics: I am grateful for the commitment.

I think we are all aware that Lifeline has been advertising on radio, and I think TV, trying to get more community support for their services. I have recently been interstate and met with Lifeline Australia, their peak body and a number of different Lifeline groups, in places such as Melbourne, Albury, Canberra, the harbour-to-Hawkesbury area in Sydney, and also in Wollongong. Some of them are connected significantly to the Uniting Church and others are completely independent. They all raise money in an array, I suppose, of different manners, and we are all aware in South Australia of those Lifeline clothing shops.

Having met with the people who work for Lifeline, whether in a paid or voluntary capacity (and a great majority of them are in the latter), I can say that the calibre of people involved is extraordinary. As well as working in their own areas, they tend now to take calls from other parts of the country to try to share the load. I am a great advocate of the work that Lifeline does and anything that we as a community and the government of this state can do to support them is well worth it.

I thank members for their support for this motion. I commend the motion to the council but I also urge members to go out and continue to encourage the community to have the conversation and discussion about suicide.

Motion carried.

Bills

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (SACFS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 May 2014.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (17:44): I rise on behalf of Liberal members to support the second reading of the bill. Members will be well aware that this has been a well-argued principle and piece of legislation. I put a position on behalf of Liberal members in this chamber in general terms back on 26 November last year. Subsequent to that, there has been a state election, at which there has been some public debate and discussion on this issue.

On 22 January this year, Liberal leader Steven Marshall issued a joint press release with the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Robert Brokenshire which indicated that a Marshall Liberal government would provide these CFS volunteers with the same access to compensation for specified cancers as for paid firefighters. The Liberal Party's position has not changed since then, and for those reasons we will support the second reading.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (17:45): I rise on behalf of the government to respond to the Greens' attempt to circumvent the review process that has been agreed to between the government, the Country Fire Service volunteers and other key government stakeholders. As was recently outlined in the other place by the Minister for Industrial Relations, this review process is well underway, as was promised before and after the state election.

The council will recall that on 19 June 2013 the Minister for Industrial Relations introduced into the other place the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (SAMFS Firefighters) Amendment Bill 2013. With the support of both sides of politics, this bill was passed by both houses in November last year. Let me make clear that no firefighter, whether a volunteer or paid, is precluded from lodging a workers compensation claim under the current arrangements for cancer compensation. I reiterate: no firefighter, whether volunteer or paid, is precluded from lodging a workers compensation claim under the current arrangements for cancer compensation.

The current act is one of the most progressive in the country on presumptive legislation, matched only by Tasmania. It removes the onus of proof on paid firefighters, as well as a cohort of Country Fire Service volunteer firefighters who attend a comparable number of fires to their Metropolitan Fire Service counterparts. Nevertheless, the government recognised last year that the amendment was controversial, and we have listened to the concerns of the CFS Volunteers Association, the Country Fire Service and the community, and as such the government promised last year that it would review the amendments if re-elected.

Well, the government was re-elected and we quickly commenced the review as promised. Since the state election, the Minister for Industrial Relations, the Minister for Emergency Services and the Minister for Regional Development have discussed the legislation and the demands of volunteers and met with interested parties, the Country Fire Service, the CFS Volunteers Association, the Metropolitan Fire Service, the United Firefighters Union, SAFECOM and others. It was agreed by all that the assumptions made in the original actuarial report would be reviewed by a working group of interested parties, and the costings for various presumptive legislation options would again be developed by an independent actuary whose appointment was agreed by the parties.

This process of reviewing the assumptions has now mostly been completed, free of any political involvement. The assumptions have already been provided to an independent actuary, and the review will be completed within about three months and tabled in parliament by the end of September, as promised. The government will then have the most up to date information, agreed by all, to inform decisions, including the extent of coverage provided by the government.

Nevertheless, the Greens decided again to introduce their own amendments to the legislation, legislation both houses had already considered and ultimately rejected. The Greens introduced this bill knowing that the government and volunteers were currently working together in good faith. I can only assume this was undertaken for political purposes, knowing that the review was underway and knowing that the opposition was planning to introduce amendments.

I ask the Greens: if you are so convinced that the government's estimated costs for the presumptive legislation are wrong, as per your 7 May speech, what costings did the Greens use, who did your actuarial work, and how much should the Treasury put aside for your bill? How nice it must be to live in a world where you only put forward ideas and do not need to be concerned about how much it might cost the taxpayer.

The Greens have again demonstrated their complete inability to understand the facts and the government's position on this issue. It is astonishing that the Greens—given that they have been in possession of the original actuarial report, which contains all costings, with and without qualifying periods, and despite their claims to the contrary on 7 May—still cannot grasp the various costings the government has outlined.

I will help by pointing the Greens to page 5 of the actuarial report, which states that \$24.95 million is the annual cost for the CFS to be fully included. As previously advised, but not understood by the Greens, the figure of \$1.8 million relates to the costs under the government's 175 over five years model. The other costs that were discussed by the Minister for Industrial Relations, \$36 million and \$84 million, are very clearly explained on page 4, table 2.1.

It is deeply disturbing to the government that the Greens speak with such authority on this issue but still do not understand the basic costing implications, and, rather than reading the report and asking appropriate questions, try and twist and turn the debate purely for political purposes. In fact, on 7 May in this chamber the Greens accused the government of politicising the issue. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is the Greens and the Liberal Party who have attempted to convince the people of South Australia, including volunteers, that they are not covered by the legislation rather than explaining to those less informed that it is about the burden of proof. I reiterate: no firefighter, whether volunteer or paid, is precluded from lodging a workers compensation claim under the current arrangements for cancer compensation.

Let me assure you, Mr President, that the government has done its homework. We did develop costings, we have spoken with Tasmania and the commonwealth about the legislation, we have looked carefully at the extremely high costs predicted in Victoria if they went down this path—which, I understand, they rejected, like all other states except Tasmania and South Australia. We have looked at the science through the Monash studies and comparable studies undertaken in New York and Canada, and we will continue to look.

The volunteers understand the reason for the review; unfortunately, the Greens do not. The government appreciates the concerns of our brave and selfless volunteers, and again thanks them for working so professionally with the government on this issue.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:54): Sometimes I think that members of the government have a different understanding of the truth than do the regular folk of this state, and, indeed, of the CFS Volunteers Association, who fully support the Greens and the Liberal Party bringing this bill back to this place. I am glad the government has finally realised that at the moment any firefighter (paid or volunteer) can take a cancer compensation claim to WorkCover and have that claim accepted.

So, the liability already sits with government; the financial implications are already there. By not having a presumptive schedule that is equal what this Weatherill Labor government says to volunteer firefighters who put their lives on the line is that, 'You are lesser and we are probably going to fight you. If you get cancer and you come to us with a WorkCover claim we are going to fight you. We are not going to give you presumption, we are going to fight you on your claim for WorkCover. We are going to shirk our responsibility, even though you put your life on the line to save our state, our property and, indeed, the people of this state.'

What I would note is that while the government has said that it has taken notice of the science it was the Hon. Kyam Maher who came into this place and said that the science was not there to prove that volunteers and paid firefighters in this state should have been treated the same. It was

this government that put up a bill that did not even consider including one single volunteer. It was this council, this chamber, that pushed the government and, indeed, the Minister for Industrial Relations (dragged kicking and screaming) not only to finally release the actuarial report that he kept quoting selectively from but to have an amendment to their government bill that did not, in the first instance, consider the plight of one single volunteer, to actually have a scheme that gave second-class citizen treatment to CFS volunteers.

It was this council that has long championed and long spoken to the CFS Volunteers Association, when I must note that it was not until the passage of the current legislation that minister Rau sat down and spoke with the CFS volunteers for the first time, after repeated requests for a meeting. We have been through several ministers on this bill. We have been through several years of debate. It is no surprise to members of this chamber that the Greens were going to bring this back. Indeed, I co-sponsor this particular bill with Dr Duncan McFetridge of the opposition and I thank him for his ongoing commitment to this issue.

I find it a little cute, to paraphrase one of the Labor ministers, that somehow the Weatherill government has a longstanding commitment to presumptive cancer compensation legislation for CFS volunteers and is here to do the behest and the bidding of the CFS volunteers. If they spoke to the volunteers, with respect, they would know that there are still industrial work bans on, that the CFS volunteers of this state are still taking industrial action against members of the Weatherill government in not having photos for photo opportunities taken with members of your government, that they are continuing to maintain the rage, that they support this bill to the hilt and that they just want equality and respect. It is the least we can do for people who put their lives on the line for us. If this fire season shows anything it shows that we need them more than they need us.

What I find cute is that you are coming in here and asking for costings, yet your actuarial report we had to drag kicking and screaming out of you on the last sitting day in this place. Indeed, as I say, the assumptions made in that report that were quoted by the Minister for Industrial Relations selectively did not factor in the schedule of the 12 primary site cancers and did not start with the five years minimum qualifying period of service, and indeed 25 years in the case of oesophageal cancer with a range in between—did not use those figures. The opposition, with their costings at the election, came up with a much lesser figure, although quite a substantial figure. But the liability sits with us.

So, the financial impost of the bill is a moot point because any volunteer firefighter and any paid firefighter who contracts cancer can take that claim to WorkCover and have it assessed. What we do with the presumptive legislation is we put it out there and say, 'This is a schedule by which more than likely we are going to presume that that cancer that you have contracted was linked to the act of your firefighting, to that brave act that we are very happy to stand and take photo ops with them straight after a fire, but five, 10, 25 years down the track when they contract cancer we do not want to hear from them,' seems to be the story coming from this government. What we say to them is that we respect you and we treat the work that you do as a firefighter with the respect that it deserves by giving the CFS equality with the treatment that we have given the MFS when it comes to presumptive legislation on cancer compo.

I have to say that not one single person will go out and try to contract cancer to get compensation. I am pretty sure in saying that. Yet that seems to be one of the underlying assumptions that the government makes here, that somehow this scheme will be sorted. I have to point out that somebody will have to have fought fires for at least five years and, in some cases, more than 25 years, to qualify, and then contract cancer—and one of the 12 specified cancers that are linked scientifically to the act of firefighting. That is a pretty high hurdle. In its current legislation, the government has a high hurdle for the MFS and then it has an even higher hurdle, in fact it has a steeplechase, for the CFS.

We have not politicised this issue, we have not come in here with our research not done; it has been this government time and time again who has fudged this issue. The government listened to its union mates and did not talk to the CFS volunteers, and they have been dragged kicking and screaming to something that I believe we should have had cross-party work on right from the start.

When I first took this issue to the government (it was the then minister Snelling and the then minister Wortley who I first spoke with about this issue), we should have had cross-party support for a bill to come before this place that considered the science and considered equality, as had been the case right up until that point under WorkCover. We had never treated the CFS volunteer

firefighters differently from the MFS firefighters. We had always considered that a firefighter was a worker for the purposes of the WorkCover Act.

You were the ones, as a government, who stepped away from that absolute respect for the work of firefighting, whether it was paid or unpaid. Indeed, you were the ones who suffered electorally as a result. You did win government. You have made up the numbers for a minority government in the House of Assembly but what I would say is that sitting in your cabinet is the Minister for Regional Development, the member for Frome, the man who co-sponsored with me in the last parliament the bill that we have before us here today. I expect he will be voting for it this time around. I know that he has been co-opted into your review. The review I believe is simply yet another stalling tactic from people who did not have the respect to work with the CFS volunteers from day one.

I would also say that in your cabinet is, of course, the member for Waite who has previously supported CFS equality and we will certainly be keeping him to that previous support. I am sure the local Mitcham CFS volunteers will have something to say about it should he not. With that, I commend the bill to the council.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 18:05 the council adjourned until Thursday 5 June 2014 at 14:15.