

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 2 July 2014

The **PRESIDENT** (Hon. R.P. Wortley) took the chair at 14:16 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:17): I bring up the fourth report of the committee.

Report received and read.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: I bring up the fifth report of the committee.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the President—

Report of the Ombudsman SA concerning the Legislative Council's Referral on the Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT (14:21): Just before we go into question time, I want to make it quite clear that I am far from impressed with the behaviour of some members in this chamber. We only got through eight questions yesterday, two from the crossbench. I think the big losers in all this would be not only the crossbenchers but the people of South Australia who actually expect question time to be used to keep ministers accountable and transparent.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: You may laugh if you wish. I was quite generous yesterday, but from now on I am going to be much more stringent on the way behaviour—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I am talking, the Hon. Mr Ridgway! You may be the first person that the wrath of the Chair is brought upon. As of now, when I give a direction for someone to desist in regard to interjections across the chamber, I am quite flexible. I believe that a little bit of passionate banter is not a bad thing in this chamber, but if I believe it has gone a bit too far. If I give a direction to cease, and if the member does not cease, no matter who it is, no matter what side of the chamber they are on, there will be a warning. If they continue, they will then be named. Once I have named someone, the Leader of the Government will then stand up and move a motion that they be removed from the chamber and you will go for the rest of today's session. So let's make it—

An honourable member: If the motion is passed.

The PRESIDENT: If it's passed, of course.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Well, I am all ready to put this into practice today. I think we have an obligation to this state and the people of this state to behave in an orderly manner. It was 100 years, I think, before the first person was ejected from this house. Obviously, they took order in this house much more seriously than we do here at the moment.

In regard to the ministers, I call upon you to try to keep your answers to a reasonable time and also where possible to answer the question and be relevant.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President, can I ask a question of you about procedure, if I may? If it is the Leader of the Government you are naming, who then moves the motion?

The PRESIDENT: We will come to that when we come to it. It will obviously be the Hon. Mr Hunter.

Question Time

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Can the minister confirm that more than six weeks ago the Environment Protection Authority identified a significantly increased risk to residents in Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park as a result of groundwater and soil contamination?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for her important question. My answer is yes.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:24): Supplementary question: have residents been informed and will they be asked to vacate their properties?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:24): The EPA has been working with a number of stakeholders in this area over a period of time. Recently, it has been brought to my attention that the ongoing low-level risk has risen and the EPA will be conducting some community consultation in the very near future, primarily getting in touch with residents and other effective—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Well they haven't been told.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The honourable members opposite are again making claims which have no substantiation or basis in truth.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:24): Supplementary: can the minister guarantee that the residents will not be asked to vacate their properties?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:24): The government will be taking all appropriate actions in this regard. First of all, we will be communicating with the residents.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:24): A supplementary question: if the minister suggests that the contamination is only low level, why can he not rule out that residents will be asked to vacate their properties?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:25): Again we have the opposition verballing me and giving my answer. That is not what I suggested. As I said, we will be communicating with the residents in the first instance. I will come back to this place with an answer in due course.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is also to the minister for the environment. Considering the EPA advises on their website in relation to site contamination, 'Residents can expect urgent information to be communicated face to face, with follow-up letters from the EPA', when did this occur?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:25): Again, I indicate that this is an ongoing concern that we have been talking to the community

about for some time. We will communicate again with the residents in the very short term, and I will bring back a response to this council in due course.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): A supplementary question arising from the answer: the minister said, 'We will communicate again,' so when did you communicate the first time? I assume 'again' is a second time.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:26): I indicate that this has been an ongoing situation and we have been continuing our investigations. I will bring back a response to this council in due course.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:26): I would ask the minister what does 'in due course' mean? When minister Caica was responsible for contamination in 2009, it took him two days to get a ministerial statement to the House of Assembly. It is 10 sitting days since we understand the EPA was advised of this contamination. No advice has gone to residents.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:26): I will advise the members opposite and this council in due course.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:26): I ask the minister: when did the—

The PRESIDENT: Is this a question, or is this a supp?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Sorry; I was taking a call on a question.

The PRESIDENT: Is this a supplementary or is it a question?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am seeking a call on a question.

The PRESIDENT: Good; your call.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I ask the minister: when did the EPA advise the public health division of SA Health about the groundwater and soil contamination in Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park, and what is their assessment of the risk?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:27): I am happy to take the honourable member's most important question on notice and bring back a response in due course.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): A supplementary question: has the local member for racism—I beg your pardon, Elder—been advised of this site contamination?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, I want you to withdraw that immediately. It's unparliamentary.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I will withdraw it, Mr President, but I will ask the question: has the local member for Elder (who used very questionable campaign tactics) been advised of this site contamination?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:27): Again, I advise the chamber I will be advising them of all actions that we will take in due course.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary: are you saying that the local member, the person who was elected to represent these people, has not been advised?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:28): Once again we see the Liberal Party trying to verbal ministers on this side of the chamber. When will they understand that I will come back to them with details in due course?

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:28): Thank you, Mr President.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Kandelaars has the floor.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Business Services and Consumers a question about a recent compliance operation undertaken by Consumer and Business Services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: I understand that Consumer and Business Services recently undertook an end of year sales compliance operation to ensure businesses complied with their obligations under the Australian Consumer Law. Can the minister update the chamber on the outcome of the Consumer and Business Services end of year compliance operation?

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) (14:29): I am very pleased to advise members about the Consumer and Business Services recent compliance operation that was undertaken to ensure that consumers are protected at a time of increased sales that are typical around the end of financial year time. The end of financial year sales obviously can offer consumers a great opportunity to snap up some great bargains, but it is important that consumers are protected from any business that might inadvertently or blatantly rip them off. That is why our state consumer watchdog has been out there visiting businesses and undertaking surprise inspections to ensure that they are meeting their obligations under the Australian Consumer Law.

This recent compliance operation by Consumer and Business Services demonstrates the great work they undertake in protecting South Australian consumers and ensuring a fair marketplace across the state. Operatives from Consumer and Business Services undertook unplanned visits to 43 stores throughout South Australia, metropolitan and regional, and all within the past week. Pleasingly, I am advised that inspectors detected only seven stores with price scanning issues, where items would scan at a higher price than that marked on the shelf ticket. Each of these stores has been issued with a formal warning and all scanning issues were rectified on the spot.

The state consumer watchdog will be visiting these stores again in future. Again, it will be another surprise visit to ensure ongoing compliance. If they are found to be at fault again, further action will be taken against those businesses, and ultimately it could even end in prosecution. I am advised that these matters relate to small amounts, but they add up. The bottom line is that the Australian Consumer Law provides an effective national framework to ensure a fair marketplace, and our consumer watchdog is out there ensuring that businesses comply.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the vigilant, hardworking Consumer and Business Services. The many officers there are very hard working and committed. It has specialised operatives out there on a regular basis ensuring that businesses comply with their obligation, but recognises the importance of educating parties on their rights and obligations under the Australian Consumer Law, resulting in measured and considered steps being taken where appropriate.

South Australian consumers can purchase goods and services with the knowledge that the state consumer watchdog is out there protecting their rights. I recognise the collaborative effort between Consumer and Business Services and the business community to ensure that together they encourage a fair market, promote awareness of parties' rights and responsibilities under the

Australian Consumer Law, and strive to achieve a competitive marketplace that provides confidence to consumers and businesses alike when purchasing or selling products and services.

It is important that consumers remember to be diligent in checking that they are paying the ticket sale price, the benefits to shopping around and not purchasing something with haste, and, if they are unsure of their rights or identify something that they think may not be right, Consumer and Business Services are there to offer assistance. It is a timely reminder of the importance of consumers knowing their refund rights, regardless of whether an item is full price or sale price.

Under Australian Consumer Law consumers are entitled to the repair, replacement or refund of an item if it is faulty or if it does not perform as advertised. Those signs you see 'No refunds on sale items' are in fact not legal signs. However, consumers are not necessarily entitled to a refund if they simply change their mind, as this will depend on the policy of the retailer. Shoppers should make sure they are aware of the retailer's change-of-mind policy before making a significant purchase.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INQUIRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for the Status of Women about the Senate domestic violence inquiry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: On average one woman a week is murdered in Australia as a result of domestic violence. This is both a national tragedy and an actual emergency. Last week the Australian Greens, under the auspices of Senator Larissa Waters, put a proposal to the Senate for an inquiry into domestic violence. It passed that chamber with tripartisan support. The matter has now been referred to the Finance and Public Administration References Committee, to report back by October this year, with submissions due in by the end of this month.

That committee will look into the prevalence and impact of domestic violence in Australia, with particular regard to both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, women living with a disability and, indeed, the policy responses regarding housing, legal services, women's economic independence, the ability of women to escape domestic violence and how the federal government can best support, contribute to and drive social culture on behavioural shifts required to eliminate violence against women and their children. Senator Waters noted at the time:

With the input of women's refuges and victims, we will find out how the federal government can best work with states, territories and the community to eliminate domestic violence.

My questions are:

1. What level of participation will the South Australian government have in this inquiry?
2. Will the government make a submission to present to this inquiry and, if so, specifically what department or agency will lead the South Australian government response and, indeed, which departments and agencies will be a part of our government response to this very important inquiry?

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) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions. Indeed, this government is very committed to addressing violence against women and children in this state, nationally and also internationally, and that is why we have had such an active agenda to roll out a range of reforms and initiatives to help eliminate violence against women and children in this state.

South Australia has been a key and fundamental player in the national arena in relation to the second phase of the National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children; I think I spoke about that in this place yesterday. Indeed, South Australia has been, as I said, at the forefront in participating both in the first and now the second phase of that national strategy. As I outlined yesterday, there are a range of initiatives in that strategy, both in terms of service interventions and primary prevention initiatives, and education and research initiatives. Especially vulnerable groups have been identified, including the disabled, Aboriginal women and some other groups that are particularly vulnerable to violence against women and children in their particular communities. We

will continue with our commitment at a national level. We will continue with our commitment to foundation Australia, the group that Natasha Stott Despoja has been given—

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Well, we have given them money. That's absolute nonsense; it is just incorrect information. We continue that commitment too, as well as rolling out initiatives at the state level. In our last budget, we announced a number of important initiatives, including additional money for a repeat offender database, a program to assist particularly young women to improve their body image and to have greater confidence and self-esteem around their body image and ideas of beauty and being treated as objects, or objectification. They are some examples of those commitments.

In relation to the national inquiry, I am not familiar with the terms of reference of that inquiry. I am happy to look at the detail of that and then to consider the best way for South Australia to contribute to that and, if that is deemed to be appropriate, the government will coordinate an across-government approach to that because there are a number of quite important different policy and agency areas that are responsible for different aspects of addressing the elimination of violence against women and children in this community.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INQUIRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:39): Supplementary: can the minister clarify whether or not this government has indeed entered into a partnership with the national Foundation to Prevent Violence against Women and their Children?

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) (14:40): We have contributed financially to the foundation, and I cannot—

The Hon. T.A. Franks: How much?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: As I was just about to say—

The PRESIDENT: Let her finish the answer.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: First, the honourable member says we haven't contributed money and now I get up and say we have contributed money. I am happy to bring back the amount. I just do not have that figure in my head at this particular moment, Mr President.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Can he advise when he was first made aware of the additional contamination in Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park, and what actions has he taken?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:40): Mr President, the opposition just does not take a hint. My preference in this situation is to talk to the stakeholders first, not to the opposition, but let me give them some background information to keep them going for a little while.

Since August 2012, Monroe and its site contamination consultant URS Australia have been undertaking indoor air and soil vapour sampling assessments within a residential area in Clovelly Park. The key chemical of interest that has been detected in soil vapour and indoor air is trichloroethylene (trichloroethene, as it is now called). The indoor air sampling that was completed during February and March 2013 identified concentrations of TCE in indoor air at six residential properties at that time. Monroe and URS Australia discussed the results of the indoor air and soil vapour sampling with the EPA site contamination auditor, the Department for Health and Ageing and Housing SA.

Further sampling was undertaken and the results identified levels of TCE in indoor air at about three residential properties slightly above the indoor air screening level criteria. On 10 April 2013, Monroe and the consultant discussed the results of the testing with the residents of the

properties. At the same time, Monroe letter dropped the wider community area. The letter advised residents of the results of the testing and the next steps in the ongoing assessment.

During late 2013, URS Australia undertook further indoor air and soil vapour sampling as part of the ongoing assessment work being undertaken within the residential area at Clovelly Park. The October 2013 indoor air sampling identified an additional five residential properties with TCE concentrations in indoor air. In total, 11 residential properties in Clovelly Park have TCE in indoor air as measured. On 16 December 2013, residents were advised by Monroe and URS Australia via letter drop and a direct discussion that the results of the indoor air sampling would be used to prepare a detailed site investigation report and committed to ongoing communication with residents this year.

Monroe's consultant has continued to undertake further assessment work at the Monroe property (on site) and off-site areas (including residential areas), and has prepared a draft Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Vapour Health Risk Assessment Report. Monroe has now provided the EPA, the Department for Health and Ageing, Housing SA and the independent EPA accredited site contamination auditor with a copy of the draft Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Vapour Health Risk Assessment Report.

I understand the Department for Health and Ageing has advised that there are no immediate public health risks but there is a need to undertake some actions in the short term. The government is now coordinating its response to the report with a view to ensuring that appropriate actions are taken with respect to site contamination and that the interests of public safety remain a paramount consideration with respect to residents in the area. The EPA will continue to have active involvement. Out of respect for the residents, sir, I will not be saying any more at this stage. We will be consulting with the impacted residents.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:43): Supplementary question arising from the answer: the letter that the minister referred to talks about a contamination auditor review by early 2014. Can the minister confirm what date that was actually made available to the EPA and when it was completed?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:44): Mr President, I will take that supplementary question on notice.

SOUTH-EAST DRAINAGE SYSTEM

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Will the minister update the chamber on recent developments regarding the drainage system in the South-East?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. The South-East region of South Australia extends over around 28,000 square kilometres. What was once a region dominated by wetlands has been converted to fertile agricultural land, thanks primarily to an extensive network of drains.

The drainage network has a long history in the South-East. It includes about 2,500 kilometres of public and private drains, floodways and associated infrastructure built over a very long time—some of that legal and some of it not quite so legal. The infrastructure supports the agricultural productivity of a significant portion of the South-East region, it delivers water to wetland habitats from the South-East through the Coorong, reduces flooding on farmland, and helps to manage groundwater salinity. The extensive network of bridges and crossings on private and public land is essential to the regional road transport network and the movement of produce.

The network of drains forms a critical part of the economic and social infrastructure of the South-East region, which contributes over \$3 billion annually to state GDP. The drainage network is currently managed and operated by the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board under the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act 1992. There has been ongoing debate regarding the long-term funding of the drainage network. The infrastructure is ageing and needs to be maintained, and, in some places, replaced. The South Eastern Water Conservation and

Drainage Board annually receives \$2.1 million of state funding to manage the system. The state government has been very clear that it will not be increasing its contribution beyond this amount of funding.

A business case prepared in 2009 identified \$7.4 million plus indexation as the optimal operating budget for the South-East drainage system. Since then the government has been working on identifying possible solutions to make up the shortfall. In 2012 the South East Drainage System Operation and Management Bill (SEDSOM) was introduced into parliament. The bill proposed to broaden the funding options available for the operation, management and maintenance of the South-East drainage system, and included the option of a levy. I have taken the decision not to reintroduce the SEDSOM bill at this stage to allow public dialogue on the future management of the drainage system. Discussions must include the question of who benefits from this important infrastructure and how those beneficiaries can contribute to the system's ongoing maintenance.

This is why I visited the region on Thursday 12 June. I met with a range of stakeholders, including local government, the Aboriginal community, farming communities and conservation groups to discuss future maintenance of the network. In my discussions I made it very clear that the community must have a voice in the solution and that no decision would be made on this matter until the consultation process I have set in train is complete.

In order to facilitate such a consultation I have tasked the South East Natural Resources Management Board with establishing a new community panel. The panel, consisting of local community members, will develop options regarding how best to provide increased funding for maintenance of the South-East drainage network, and will examine the value of the drainage system to the region, who it benefits, who it impacts and how that can be calculated. I am looking forward to receiving a series of recommendations from the local community through the community panel regarding increased maintenance to the network and how it will be funded.

In addition to my discussions with stakeholders, it was also a real pleasure to go to the South-East to announce the recent approval of \$60 million in funding for the Coorong South East Flows Restoration Project. This is a project that has been discussed over a long period of time. It is a great achievement and I am very pleased that is now being progressed.

We are all aware that increasing salinity levels have had an enormous environmental impact on the Coorong. This program will take fresh water from the drainage system and redirect it through a combination of watercourses and existing drains back into the South Coorong. Currently the South-East drainage system delivers on average 30 gigalitres per year to the Coorong at Salt Creek; the South-East flows project will provide an additional 26 gigalitres per year on average, and this will allow us to better control salinity levels in the Coorong in the event of another drought in the future. The project will also enable additional water to be diverted into South-East wetlands en route to the Coorong, addressing priority local environmental needs along the way.

In addition, we know that drain water flowing out to sea has a harmful impact on ecosystems, particularly the natural seagrass beds at the outlet. The South-East flows project will have the added benefit of minimising this environmental impact into the future. The Australian government is providing \$54 million in funding and the state government is providing an additional \$6 million. The funding will cover expenses for landholder consultation, broader community and Aboriginal engagement programs, and an environmental management program to support monitoring and understanding of the South-East drainage system and the Coorong. A steering committee which includes representatives from the South East NRM Board and the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board will manage the project.

As with the long-term funding of the drainage system, it is very important that local communities have a say in these projects. This is a great achievement for the South-East and for the communities involved, and shows how much can be achieved when all levels of government and the community work together effectively. Whilst I acknowledge that the approval is just the beginning of the program, it is a very important first step.

I would like to thank all the parties that have played a part in ensuring this important project reaches the stage it has, particularly the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources major projects team, the water and climate change branch, the South East NRM Board, the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board and natural resources South-East staff. Their hard work helped to secure this project which will improve the health of the Coorong, the Lower Lames

and the Murray Mouth, the marine environment and the significant wetlands in the state's South-East and benefit landholders in the region and the broader community.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:50): Supplementary question: does the minister include in that list of bodies to thank the Abbott Coalition government for supplying 54 of the \$60 million in funding?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:50): I appropriately acknowledged their contribution, as I did in the South-East, and I will gratefully accept the contribution and also offer the chamber's congratulations to the state government for their contribution.

HANSON BAY

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:50): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation questions with regard to the government's purchase of land at Hanson Bay.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: On 5 June, in answer to my question, the minister advised that the government had obtained an independent valuation in 2008 of \$1.3 million for 1,900 hectares of land at Hanson Bay. The minister also advised that the government subsequently purchased the land for \$1.8 million in 2012. My questions are:

1. Did the government receive further valuation advice closer to the purchase date in 2012 and, if so, what was this advice?
2. If not, what explanation can be given for paying half a million dollars (or 38 per cent) more than the valuation of \$1.3 million for the land?
3. Was the minister aware of any other parties interested in buying the land and, if so, how many?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his most important question but I have to say that I have already answered a substantial part of his question in terms of the value of the land and why it was worth purchasing and connecting parks.

The Hon. G.E. Gago: Tell us again.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I should probably tell you again. I thank my leader for her instruction; it is excellent, as always. One of the primary purposes of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 is to establish a system of reserves to manage land for conservation purposes. The government released a strategy called, 'Conserving nature, 2012-2020: a strategy for establishing a system of protected areas in South Australia', which aims to add land to existing reserves where there are strong conservation outcomes to be achieved.

In late 2012, the government purchased 1,900 hectares of land at Hanson Bay on Kangaroo Island for a figure of \$1.8 million, I am advised. This is, I am advised again, an extraordinary piece of land that sits between two major parks: Flinders Chase National Park and Kelly Hill Conservation Park. This land represents a once in a lifetime opportunity to bridge a gap and create a continuous coastal conservation corridor at the south-western end of the island. This is a significant and strategic addition to the state's reserve system.

It is anticipated that the land will be formally added to the Flinders Chase National Park later this year, with the concurrence of the parliament. The purchased land is largely undisturbed intact mallee and coastal heath vegetation that provides habitat for a range of threatened species, including the western whipbird, the rock parrot, the osprey and white-bellied sea eagles. This purchase will allow the integrated management of continuous land parcels across a number of parks and reserves, including fire management. It will also provide opportunities for recreation and tourism, supporting

business opportunities, from small operators through to medium operators, through the adjoining of the Southern Ocean Lodge at Hanson Bay.

So, I think I have outlined again very clearly why this was a strategic purchase and why the government welcomes the adoption of this piece of land into our national parks system on Kangaroo Island. It doesn't come up very often that we can actually join discontinuous pieces of national park with a corridor such as this, and it was worth the price.

HANSON BAY

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:54): The reason I asked the question, minister, was: why did you pay \$500,000 more than the valuation that you had received unless, of course, you had subsequent valuation advice closer to the date of purchase?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:54): Mr President, I just explained to the honourable member why this was such a strategic purchase and why we were prepared to pay that price. It will never come up again in my lifetime, probably, such a key purchase to join two national parks in a key part of our state, a key part of our tourism offerings, and I just cannot believe the honourable member does not see the obvious value in purchasing that piece of land.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question about the state's unemployment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: South Australia has the highest unemployment rate on the mainland after a disastrous jump in the unemployment rate from 6.2 per cent to 6.8 per cent, with the loss of 4,500 jobs in May. Since the last budget, almost 20,000 jobs have disappeared from South Australia. In particular, the unemployment rate in the Mid North of South Australia is now dangerously high at 9.6 per cent, having been 5.8 per cent only 12 months ago. Equally concerning is the youth unemployment rate which has leapt from 11.4 per cent to 16.9 per cent. Since the Labor government promised 100,000 new jobs in 2010, South Australia has actually 800 fewer jobs and an extra 18,000 unemployed. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the government stand by the promise it made in the lead-up to the 2010 election that it would create 100,000 new jobs by February 2016?
2. Can the minister advise why the government has led regional unemployment figures to a dangerous level of 9.6 per cent?
3. What measures does the minister have in place to address the skyrocketing youth unemployment rate which is now at 16.9 per cent?

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) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. Indeed, South Australia does face significant challenges and they reflect in our employment capacities. We have seen South Australia be confronted by a drop in GST revenue and the after-effects of a global financial crisis. We have seen Holden's announcement to cease its operations. We are the oldest population on the mainland and as people reach retirement age we need to ensure obviously that we replace those skills. We have also got an economy that is heavily reliant on a traditional manufacturing sector and we know that that has and continues to face very tough times. All these things are placing a strain on our economy.

However, the resilience of our economy will improve as we continue to roll out our plan, our strategies, to diversify our economy, advanced manufacturing, premium food and wine from a clean environment, and exploration of new mining and energy resources. We have seen exports reach record levels. More than \$12.3 billion in the 12 months to April 2014. Year on year growth in South Australia at 14 per cent was the highest across Australia. We do not hear the Liberal opposition talking about those figures.

In terms of nominal trend retail turnover, there has been a very positive growth in the past 13 months. In value terms trend nominal retail turnover remains close to record levels of \$1.49 billion. We have seen new dwelling approvals up 23 per cent through the 12 months to April 2014, the second highest in the nation. This compares to a national growth of 15 per cent so, again, we are 23 per cent, national growth is 15 per cent.

There are some positive signs in construction work, up more than 20 per cent. We have a jobs plan to stimulate the economy, to encourage investment, grow business and build a skilled workforce. Our job plan has key actions aimed at securing the future of the state's manufacturing sector and helping to diversify our economy. We announced a number of initiatives at election time: the acceleration and transformation of our manufacturing sector, significant infrastructure projects that will create jobs, the creation of a new jobs accelerator fund, retraining displaced automotive workers when that occurs, helping to transition the automotive supply businesses into new markets, and particularly supporting the northern suburb communities to generate local activity and jobs.

In terms of business, we have developed detailed plans for jobs and supported this through a raft of other measures to help grow businesses. We support business growth with investment through things like payroll tax concessions, reforming WorkCover, building a skilled workforce, providing for more help to businesses to win government work and also supporting skilled migration. All of this is obviously delivering a very clear message to business and investors that this state is open for business and that this government welcomes new investment in jobs.

We see the Liberal opposition talk down this state every single day. Every single day, we see them talk down South Australia, and we know how damaging that is. It erodes consumer confidence, it erodes business confidence and it erodes investors' confidence. So that is what the Liberal opposition do when they keep talking this state down. We do have challenges, and this government does not resile from addressing those, but we will not be party to just talking this place down.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens, could he listen to the minister, please.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: For instance, look at the businesses that are choosing to invest here in South Australia. We see that minister Mullighan recently announced that the South Road upgrade is likely to create around 850 new jobs. We see that Leveda disability service has recently announced that they will need to increase their workforce by around 230 over the next two years. We see the US retail store Costco planning to open three stores—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Costco, goose.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Costco, I beg your pardon, to open three stores—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable minister, can you sit down please. I just heard one of the honourable members call the minister a goose. I would like to hear the honourable member withdraw that.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable minister.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Thank you, Mr President. We also see Costco investing some \$50 million, creating around 300 retail jobs with about 30 corporate positions, and I understand the first store at Kilburn is expected to open this November. We see Aldi investing, Masters investing, Brickworks Marketplace investing (800 jobs anticipated out of that project), BP Australia investing, Caltex (an 85 million-litre fuel storage terminal), Coles (additional stores are creating 100 new jobs in Gawler), Jetstar trebling its workforce, On The Run expansion to create an anticipated additional 200 jobs, Hewlett-Packard bringing 400 high-end IT jobs to South Australia, Hills—the list goes on and on.

So although the opposition might like to dwell on where the challenges lie, as I said, we do not resile from working hard to develop initiatives and programs to address those challenges. We will not be party to the Liberal approach, which is talking down this state, bagging this state, undermining consumer confidence, undermining business confidence and undermining investors' confidence.

COMMUNITIES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION DEPARTMENT SCREENING UNIT

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion a question regarding relevant history checks for volunteers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: The government has announced in recent days a \$1.3 million spend on the screening unit to deal with the dramatic increase in applications for mandatory background checks for volunteers and jobseekers. It has been reported that applications have surged by some 66 per cent and, due to insufficient funding and infrastructure within the screening unit, security clearances have been delayed in some cases for several months.

This is not an unknown phenomenon. Yesterday, it was reported in *The Australian* that Western Australia's Department for Child Protection has also taken too long to process checks for those working with children. A report tabled in parliament found alarmingly that some 80 per cent of applications being processed at the end of March had not been screened. Obviously, this is not a situation that South Australia wants to endure.

Currently in South Australia there is no offence for someone who is working without having their relevant history screening. As the act stands, the requirement falls upon the responsible authority to ensure checks are undertaken, but no personal responsibility falls on the individual, who may work without clearance. Sole traders and those in partnerships may well fall outside our legislative framework as well. There is, however, provision within the Statutes Amendment (Assessment of Relevant History) Bill, which requires sole traders and those operating in partnerships to undergo relevant history checks, and this has yet to commence. My questions are:

1. When will the section 8BA provision relating to sole traders or partnerships commence?
2. How many sole traders or partnerships does the government expect will be caught under this provision and therefore required to undergo screening?
3. How much additional funding has the government dedicated to the screening of sole traders and partnerships to ensure that South Australia does not end up in a screening crisis that is similar to that seen currently in Western Australia?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for his most important question, which belongs in the portfolio of the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. As it happens, however, I have some documentation in front of me which may answer part of his questions at the very least. I am advised it is the government's responsibility to protect vulnerable members of the community—obviously. That the community expects this of us goes without saying, and we take this responsibility very seriously. This means that, depending on the role that they perform and the sector that they work in, employees and volunteers may require a screening check from the department's screening unit (Department for Communities and Social Inclusion).

From 1 July 2014, there are new requirements and regulations under the Disability Services Act 1993 in relation to screening requirements for people working in funded disability services. I am sure everybody in this chamber will agree that it is our duty of care to ensure these vulnerable groups are afforded a very high level of protection. From 1 July there has been an increase in the fees for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion's screening services. As a result of increasing costs associated with conducting these important checks in line with increasing community expectations, the nature and scope of the screening process has changed, making it much more complex and therefore somewhat more expensive.

The 2014-15 budget included increased appropriation to the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion of \$1.3 million. This ensures the impact of fee increases on volunteers is minimised, as well as enabling important service improvements, such as online application processes, that will benefit applicants. New fees have been introduced as of 1 July 2014 to ensure that the fees more accurately reflect the costs of conducting an assessment. The fees have been increased, I am advised, to \$99.55 (GST inclusive) for child-related and disability services

employment screening for paid employees, \$82.50 (GST inclusive) for all other forms of screening for paid employees, and \$55 (GST inclusive) for all forms of screening conducted for volunteers and students on placement.

Where an employer requires more than one type of check, they will now be charged for each check. Volunteers will only be charged once. The government will subsidise the cost of conducting these volunteer checks through additional appropriation to the screening unit. Screening checks, I am advised, are valid for three years. The time taken for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion screening unit to process a screening application depends on the relevance, complexity and the amount of information requiring assessment.

Where no relevant information is identified, the turnaround time for processing an application, I am advised, is approximately 20 business days. Names which register as a match on any of the databases assessed by the screening unit may require additional time beyond the 20 days to process. From the period 4 November 2013 to 16 May 2014, an average of 84 per cent of applications were processed within 20 days of receipt. The remainder required further investigation and assessment. If further assessment is required, an application may take more than eight weeks to process, and these time frames are disclosed on the DCSI website, I am advised.

It is not possible to directly compare these time frames with other jurisdictions due to differences in respective legislative obligations and procedures, differing from state to state. It should be noted though that child-related employment checks undertaken by the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion's screening unit assess a wide range of available information in Australia, not only criminal history information. This supports child-related employment screening as an essential mechanism in protecting South Australia's children and young people from harm. The government makes every effort to fully investigate all relevant matters pertaining to applicants for child-related employment screening.

APY LANDS, RENAL DIALYSIS UNITS

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:09): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation questions about renal dialysis on the APY lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I asked the minister a question on this issue on 6 May and he referred to the Central Australian Renal Study which recommended a hub and spoke model with a base in Alice Springs. It also mentioned that Anangu are mobile across the state, rendering homelands-based services redundant. An Ernst & Young report released in February for Western Desert Dialysis, which runs The Purple House in Alice Springs, also recommended a hub and spoke model for this base in Alice Springs. It also recommended supporting people to remain on country and that services be introduced to allow this to occur, rather than forcing people to Alice Springs, Port Augusta or Adelaide.

Western Desert Purple House already runs permanent dialysis in the following communities: Kintore, Yuendumu, Ntaria and Lajamanu in the Territory, as well as Warburton and Kiwirrikurra in Western Australia. These act as permanent spokes, as referred to in the reports. The purple truck cannot act as a permanent spoke, given its temporary nature.

Liberal Party policy, developed in consultation with The Purple House, would station permanent beds on the lands, ensuring that Anangu could remain on country. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the minister aware of the good work the Western Desert Dialysis/Purple House organisation does?
2. Given that the Liberal Party policy is consistent with the Central Australian Renal Study that he referred to in May, the Ernst & Young report, requirements of Western Desert Dialysis and, most importantly, the needs of Anangu, why won't he support it?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and his ongoing interest in this matter. As I have previously advised the house on many occasions, at the moment there are currently 23 people from the APY lands receiving dialysis in Alice Springs, Adelaide or Port Augusta.

Twelve of these people receive dialysis in Alice Springs, with 11 people receiving dialysis in South Australia, and nine of these based in Adelaide and two in Port Augusta.

The Australian government provided \$600,000 in funding to Country Health SA local health networks to build and fit out a renal dialysis truck for use in remote Aboriginal communities. The truck was completed in late December 2013 and delivered to South Australia in January 2014. Following an official launch and successful trial of the truck in Adelaide, the first trip was undertaken to Ernabella on the APY lands in March 2014, with five patients attending, I am advised. A further three trips to the APY lands have been scheduled, including Marla, Amata and Mimili. It is envisaged that the service may move to longer visits in communities, allowing patients to return to their home communities for a longer period of time.

Prior to the South Australian truck being built, a mobile dialysis truck was leased for the Northern Territory to provide these visits. Visits to Coober Pedy, Yalata and the Flinders Ranges will also be scheduled for 2014. I am told it is expected the truck will visit remote communities for approximately 16 weeks in the 2014 calendar year. However, this will be subject to the successful completion of the first four trips.

As I said, this expands services on the lands and expands services out to remote communities which would not otherwise have access to it, but any analysis of health needs on the lands needs to take into account where people prefer to be treated. The fact is that there is an absolute preference to come down to Port Augusta or Adelaide, because not only do they get their renal analysis treated but they come down with families and do other business while they are here.

The renal dialysis truck allows flexibility for people to be treated in places such as Coober Pedy, Yalata and the Flinders Ranges. A permanent facility, as suggested by the Liberal Party in its election policy, would remove this flexibility. I recall (and I do not have it at hand but will try to find it) a media discussion with the Leader of the Opposition in the other place, Steven Marshall, about this issue, and I recall him saying something to the effect of 'we will divert services from other areas to pay for this'. That would mean, I suspect, the services that are paid for in Coober Pedy, the services the state government pays for in Alice Springs and the services paid for the communities in Adelaide. You can't have it both ways.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: But, this is what the Leader of the Opposition didn't say. He didn't say that he would continue that existing funding. He didn't say that.

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

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the minister finish his answer.

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

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Dawkins.

The Hon. G.E. Gago interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: It seems that way. He didn't say that he will continue the services that are already provided and have a permanent service—he didn't say that at all. He said he would fund it by redirecting existing services.

APY LANDS, RENAL DIALYSIS UNITS

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:14): By way of supplementary question, is the minister aware of how much money is spent retrieving ill people from the lands who have returned home to the lands and ceased their treatment, and at an enormous cost taken back to Adelaide to be treated for dialysis?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:14): What we will not be doing as a government is replacing services in Port Augusta, Alice Springs and Adelaide with a service in Ernabella, which would mean less flexibility in Aboriginal communities, less flexibility for Anangu and worse health outcomes.

APY LANDS, RENAL DIALYSIS UNITS

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:14): I have a supplementary question. Is the minister suggesting that it is more difficult to get to one community on the lands than to relocate a whole family to Adelaide for dialysis?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:15): The honourable member, I am sure, knows better. The honourable member understands pretty clearly, I would have expected, that Anangu are a very remote but very mobile community. They don't stay on the lands all year round; they move around. If you want to put a fixed facility in Ernabella, you are going to have to understand that part of the community will not be there the whole year round, and we need to put services where they will be taking those services.

ADELAIDE CITY WI-FI PROJECT

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:15): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Science and Information Economy a question about the use of technology in creating a modern and vibrant city.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: The effective use of technology and innovation is important to our economy and to our community. Connecting people with businesses and entertainment and with each other is what makes a community vibrant and inclusive. I was once an adviser to the Minister for Science and Information Economy, and I was proud that the Labor government was in partnership with Adam Internet to build wi-fi technology to provide high-speed broadband where fixed line broadband was not available. I know that the technology has enabled thousands of families and businesses the opportunity to have access to fast broadband they would not otherwise have had. My question is: can the minister inform the chamber about a recent announcement to create a more modern and vibrant city?

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) (15:16): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and for his ongoing interest in this policy area. However, before I provide a response, I want to place on the record that this government has contributed \$5,000 to the foundation, and I do accept the Hon. Tammy Franks' apology for misleading this chamber when she said that we had provided no financial contribution.

I am pleased to inform the chamber that Adelaide has become the first capital city in Australia to provide large-scale, fast and free wi-fi in outdoor public places.

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I can't hear myself, Mr President.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I think that it is important that we allow the minister to answer this question in silence. I think that there are other members who want to hear the answer. The honourable minister.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Thank you, Mr President. We are the first capital city in Australia to provide large-scale, fast and free wi-fi in outdoor public spaces. This \$1.5 million investment means that anyone with a laptop, smart phone or tablet—shoppers, diners, workers, students and visitors to the city—can surf the net, send emails, post photos, do business on the go or promote Adelaide to the rest of the world.

Up to 200 new wi-fi locations, complementing an existing 100 locations already offered by Internode, are now active across Adelaide's main business district, including public areas, such as squares, the Riverbank district and the Central Market, along with parts of North Adelaide, with another 11 wi-fi locations to be completed over the coming months. So, we are continuing to roll that out.

Access to free wi-fi will help revitalise squares, laneways and streets as places for people to work, study and communicate with friends and relatives, making Adelaide a more vibrant place. We know that as many as 5,500 users are connecting to the AdelaideFree network at any one time, with some 30,000 unique users every day, and we are sure that those numbers will increase rapidly as people take advantage of the new free wi-fi connections. The quality of the service is comparable to mobile phone 3G and ADSL2+ home broadband services, with a guaranteed download speed of two megabits per second.

The network speed has been trialled successfully at some of Adelaide's biggest events, including the Tour Down Under in the city, and also the Adelaide Fringe festival, so we are very confident in our capabilities. In addition, 10 mobile access points are available to enable temporary coverage in the Parklands and are used to bolster coverage at major public events.

The AdelaideFree wi-fi network is an excellent example of cooperative partnership between the state government, the Adelaide City Council and Internode, which administered the connection sites. The network will enable the state government and the Adelaide City Council to develop smart services and applications, including things like parking meters, street lighting, waste management and environmental monitoring, and new ways to address security and also public safety. There are so many opportunities that this new capability opens up for us. There will be no ongoing cost to the state government to operate the network beyond the initial investment to set up the network infrastructure.

They have said that Adelaide is leading the way for the nation. In fact, other capital cities admire our model so much that I understand they are going to copy it. The AdelaideFree wi-fi network really does build our reputation as a smart city and a city where creativity and innovation thrive. I would also like to mention that as part of the launch of the AdelaideFree wi-fi network I had great pleasure in announcing the winners of the AdelaideFree wi-fi competition. The competition encouraged local app developers to submit ideas for apps that provide a meaningful service for users who interact with the AdelaideFree wi-fi network.

With these new apps, people now have more information about nearby attractions, restaurants, transport services and the like. The six winners received \$5,000 and a six-month mentoring service. Also, I would like to place on record my congratulations to the developers of the following apps. One is called Open in Adelaide by NextFaze and it tracks nearby shops, restaurants and attractions that are open in the city, anywhere and any time. Also, NextUp Adl, by Quentin Zervaas, is an app that quickly accesses when the next bus, train or tram is coming for the nearest stop along the route map. Tootz by Tootz is a location-based app that enables nearby businesses to advertise services and offers via push notifications to subscribers. Also, Around Adelaide by David Dennis offers location-based mapping directions and street views of Adelaide and details the best pubs, clubs and spots, and a range of different locations for people to socialise.

These apps can be downloaded through the iTunes store, and information about wi-fi locations can be found on the website www.adelaidefreewifi.com.au. It was wonderful to see a bunch of schoolchildren at the market at the time all using wi-fi. I went around and chatted with them and they were all absolutely delighted with the capability and they all remarked on the amazing speed capacity of the system at that particular location. I congratulate all those involved.

Personal Explanation

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INQUIRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:24): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: In question time today, the Minister for the Status of Women accused me of misleading parliament with regard to my assertions about how much this government has given to the Foundation to Prevent Violence against Women and their Children—and I say that slowly because the minister cannot remember the name of the foundation.

I interjected that it was a piddling amount that we had given them and the minister confirmed that by confirming that we have only given them \$5,000 when, indeed, it is \$1 million to become a member of the foundation—which the Victorian government, the federal government and the

Northern Territory government have all committed. They show that they put this issue front and centre.

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) (15:24): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: In question time today the Hon. Tammy Franks made an interjection when I spoke about this state government making a financial contribution to the foundation. Her interjection was, 'You know you have not.' I corrected her then and there on the spot, and said that no, in fact we had. She then asked how much and I have now provided that information. As I said, Mr President, I do accept her apology for misleading this place.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Now, look—

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:25): Mr President, I am sorry but I seek leave to make another personal explanation. I interjected that it was a piddling amount—

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted? Leave is granted.

The Hon. G.E. Gago: I heard you. You said, 'No you didn't.'

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I said, 'No, you didn't become a full partner.'

The PRESIDENT: I now call on members to make statements of interest. The Hon. Mr Kandelaars.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Mr President, I seek leave to make a personal explanation. I have had an injurious statement made against me and, under standing order 193, I have the right to have to have that corrected.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Is leave granted?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I will ask you, Hon. Mr Wade, to allow processes to occur without interfering. Leave is granted; go ahead.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: As I have said to the minister, my interjection was that you have not become a full partner of the National Foundation for the Prevention of Violence against Women and their Children—

The Hon. G.E. Gago interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, we need to hear the personal explanation.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: You could not even remember the name of the foundation, you could not remember the amount. To be honest, I thought it was only \$50,000 that you had given them but, in fact, it was even less; it was \$5,000. It is a piddling amount. That was my interjection. You should stand up for women—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Franks—

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: —and actually become a full member.

The PRESIDENT: Can you sit down for a second? These are not debates. A personal explanation is a personal explanation. I do not want debate. It turns this whole place into a sham. If any member steps up and seeks leave to make a personal explanation we should give them respect to do that unless the council decides otherwise. No debate, just a personal explanation.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Point of order, Mr President. Whether or not it is debate, the minister is to put her criticism through you as the Chair, not directly to the member.

The PRESIDENT: Point taken.

Matters of Interest

LIBERIAN MEN OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (15:27): On Saturday night I had the great pleasure of attending the fifth anniversary of the establishment of the Liberian Men of South Australia (LIMSA), representing the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, the Hon. Zoe Bettison. Zoe did make an appearance during the evening with her son Hugo, and this was greatly appreciated by those present.

The evening was also attended by other dignitaries from the Liberian and African communities, including Mr Mabok Deng Marial, chairperson of the African Community Council of South Australia, Mrs Annie Toe-Ketor, chairperson of the Liberian United Women's Association, and Mr Perry Pewee, chairperson of the Liberian Community of South Australia. Over 100 members of the Liberian community of South Australia attended the event, which is quite remarkable, given that the Liberian community here in South Australia is relatively small and made up almost entirely of refugees who have fled conflicts that have been taking place in Liberia for over three decades.

Liberia was the only American colony to be established in Africa, and was settled by freed American and Caribbean slaves in the early 19th century. They chose the name Liberia from the Latin 'liber', meaning 'free'. Liberia has 3.8 million people, who speak English as their official language as well as 29 African languages. There are also 16 ethnic groups that make up the Liberian indigenous population. The Americo-Liberians represent about 5 per cent of the population, and diamonds, iron ore, rubber, timber, coffee and cocoa are Liberia's major exports. Monrovia is the capital, and Liberia has a significant amount of Africa's rainforest. In July Liberia celebrates 167 years of being Africa's oldest republic.

Liberian Men of South Australia was established in November 2009. The group provides an opportunity for Liberian men to come together and discuss issues important to them, including their settlement in Australia, their families, and the Liberian community as a whole. The group describes itself as a role model and White Ribbon Ambassador for its community, with its aim to create awareness of the role men can play in stopping violence against women and girls. This is a very commendable role indeed. As a White Ribbon Ambassador myself, I know the importance of the role and LIMSA can rightly claim leadership in the African community in South Australia for raising community awareness around the issue of domestic violence and violence against women.

On another issue, during the evening it was fitting to reflect and celebrate the recent announcement of Mr Hieu Van Le as the next Governor of South Australia. This was most fitting, given the celebration of Refugee Week and its focus on leadership. As we know, Mr Hieu Van Le arrived here 37 years ago as a refugee. He arrived with little but brought with him a wealth of talent, many hopes and spectacular drive, as many refugees and migrants do. While he is an inspiration for the whole community, he is a particular inspiration for refugees and migrants in South Australia and, for that matter, the whole Australian community.

In 2010, LIMSA was involved in bringing 2,000 of the Liberian community from across Australia to Adelaide to celebrate at a national convention. The Liberian community of South Australia is hosting a convention again this year (this month, actually). This sort of leadership is a fabulous reflection of that community. I think the men of LIMSA who decided in 2009 that the men of South Australia's Liberian community needed to get together to discuss issues affecting them and the community showed great leadership. They had the vision and the drive and here we are, five years later, and their vision was spot on.

As a community, they have demonstrated leadership by taking on the White Ribbon Ambassador role. I would like to wish the Liberian community every success in the future and thank them for their community leadership.

AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION REFORM

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:32): The workings of the federation should be of the utmost importance to the members of this chamber, as well as those in the other place. It is for this reason that I rise to provide the chamber with comment on a recent initiative of the commonwealth government. On Saturday 28 June 2014, the federal Liberal government released the terms of reference for the white paper on the reform of the federation. The white paper will present the

commonwealth government's position on the federation. I commend the Prime Minister for this initiative.

I am also encouraged by the commissioning of this important body of work as it presents the first steps in an important journey to improve the manner in which our federal system now operates. I agree with those who advocate that the reform of federalism has become an economic imperative. The lines of responsibilities between the states and the federal government have become confused. However, I hasten to add that this is largely not the fault of the states but rather of the commonwealth and its ambitious bureaucracy which consistently seeks to overreach its constitutional mandate.

It is my view that the federal system provides us with significant social and economic benefits. I find that the call for greater centralisation to Canberra is misguided and I fear that if this school of thought continues unabated the people of this state will lose the precious franchise that sustains it and underpins our community. A federal structure accommodates and encourages choice and diversity. It encourages creativity and competition, as well as ensuring government initiatives meet the needs of affected communities.

At the same time, it ensures that unbridled power does not coalesce in the one place. We need only gaze on foreign shores to witness federations successfully serving their member states and citizens. Germany and Switzerland are leading examples. I also find it curious that we talk so casually of centralisation in Australia, when in the very place where our democratic traditions were first formed the leaders in that country have subsequently devolved powers from the centre to the capitals of Wales and Scotland.

There is a line of argument in the national conversation that centralisation automatically equals efficiency or delivers some other community benefit. Yet the recent experience with the commonwealth rollout of the home insulation scheme demonstrates that decision-making that takes place far from the people can have unfortunate and tragic results. This has never been more evident than during the testimony given by witnesses in the current royal commission into this issue.

Research has indicated that across the globe federations have outperformed unitary states in economic terms. The national debate, indeed the debate in this state, must be about leveraging the benefits of the federation, rather than defaulting to the lazy and largely unsubstantiated argument that centralised power delivers more to the citizen.

This is not to suggest that our federalism cannot be improved. Indeed, it is my hope that this new examination of the relationship between the states and the federal government leads to important reform that reduces duplication, clarifies responsibilities and builds a new structure for intergovernmental cooperation.

I am greatly encouraged by the views of a former Labor premier, the Hon. John Brumby, who recently delivered the 2014 Hamer Oration at the University of Melbourne on this issue. He challenged us all to think, discuss and debate how to best improve our current federation. He acknowledged that our federation has delivered a significant level of fiscal imbalance which undermines the ability of our governments to take real accountability.

He suggested the financial arrangements between the states and the commonwealth are in need of recasting, together with their respective taxation regimes. In other words, we need to better align roles, responsibilities and revenues. This is not to say, however, that horizontal fiscal equalisation is not appropriate within the extant relationships between the commonwealth and the states.

I am disappointed that the honourable member for Cheltenham in the other place, the Premier, has labelled the government's proposed reforms 'transparent nonsense' and commented that, 'We'll be trying to get rid of this doctrine that seems to have emerged about governments being sovereign in their own sphere.' I believe that all South Australians must stand together and fight for the future of their community. We must aspire to be self-reliant. We must fight for our state to have the freedom to grow and not allow us to be addicted to conditional federal funding and complicit with the compulsory compliance obligations that inevitably accompany any grant.

I reject the proposition that the states are simply subcontractors for the federal government. We are sovereign. We are the true engines of competition and innovation on our continent. My ideal for the federation is that it accommodates the desires and needs of all the many regions that make up our nation. This can only truly be achieved by vibrant, energised and prosperous states. I look

forward to the discussion and the debate that will accompany the white paper. I commend the federal government for this initiative.

MULTICULTURALISM

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:37): I recently had the pleasure of travelling to Virginia for a celebration commemorating the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the Hoa Hao Buddhist congregation. This is the first time that I have been invited to this particular event and, indeed, to any event within the Vietnamese community, so it was a real pleasure and privilege to get to know some new people, and I could not imagine being given a warmer welcome into that community.

I will admit that most of the proceedings were a little bit beyond me, mostly because I do not speak a word of Vietnamese, although it is definitely now on my to-do list to learn to do so, but with some help from the Hon. Mr Tung Ngo, as well as other members of the community, I managed to get by and learn some new things about the Vietnamese culture as well as Buddhism and hopefully make some new friends.

As I am sure many members would be aware, Buddhism is founded on ideals of self-awareness, self-improvement and gratitude, and I was certainly very grateful to be so warmly welcomed. Members will no doubt be aware that I am a strong advocate for the benefits of multiculturalism and am also a proud ambassador for Welcome to Australia, a community organisation seeking honesty and compassion in the often dehumanised asylum seeker and refugee debates.

It may seem a little odd to draw one simple community event into a wider debate such as this, but I think that now perhaps more than has been necessary in quite a long time it is important for all Australians to remind ourselves of the many benefits of multiculturalism and the importance of freedom of belief.

At a time when the federal government is placing more importance on funding chaplains in schools rather than secular counsellors and at a time when discussions about those who are seeking asylum in Australia or indeed those who have been lucky enough to find a new home here are often fed by fearmongering and untruth, it is important to fight for diversity and freedom.

I myself come from boat people as I suspect more than a few of us here in this parliament do. My biological father came over from England on a boat and that is how he met my mother. Were it not for this coincidence, I may not have had the opportunity to call myself Australian today. This is one of the many reasons that I am always mindful never to judge anyone on how they got here, but there is far more evidence to support the importance of multiculturalism than that little anecdote.

According to the Refugee Council of Australia, 65 per cent of our current enterprises are comprised of refugees from non-English-speaking backgrounds, compared with 35 per cent from English-speaking backgrounds. A good illustration of this entrepreneurial characteristic that refugee arrivals bring is also the *Business Review Weekly's* annual Rich 200 list. It reveals that five of Australia's eight billionaires were people whose parents migrated to this country as refugees, so they are hardly the dole bludgers that some people would have you believe they are.

Of course, diversity is not only important for our nation's purse but for its mind. Diversity opens us up to new ideas and experiences and calls on us to learn from each other and use the best of those learnings to build whatever we imagine to be a better society. I am a big believer in freedom of belief, religious or otherwise, and perhaps an even bigger believer in healthy debate, and I believe that many of the discussions that we as a society are currently having on these issues are far from healthy. This is because often while people are arguing about people jumping an imaginary queue or whether it is better to grow here or fly here, we are missing many opportunities to benefit from our different experiences and our shared humanity.

I would like to again thank the members of the Vietnamese Buddhist community for inviting me to their important event and, because it is an excellent example of peaceful multiculturalism, I hope to share this event with them again in the near future and I hope that we can all work together to build an Australia that we can all be proud of.

SUPPORT ACT

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:41): Premier Weatherill recently said, 'I wanted to shake up the City of Adelaide; creating a vibrant city to become one of our central strategic priorities for the

prosperity of our state.' He went on further to say, 'We wanted to do something to excite the CBD, and obviously we looked at live music to give it a lift.' In light of these comments and the importance that live music has in our vibrant city, I would like to bring the council's attention to Support Act Ltd, a benevolent music industry fund for career musicians and those important individuals who provide behind the scenes assistance.

This national organisation, often referred to as the heart and hand of the music industry, is a light in the storm for hardworking musicians who find themselves seriously affected by injury or illness and have no other means of assistance, whether it be financial help, counselling or rehabilitation. Originally the brainchild of John Bromell, Support Act came to fruition in 1997. Comprising 12 board members, the fund has a professional, experienced background upon which to stand, including leading industry bodies the Australasian Performing Right Association, Australasian Mechanical Copyright Owners Society Ltd, Australasian Recording Industry Association and the Phonographic Performance Company of Australia Ltd.

Support Act can provide assistance to any person who has dedicated the majority of their life to music in any number of categories, including but not limited to composing, performing, managing, journalism, writing, arranging, promoting, producing or supporting as crew. It is these behind the scenes folk who make so much of the magic happen for such little accolade or recognition. When one thinks of audio piracy, it is probably the headline artists' bank account that one would think suffers most, but many individuals make a living from the music industry and they are no less deserving of their livelihood.

Given the vast array of applicants, Support Act provides individually-assessed assistance in as practical a means as possible. Financial aid is limited to \$5,000 per artist and is paid directly to utilities and service providers; cash is not simply handed out. This ensures the system is used in the best interests of as many industry recipients as possible.

Every vibrant city has a live music scene; however, not every musician gets paid or is supported. Like most other industries, workers fall on hard times, hence the industry took responsibility by setting up Support Act. David 'Daisy' Day, a veteran of the Australian music industry and generous benefactor of the South Australian Music Hall of Fame that I will be speaking of, heads up Adelaide's arm of Support Act. Backed by a team of local industry enthusiasts, David and the Support Act crew work hard to raise money and awareness for industry professionals who are in need of support.

I would urge all honourable members who come across functions and performances promoted by this group to attend and support such an integral part of our local and national music industry. The promotion, encouragement and help provided to people who dedicate their lives to creative and passionate causes in spite of challenges and hardships certainly deserves to be acknowledged and nurtured.

It is on this note that I wish to bring to the council's attention another local hero in the South Australian music industry, Mr Enrico Morena. A professional drummer since 1978, Adelaide-based Enrico has performed, toured, recorded and taught master classes and workshops in 45 different countries around the world. His scope of experience and talent is phenomenal, including concert, workshop and music diplomatic tours of Central Asia with the British Council, and cowriting credits for music used in two Hollywood films. Enrico is currently touring, playing and recording with esteemed Australian artists Kate Ceberano, John Schumann, the Brewster Brothers, Swanee and the Baker Suite.

Earlier this year Enrico came up with the idea of the Adelaide Music Collective (from here on referred to as the AMC), an invite-only collective of Adelaide artists and associated professionals with a large pool of experience both nationally and in some cases internationally. The AMC's aim is to cooperate as a collective of respected industry professionals who network in a spirit of egalitarianism, facilitating access to knowledge and resources, to drive the development and recognition of Adelaide as a musical hub of similar stature to Austin, Nashville and Seattle, and to establish links to Adelaide artists based interstate and abroad.

The AMC's upcoming event on 11 July was to see a performance by Jim Keays of the Masters Apprentices followed by his induction into the hall of fame, but as members may be aware, Jim sadly passed away at the start of this month. His daughter Holly will be accepting the accolade on her father's behalf, joined by the remaining original band members. It is unique individuals like

Enrico who are not afraid to bring the world's attention to Adelaide and who are prepared to share their knowledge, gifts and enthusiasm with others who are truly responsible for reigniting the spark in Adelaide's live music scene.

POLLUTION LICENSING

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:46): Last month the annual release of figures under the National Pollutant Inventory was a wake-up call to many South Australians. As members might know, you can search the National Pollutant Inventory by company, suburb or postcode to find out what are the emissions of companies in your area. What we find when we look in South Australia is that some of the biggest polluting companies are ones that we have known about for some time. Clearly, we have the power stations at Port Augusta and the lead smelter at Port Pirie. The steelworks at Whyalla has been a frequent flyer, although that appears to be on the improve, which is good. When it comes to Port Adelaide, we see that Adelaide Brighton Cement, despite all the attention that has been paid to that company in relation to its pollution over the years, has gone from bad to worse.

I will just quote four particular pollutants. If we look at the figures, we see that when it comes to oxides of nitrogen, over the last four years they have gone up 12 per cent. Particulate matter of size 10 microns or less—the so-called PM10s—have gone up 59 per cent. PM2.5s, which are smaller particles, have gone up 175 per cent, and sulphur dioxide has gone up 289 per cent. What we see in Port Adelaide is that the figures from that particular plant are getting worse and worse. Those percentage increases that I have quoted are from the year 2009-10 up to the year 2012-13.

We know that heavy industry in Port Adelaide is one of the main barriers to the revitalisation of the Port and to the construction of new housing. For example, the location of the Incitec Pivot fertiliser plant effectively killed dead the redevelopment of Dock 1. The government has now negotiated for that plant to be moved, which is a good thing for the revitalisation of the Port, but we still have problems with companies such as Adelaide Brighton Cement.

The problem with pollution in Australia generally is that it is little known that it is a major killer of Australians. A report that came out just a month or so ago from Environmental Justice Australia shows that each year 3,000 Australians are killed prematurely by pollution, and it will be no surprise that most of those people are from disadvantaged and low socioeconomic backgrounds. That is 3,000 avoidable deaths per year caused by pollution. So, when it comes to the regime for pollution licensing in South Australia, we know it is the Environment Protection Authority that is responsible. When we look at the licence to pollute issued to Adelaide Brighton Cement, we see that it is a 10-year licence that is not due to expire until 2017.

In addition to the licence there is also an exemption, because the EPA recognises that, in some circumstances, that company will never achieve acceptable pollution standards, so they are given an exemption so they do not have to comply with those standards. The problem with the EPA pollution licensing regime is that, apart from the very first time a company is given a licence when public consultation is called for, at every subsequent stage in the process, at every renewal or revision of the licence, there is no obligation on the part of the EPA to consult with affected communities.

So, the Greens are calling for the EPA to review the Adelaide Brighton Cement licence as a matter of urgency. We ask them to involve the community in that review, even though, under their act, they are not legally required to. We believe they should do it, because the community of Port Adelaide is the main stakeholder in relation to pollution from the plant.

Finally, we would ask that the state government revise the Environment Protection Act to make it a legal requirement for consultation on pollution licence reviews. It is not good enough for a company to be given a 10-year licence to pollute and for the community to have no say in what the conditions should be under that licence.

SANT BALBIR SINGH SEECHEWAL

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:51): Today it is with great pleasure I rise to pay tribute to a living legend, an eminent eco-activist and a religious guru based in Punjab, India. I remember Wednesday 21 May 2014 being a wonderful day to have the great honour to welcome an inspiring spiritual leader, Baba Ji—Sant Balbir Singh Seechewal from India to Parliament House in South Australia. As a form of great respect (and for the benefit of Hansard) I will refer to this spiritual guru from now on as Baba Ji.

In the age of gurus and babas, Baba Ji preaches a different kind of message: protecting the environment through personal example, spiritual leadership and sustained community work. I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to Robbie Benipal, CEO and founder of Raabta Radio, a respected member of Adelaide's Indian community, for arranging this wonderful meeting. I was delighted to also meet with Mr Balbir Singh Billing from the Supreme Court of India and Punjab and Haryana High Court, as well as Mr Sukhjinder Pal Singh, Managing Director of Hope International. These distinguished gentlemen accompanied Baba Ji during his visit to Australia.

Baba Ji rose to international fame due to his prominent work in multiple fields in preserving environmental pollution, planting trees in wastelands, installing underground sewage systems in villages and towns, building roads and bridges in remote areas, establishing schools and colleges for the poor and needy and, most importantly, he is renowned for his contributions and leadership in purifying the 160 kilometres-long river, Kali Bein (the holy place where Guru Nanak received enlightenment).

Cleansing the Kali Bein River was a true and unique environmental success story. Like many rivers in India, Kali Bein over the years was turned into a filthy drain into which six towns and more than 40 villages emptied their waste. In 2000 Baba Ji, a Sikh holy man, was troubled by the state of the historical river and that human insensitivity was the cause for this toxic and deteriorating state. He therefore set out to clean up the mess. Drawing on the Sikh tradition of *kar sewa*, which translates into 'voluntary service', he and his followers empowered locals to clean the Kali Bein River, enlisting volunteers to do the physical work and raising funds for equipment.

At the height of this movement, people from more than two dozen villages were pitching in, averaging almost 3,000 volunteers per day. The scale of the task was remarkable. Volunteers cleared the entire riverbed of polluted water channels and built riverbanks and roads alongside the river. Some villages revived traditional methods of waste disposal and treatment, and farmers lined up for a share of the treated water.

The Kali Bein River is now at the forefront of religious and social activities, especially during World Environment Day. Also, the health of the river has brought prosperity to farmers and to the agricultural industry in India. In 2004, the former president of India, Dr A.P.J. Abdul Kalam, recognised Baba Ji's achievement as 'one of the nine great technological achievements in the country'. He acknowledged Baba Ji's community project of the Kali Bein in more than 35 of his national and international speeches and said that the Holy Bein project was ample illustration of the fact that religion can be an extremely effective means of preventing river water pollution through self-reflection, personal responsibility and community leadership.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Baba Ji for his amazing movement and ongoing campaign, which restores hope and faith in common people to achieve what was deemed beyond the competence of governments and larger organisations. Thank you, Baba Ji, for your outstanding contribution to the environment, humanity, education and health. Honourable members, I hope that you will join with me to acknowledge Baba Ji and his team in this parliament today.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:56): I rise to express my very deep concern about the changes proposed to the current commonwealth racial discrimination legislation by the federal Attorney-General, the Hon. George Brandis QC. As a new member of this parliament, I am here to devote my best efforts to serving the interests of our community, one of the most peaceful and harmonious multicultural communities in Australia and, arguably, the world.

The Hon. Kelly Vincent has just spoken about the importance of different cultures working together. It is because of my commitment to those best interests that I feel compelled to publicly express my deep alarm about and complete disagreement with the terms of the exposure draft of the Freedom of Speech (Repeal of Section 18C) Bill 2014, lately released for public comment by the federal Attorney-General.

It is my view that the changes proposed for section 18C are unnecessary as our present legislative scheme works well. In fact, the legislation as it currently stands has enjoyed bipartisan support for more than 40 years. If these changes are enacted, they will send a very dangerous indication to minority elements in our society that freedom of speech can encompass words of hate and that bigotry is sanctioned by our government and our society.

The negative ramifications of the repeal of section 18C have been widely canvassed. I agree with these analyses, but it is my view that changes to section 18D, which would become subsection (4), are equally dangerous. Section 18D specifically exempts from sanction conduct which has been carried out reasonably and in good faith for particular and specified purposes, including the making of fair and accurate reports or a fair comment on an issue of interest to the public if it is an expression of a belief genuinely held by the commentator. Basically, it seeks to balance section 18C's objectives with acknowledgement that there exists freedom of expression.

By contrast, the exposure draft broadens the exception so that, essentially, words, sounds, images and writings that are communicated as part of involvement in public discussion on any 'political, social, cultural, religious, artistic, academic or scientific matter' are exempt from the requirement that they be 'reasonable' or made 'in good faith'. Given this, it is hard to see how the protections could operate at all in the public domain.

Recently, submissions have been sent to Senator Brandis by Salisbury council and my former council, the Port Adelaide Enfield council, opposing the proposed changes. I commend these councils for taking a principled stand, and I concur with their views. I encourage other councils around the state and, indeed, Australia to do the same in opposing these changes. I urge the federal government to withdraw this bill.

Motions

STATUTORY OFFICERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (16:01): I move:

1. That this council—
 - (a) notes Message No. 9 from the House of Assembly of 6 May 2014 advising of the appointments to the Statutory Officers Committee of the Hon. M.J. Atkinson, Hon. J.R. Rau and Mr Wingard;
 - (b) notes section 21(2)(e) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 which states 'A person ceases to be a member of a committee if the person...becomes a Minister of the Crown'; and
 - (c) invites the House of Assembly to reconsider the appointment of the Hon. J.R. Rau, Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development and Minister for Industrial Relations.
2. That a message be forwarded to the House of Assembly conveying this resolution.

I have moved this motion to make sure that we stick to the rules and the intent of the Parliamentary Committees Act. It is my understanding that the act states, 'A person ceases to be a member of a committee if the person...becomes a minister.' My understanding, I think, is that the government is trying to argue that, because he was already a minister in a legal and technical way, he is still eligible to be on the committee because he has not become a minister while he was on the committee.

In this case, of course, the Attorney-General will be providing recommendations to that committee as to who the new ombudsman should be. As you would know, Mr President, we appoint the Statutory Officers Committee whenever there is a vacancy for an ombudsman, auditor-general and those types of government appointments, and always in the past members on that committee are not ministers.

Minister Rau, I note, in a response to the issue being raised by Sheradyn Holderhead of *The Advertiser*, said, 'No member of the opposition raised this in the House of Assembly when the appointments were made on the first day of parliament.' It is a bit interesting and a bit cute, Mr President. You have been a minister and had the pleasure of it and, as you know, you have a team of advisers. You have a whole department behind you. Minister Rau is saying that not one person in his office or in the department has ever read the Parliamentary Committees Act to know that this could have been a problem. I find it hard to believe, with the resources of government, that they had not actually checked exactly what the Parliamentary Committees Act says.

I think it is important that we acknowledge it is totally inappropriate for a member of cabinet to be on the committee because these officers are supposed to be independent. They are not actually government appointments, they are appointments of the parliament, and they are obviously meant to be independent. I do not want to prolong things today because I know we have a very extensive

schedule of private members' business today, but I would indicate that I will bring this to a vote on the next Wednesday of sitting. It is just a simple motion.

I suspect it may well be that they have already met and selected an ombudsman, but I would ask the government to reconsider their position—they have another sitting day tomorrow—and to amend that committee appointment. It would be very simple for them to do so over the next couple of days—tomorrow, especially—so that this anomaly does not continue and that we have a truly independent committee to appoint our next ombudsman.

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

WHITE RIBBON DAY

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (16:05): I move:

That this council recognises White Ribbon Day and encourages all men to swear an oath to never commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women.

In moving this motion I note that the member for Stuart in another place will also, in the near future, move exactly the same motion (as I understand it) about White Ribbon Day, and I acknowledge that, like myself, he is an ambassador for White Ribbon. I also put on record that the member for Stuart also recently moved a motion in the House of Assembly recognising Domestic Violence Month.

White Ribbon is a male-led campaign to end violence against women. The vision of the campaign is that all women should live in safety, free from violence and abuse. The organisation came to Australia in 2003 after starting in Canada in 1991. I suppose the establishment of the organisation was a response to the 1989 massacre at Montreal University, where one male attacker killed 14 female classmates.

The organisation runs as part of United Nations Women through the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, and White Ribbon Australia is a registered company under the Corporations Act 2001. Members of the White Ribbon board are independent, non-executive directors who volunteer their time and skills to the organisation.

The meaning of White Ribbon certainly does not imply purity or perfect relationships, but instead a perfectly clear belief that violence against women is unacceptable. White Ribbon observes, and asks its ambassadors to observe, the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women on 25 November each year. I think, sir, that you and many others know that the response to the celebration of that day has lifted enormously in recent years, and proceeds from White Ribbon Foundation merchandise sales go towards high impact media campaigns aimed at changing community attitudes.

My first involvement with White Ribbon was when I went to a briefing at Hindmarsh a number of years ago along with my colleague the Hon. Mr Wade. I acknowledge the fact that two of the hosting members at the function that evening were the Hon. Mr Gazzola and the Hon. Mr Hunter. As a result of that briefing I became further involved and became an ambassador for the White Ribbon campaign in 2008.

In the nomination form that I filled out I said that I am passionate in my opposition to violence against women and am able to convey that message in my work right around South Australia. I think that is something that all of us in this place can do. It is certainly something that we need to talk more about and, in common with my passion of talking about suicide in the community, I think the reality is that domestic violence is something that, unfortunately, we have, on many occasions, turned a blind eye to and that is not something we should continue at all. We need to make sure that we get the message out there that we do not condone violence against women and we also do not condone silence about violence against women.

As well as the annual breakfasts on White Ribbon Day, the Men in the Mall events have grown in popularity. Certainly, myself and a number of others at those events have signed a pledge to not condone violence against women. There are many other ambassadors for White Ribbon in this parliament now and I was pleased last year to sign a nomination form for the Leader of the Opposition, Steven Marshall, and I know that many other colleagues on all sides of parliament are involved.

While it is a group of men being ambassadors for this message in the community, of course there is great support from women for this work, particularly through a number of women's organisations. Zonta International is highly involved in that work and one of the earlier functions I went to after becoming an ambassador was run by the Zonta Club of Gawler. So, I congratulate those groups for the support they give to White Ribbon Day and their encouragement for men. I must say that many more much younger men have been signing up as ambassadors in recent times, and I think it is very important that we get those younger men involved because they can put the message out to other younger men.

In conclusion, I will put some statistics about violence against women. Three-quarters of those who experience violence at the hands of a current and/or previous partner are women. Almost half of Australian adult women have reported experiencing violence. In women aged 15 to 44 intimate partner violence is the leading contributor to death. While these statistics can only rely on reported incidents, it is safe to assume the figures would be much higher if they included unreported violence against women. Almost 70 per cent of women assaulted by a male do not report the assault to police. In 2012 alone, it was estimated that 51,000 or more women aged 18 and over were victims of sexual assault, yet less than a third reported the event (and that was in Australia).

It brings us back to the fact that so many of these incidents are not reported or not spoken about in the community. We need to make sure that that changes. I commend all others who are prepared to be ambassadors for White Ribbon and to make sure that the message gets out into the community that violence against women cannot be condoned in any sense. I commend the motion to the council.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:14): I also rise to speak in support of the Hon. Mr Dawkins' motion, and I thank him for his ongoing leadership on social issues that are important to the lives of many South Australians. Violence against women affects us all: men, women and children. Men can take a stand and refuse to accept violence against women by taking the White Ribbon oath. As half of our community, the support of men and their influence as role models to young men and boys in ending violence against women is essential.

The community does look up to people in positions like ours, especially the young, so I think it is very important that we promote this day so that violence against women can be reduced or end. We are a government that has prioritised the prevention of violence against women. Changes to legislation in recent years have given additional rights and protection to victims of rape and sexual assault, and family and domestic violence. From early intervention work focused on preventing violence, through to community education and awareness and improving service responses to women experiencing violence, a Right to Safety reaffirms our commitment to reducing violence against women.

We have also introduced a target in South Australia's Strategic Plan to have a sustained reduction in violence against women and we have introduced A Right to Safety, the next phase of South Australia's Women's Safety Strategy. A fundamental part of A Right to Safety is the recognition that men can and must take a role to respond to and prevent violence against women. Men can be role models. They can show boys and young men how to live without violence. They can prevent violence from occurring where they can see or hear it.

A Right to Safety includes a focus on improving systems through the Family Safety Framework. This framework, as an initiative, endeavours to harmonise services to families most at risk of violence so they are addressed in a structured and systematic way, through agencies sharing information about high-risk families and taking responsibility for supporting these families to navigate the service system. The model contained in the framework has been so successful that it has been adopted interstate, with Family Safety Meetings being established in Alice Springs and a similar model proposed for New South Wales.

By completing the rollout of the Family Safety Framework and continuing the focus on A Right to Safety, we can keep on working towards ensuring South Australian women live free from violence. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (16:18): I too rise to support this motion and, in doing so, I think it is worth congratulating you, Mr Acting President, on bringing this motion to this house. I know that you are very passionate about a number of issues, and I hear from people who are involved in this area about your passion for this and also suicide prevention. If you can be known for a number of

things in your time in this parliament they are two very worthy things and I congratulate you on your work in those areas.

This is an area that has been important to me in my early life. In Mount Gambier my mum was a social worker and then administrator for the Mount Gambier Women's Shelter. Particularly in regional areas, where there is often less support around, domestic violence takes a massive toll on families and really excludes people from involving themselves in society as everyone else would have a chance to.

I am glad that the South Australian government has taken a strong stance on this issue and particularly on primary prevention. The establishment of the Violence Against Women Collaborations is one of the key strategic priorities for a strong stance on primary prevention, and given some of the underlying causes of violence against women, the primary purpose of the Violence Against Women Collaborations is to build community capacity to prevent and reduce the incidence of violence against women in local regions through cultural and attitudinal change within a community.

Each of these collaborations identifies the key issues and priorities in their own region. For example, the Western Adelaide Violence Against Women Collaboration held successful White Ribbon Day events in 2012 and 2014 and have now developed a relationship with Adelaide United Football Club and will work in partnership to deliver White Ribbon activities throughout 2014. The first activity was at the Adelaide United final home game on 4 April 2014. The game had a theme of White Ribbon and collaboration members attended, provided White Ribbon promotional materials and were able to talk to people attending the game.

Many other sporting clubs are doing commendable things in this area. Last year, I had the honour of attending the Port Noarlunga Football Club's White Ribbon round on 24 August, along with the now member for Reynell Katrine Hildyard and the federal member for Kingston. Before the A-grade game started, players and supporters all took the White Ribbon oath and also the club's Sit Up Stand Up Shout Out mosaic project was unveiled, where 10 local southern community groups had made mosaics about what they are doing in their community to stop violence against women. This is a great initiative by the Port Noarlunga Football Club and I congratulate all those involved and look forward to my continuing involvement in this event in future years.

The National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children, which was released in February 2011 following the endorsement of the Council of Australian Governments, is another important commitment that this government is involved in. The national plan brings together government efforts across the nation to make a real and sustained reduction in the levels of violence against women. The national plan was developed in response to the Time for Action report of the National Council to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children. The report made recommendations designed to tackle the unacceptable levels of sexual assault and domestic and family violence in Australia and to provide clear directions about helping Australian women live free of violence with respectful relationships in safe communities.

Women experience violence in public places, at work and at home. As part of its commitment to a safer community, the South Australian government believes we need strategic and comprehensive approaches to violence against women and to make the best use of resources to guide our future action. As has been stated by previous speakers, I encourage all men to take the White Ribbon Oath and to never commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.G. Wade.

Bills

EVIDENCE (PROTECTIONS FOR JOURNALISTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:24): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Evidence Act 1929. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:25): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill is identical to the one I introduced in the last session of parliament. Its purpose is to enshrine in legislation the fundamental principle that journalists should not be compelled to reveal their sources and equally, if not more importantly, better promote the notion of the public's right to information. In doing so, it will bring South Australia into line with other jurisdictions that have recently implemented similar pieces of legislation.

South Australia is now one of only three jurisdictions that have yet to pass shield laws. In 2011, the commonwealth also enacted the Evidence Amendment (Journalists' Privilege) Act. Victoria, New South Wales, Western Australia, Tasmania and the ACT have all enacted legislation similar to the federal legislation. I am very pleased that in the closing weeks of last session of parliament the Liberal Party also indicated their support for this legislation through the introduction of a bill by the Hon. Stephen Wade. I understand that this bill was also the subject of some community consultation.

Members will recall that the bill introduced by the Hon. Stephen Wade on behalf of the Liberal Party differed to my bill in relation to two or three matters. Those differences included the definition of journalist, the requirement that there be some form of agreement between a journalist and their source that the information disclosed is to be treated as privileged, and lastly whether or not the jurisdiction of the bill ought to extend to the Independent Commission against Corruption.

Other than that, both bills were, and indeed are, very similar, certainly in so far as their intent. I am confident a reasonable compromise can be struck in relation to the variances between the two bills and I look forward to the Liberal Party's continued support on this very important issue. I will not speak too much further on the bill today, but I will refer honourable members to my contribution of 20 February 2013, when the bill was first introduced, which provided plenty of background information and case studies.

Again, for those members who are interested, there have also been several parliamentary inquiries into this issue both at the national level and in other jurisdictions. I would urge honourable members to take the time to read the reports of those inquiries, which provide very useful background information.

In closing, there is no question that South Australian laws with respect to this issue are wanting. As I said when I first introduced the bill in 2013, the bill provides South Australia with the opportunity to create a fairer balance between ensuring the administration of justice on the one hand and upholding the public's right to know without fear of incrimination for journalists on the other.

I am grateful for the support of Right to Know, Free TV Australia and other media organisations which have been pushing for these reforms and look forward to working with them further on this very important issue. With that, I look forward to hearing the views of other honourable members on this important issue.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A.L. McLachlan.

EVIDENCE (JOURNALISTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.G. WADE (16:29): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Evidence Act 1929. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.G. WADE (16:30): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

On 20 February 2013 the Hon. John Darley introduced the Evidence (Protection for Journalists) Amendment Bill 2013. On 29 October 2013 the Liberal Party released its shield laws policy and on 30 October the Evidence (Journalists) Amendment Bill 2013 was tabled in the Legislative Council.

On 15 March the Liberal Party won a majority of votes on a two-party preferred count at the general election and a share of at least 90,000 votes larger than any other party. This bill is part of the agenda that the people of South Australia voted for. This bill is the same bill that I tabled on 30 October 2013, and my comments will be a reaffirmation of the comments I made at the time.

The Weatherill Labor government's commitment to secrecy over transparency is seen in a range of areas such as suppression laws, the secrecy of the ICAC and recent Ombudsman's findings in relation to the handling of freedom of information requests by the Weatherill Labor government. Labor has a highly controlling approach to the media, so much so that the name of a former senior Labor media adviser has gone into our urban dictionary as a word for an aggressive attack on a journalist.

But Labor is also more than willing to use the law to control the media. South Australia's suppression laws are more constraining than those interstate, and even when an independent judicial review commissioned by the government recommended winding back these laws Labor rejected that recommendation. The Liberal team is committed to an open society where a transparent public conversation is supported rather than suppressed. The Liberal team supports an open society through shield laws.

To maintain a healthy, open society we need a free media. Journalists and media outlets hold interest groups, companies and the government to account by publishing important information from a range of sources. Many of those sources risk their livelihood, even their safety, by exposing information in the public interest. As the leader of the state Liberal team, Steven Marshall, put it when launching the Liberal policy on shield laws last year:

People who alert the media to important public issues embody the core values of an open society.

If journalists are not able to provide those sources with an assurance of anonymity, it is likely that critical information benefiting the public will not be passed on. This damages public debate, it hides corruption, it undermines accountability and it fundamentally undermines the capacity for society to provide a safer, nurturing environment in which citizens can participate.

As a matter of law, Australian common law does not provide any protection to journalistic sources. While whistle-blower laws provide limited protection once a source has been disclosed, shield laws act to protect sources by protecting anonymity so that the source is not disclosed. Shield laws have been used internationally and around Australia to provide protection to people who engage journalists. As a matter of law, shield laws aim to provide protection to journalistic sources by suppressing their identity and providing journalists with confidential 'source to journalist' privileged communication.

As the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee said in its report on commonwealth shield laws:

Journalists' privilege operates not only to protect the privacy of the source and the relationship of trust between the journalist and the source, but also to protect public interests in the accountability of public officials, an informed public and the free flow of information, all of which are vital components of a democratic society.

As the Hon. John Darley indicated, shield laws operate in most other states in the commonwealth. South Australia still has no protections in place. Only the Northern Territory and Queensland are other jurisdictions which have not legislated to provide such protection.

If this bill becomes law, journalists will be compelled to reveal their sources only if the case fails the public interest test, that is, where the public interest in revealing information outweighs the potential detriment to the source, for example, if a journalist has information about a threat to public safety. For the Liberal Party, shield laws are not primarily about journalists; they are primarily about the protection of the public interest in a fair, accountable and transparent government and society.

Let me briefly outline how the bill would work. If a journalist has promised not to disclose an informant's identity, or if the journalist receives information in a context where such a confidence is implied, neither the journalist nor their employer could be compelled to answer any question or produce any document which would disclose the identity of their informant or which would enable the source's identity to be determined.

The privilege against disclosure of a source includes situations where a person is compelled to answer a question or produce a document that would disclose the identity of the informant or enable that identity to be determined. The court may, on the application of a party, compel the information be released on the grounds that the public interest and the disclosure of the evidence or identity of the informant outweighs any detriment to the source.

During the development of the bill that I have tabled today, the Liberal Party considered the existing provisions in other states. The commonwealth, New South Wales, ACT and Victorian provisions are worded in such a way as to require the journalist to promise to the source that they will not disclose the source's identity for the journalist then to be able to rely on the shield law.

Typical of these provisions is the provision in New South Wales that states that, if a journalist has promised an informant not to disclose the informant's identity, neither the journalist nor his or her employer is compellable to give evidence that would disclose the identity of the informant or enable that identity to be ascertained. The Western Australian and Tasmanian provisions require it to be shown that there is a protected confidence, protected identity or a document that records a protected confidence.

The bill the Liberal Party is tabling through me today does not require an explicit promise of secrecy from a journalist to their source for that information to be privileged. It can be the nature and circumstance of the communication that can determine that protection applies. It may be that the nature and circumstances of the communication are implied to be confidential and that would be respected under this bill.

The opposition warmly acknowledges the work the Hon. John Darley has done in what I would call the 2013 bill and again with the bill he has tabled today. It is significantly through his efforts that our shield laws are on the agenda of this parliament again. Whilst our bill differs from the bill of the Hon. John Darley in some respects, we share both his general approach and his commitment to strengthening our democracy. Certainly, I reciprocate the sentiments expressed by the Hon. John Darley in his remarks, that he, like we, will be looking to engage constructively. The differences are not fundamental, and we are keen as a party to find the best possible form of South Australian legislation. Like the Hon. Mr Darley, we are very keen to hear from other members of this council and to engage constructively to make sure that South Australia has the best law possible.

One significant difference between the bill of the Hon. Mr Darley and the bill I have tabled today is that the Liberal bill does not include a criteria of 'professional' in the definition of 'journalists'. In other words, it extends more broadly to other journalists, such as those operating as contractors and freelancers. This, we believe, is particularly important in terms of the increasing casualisation of the journalistic profession, particularly in some of the larger media organisations. This approach is the approach that has been taken in the commonwealth provisions. It also provides some futureproofing to the laws in the sense that they should be able to accommodate the changing nature of both news media and news organisations.

Media journalism and news dissemination are evolving at a rapid pace and increasingly rely on contributions from the public, ad hoc journalists and non-professional sources. Even established professional journalists often will blend their media sources such as where journalists use blogs and Twitter to comment on mainstream stories. It is not unusual now to find, shall we say, flash-outs of Twitter comments in amongst a mainstream story (and, of course, we know what a compulsive tweeter is the Hon. Tammy Franks). It is not yet clear how investigative journalism will evolve over the months, years and decades ahead but our bill, we believe, is even handed to journalists and journalism across the range of platforms on which they might operate.

Under current New South Wales law, a professional journalist who blogs at home or in a forum other than their workplace may not even be covered. We believe that the nature of your contractual relationship as a journalist, the nature of your workplace and the nature of the organisation in which you work should not provide limitations to your protection under the law. In fact, let me rephrase that—not your protection under the law, but the protection of your sources.

Secondly, unlike the bill of the Hon. John Darley which does not provide protection to journalists when their sources are being questioned by the ICAC, the Liberal bill does provide that same level of protection for journalists and their sources throughout. Of course, we have the highest regard for the ICAC. My party was the first alternative government in this state to support an ICAC. I acknowledge that the crossbenchers might have been working for it about 15 years before the major parties started working for it, but could I just say to the crossbenchers that at least we were seven years in front of the Labor Party.

The third differentiating element would be the issue which the Hon. John Darley has highlighted and which I have dealt with at length earlier in my contribution, that is, the fact that the Hon. John Darley's bill requires some element of a promise to a source to provide anonymity. As I

said before, the Liberal bill and the bill of the Hon. John Darley have a lot in common and both ensure that the protection cannot be circumvented by targeting journalists' employers.

The commonwealth, New South Wales, ACT and Victorian provisions all explicitly grant protection not just to the news provider but also to their employer. I appreciate how keen members of the parliament will be to ensure that, what do we call them, media moguls are provided protection under the law. Seriously, neither the employer nor the journalist, in our view, should be compelled to provide the name of the source unless ordered to do so by a court.

Often a journalist, in terms of progressing their story within their publication, will need to discuss their source with an editor or another representative of their employer and we do not believe that that sort of engagement should compromise the relationship of confidentiality with the source. Western Australian and Tasmanian provisions relate to the nature of the information and the means by which it is provided, so do not have a specific provision to cover certain classes of people or their sources.

The definition of 'journalist' in our bill covers anyone who is engaged and active in the publication of news. Proposed section 72B(5) of the bill also extends the protection to journalists' employers, people who engage the journalists under a contract of services, and also gives the capacity for other persons to be prescribed by regulation.

The Liberal Party believes that the bill before us represents a robust approach to shield laws and that they are an important step in supporting journalists in South Australia to meet their ethical obligations to protect their sources without fear of risking criminal sanctions to do so. These laws represent a clear contrast between the approach of the Marshall Liberal parliamentary team and the Weatherill Labor government.

Only yesterday we heard the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars put forward his view that the media should have to seek court approval to use recordings of people without their consent. Quite remarkably, the honourable member reflected on the ethics of local journalists by comparing their work to journalists who have faced trial in bugging inquiries in the UK. It is an outrageous comparison to make. If the honourable member is saying that the laws he is promoting are justified because on the other side of the world someone of the same profession committed crimes and, as a result, journalists here should be hit with some greater restrictions on free reporting—the greatest restrictions that the state has ever seen—then the Liberal Party will not be joining him in those calls.

The honourable member reflects the government of which he is a part, in failing to understand and support the ethical obligations of the journalistic profession. Further, he undervalues the moral imperative placed on journalists to expose abuse of public resources, to bring to light fraud, corruption, misappropriation and other forms of maladministration. These moral duties should not need to be given the green light from the judiciary or the government before they can be exercised. The laws being proposed by the opposition and the Hon. John Darley recognise and seek to protect these important journalistic ethics and these important duties.

When it comes to journalistic freedom, the hypocrisy of the government is astounding. The Premier has moved a motion to express concern at the plight of journalist Peter Greste while simultaneously moving to restrict media freedom and to refuse to protect the confidentiality of journalists' sources. It is one thing to pay lip service: it is another thing to act to support and defend a free media. The government continues to fail to act and, worse still, is seeking to restrict that freedom.

Under Steven Marshall's leadership the Liberal team will continue to advance the interests of transparency, openness and informed democratic debate through this bill and other initiatives. I commend the bill to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.M. Gazzola.

MARINE PARKS (SANCTUARY ZONES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 May 2014.)

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:48): The Greens will not be supporting this bill, which seeks to undo a number of sanctuary zones that are due to come into operation on 1 October. It is no secret that this bill can be described as a second bite at the cherry, or perhaps a last gasp attempt to try to modify the arrangements that were put in place after years of extensive community consultation.

The bill is clearly introduced by the honourable member at the behest of some elements in the commercial fishing industry who, if we are honest about it, do not like marine parks at all if it means there are any restrictions on where they can fish. I think we do need to be honest in this debate, what we are seeing is a last-ditch attempt to undo the work that has been done.

It is also no surprise to anyone that the arrangements that were developed were a compromise. It is probably fair to say that they made everyone unhappy. There were people, and I will add my name to their number, who do not think the legislation went far enough and we did not protect enough areas that were deserving of protection. Other people, such as the Hon. Michelle Lensink's constituents, thought that it was overly generous in the opposite direction. Everyone got less than they wanted.

Sadly, I cannot see this bill as anything other than part of an anti-environmental agenda on the part of the Liberal Party. I do not believe, in all honesty, you can say you believe in marine parks but undermine the very feature of those parks that protects the marine resources within them. I do not find that position internally consistent. If we look at the honourable member's Liberal colleagues in the federal parliament, it is like they say they believe in climate change and they then seek to undo absolutely everything that has been put in place to address it. You cannot have it both ways. Not to say that this government is perfect; I am not going to join that crowd. The cuts to the environment department have been a savage blow to conservation in this state. In relation to this bill, we just cannot support undoing the sanctuary zones that are yet to come into operation.

I know the Hon. Terry Stephens was keen for me to make a lengthy contribution so I will satisfy him in some way by putting on the record a couple of pieces of homespun philosophy that I have learnt in my lifetime of working in the conservation sector. The first one relates to how we should deal with protected areas, whether they be terrestrial or marine. The philosophy is very simple, it goes like this: easy in, hard out. In other words, we should make it as easy as possible to conserve areas for conservation and for the benefit of future generations and we should make it as hard as possible to undo those protections.

Easy in, hard out. That is exactly the approach that is taken in, for example, the National Parks and Wildlife Act in relation to the terrestrial environment. The government, the executive arm of government, can declare national parks but it takes the parliament to undeclare them or to shrink their size by altering their boundaries. It is a very sound principle of conservation—easy in, hard out.

The second bit of homespun philosophy is that, in my experience, decisions to conserve can be undone by future generations, but decisions to exploit very often cannot be undone. Also, the flip side of that coin is that if future generations decide that their grandparents (us) were overly enthusiastic about conservation and we protected too many areas then they can make that call, but they do not, they very rarely make those sorts of calls. Decisions to conserve are rarely regretted by future generations. What is regretted are decisions to miss opportunities and to fail to protect places that are worthy of protection.

This bill seeks to undo the environmental regime before it has even had a chance to come into operation. Depending on how the vote goes in relation to this bill we might get to the committee stage and we might go through park by park and we might need to test the evidence for each of the sanctuary zones to be undone, but as a matter of principle the Greens will not be supporting the bill at the second reading and we will not be supporting it at any subsequent stage either.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:54): I rise very briefly to speak on the Marine Parks (Sanctuary Zones) Amendment Bill. The bill identifies 12 out of 84 zones that are to be converted from sanctuary zones to habitat protection zones, effective from 1 October of this year. At the outset, I wish to place on the record that I do not oppose marine parks; that said, I continue to hold concerns over the issue of sanctuary zones.

Sanctuary zones have the potential to impact businesses generally, not just the fishing industry. Regions such as Port Wakefield, Hardwicke Bay and Port Moorowie, to mention a few, rely on holiday makers and fishing enthusiasts to survive. They are towns built on the back of fishing.

There is no question that fishing restrictions will have a huge impact on these businesses. The legislation will devastate townships like Port Wakefield.

Business owners cannot put their livelihoods on hold for five or ten years for a review. Once the damage is done, it cannot be undone. If these businesses go there is no question that the rest of the townships will follow. It is all well and good for the government to say that businesses in these districts can adapt to other opportunities like ecotourism, but not do anything constructive to help them achieve those goals.

A good example is at Port Wakefield where the government is already aware of an application for the construction of a marina development that will incorporate a retirement facility, commercial precinct and housing. As I understand it, roadblocks have been put in place by the Department of Environment every step of the way. I am advised that the comparisons of the economic impact that the Port Wakefield region is likely to face on an annual basis range between \$1.4 million and \$3.25 million. The \$1.4 million, which I understand is intended to persist over some 20 years, was the figure arrived at by EconSearch, which were contracted by the government to undertake an impact assessment of the region. The \$3.25 million was the figure arrived at by the fishing industry's own analysis.

I have to agree with the comments made at a recent briefing by Mr Bart Butson, a third generation fisher, that regardless of which figure is correct the loss of economic activity and jobs will be devastating to a small community with little wealth. It comes back to a whole-of-government approach. You cannot have the government espousing one thing and individual departments another.

The reality is not all businesses will be able to adapt to ecotourism. Not all businesses will be able to sustain the economic losses they are bound to be faced with. Businesses across the board are struggling to survive in today's economic climate as it is. We should not be doing all we can to seal their fate. There is absolutely no question that the issue of sanctuary zones is extremely vexed. Proponents and opponents of the government's legislation are equally critical of each other's position and there is very little consensus, in fact, they disagree on just about everything from scientific evidence and environmental impacts to the economic impacts.

The Hon. Michelle Lensink has been quite clear in her intent with this bill; that is, because of the way the legislation works she is unable to amend the zones themselves. The bill should send a clear message to the government that there is a problem with the boundaries and they need to fix it. I agree with her position entirely. For that reason, I will be supporting the bill.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (16:57): I will speak briefly today on the Hon. Ms Lensink's Marine Parks (Sanctuary Zones) Amendment Bill. I would like to thank the Hon. Ms Lensink for providing a briefing on her bill and for arranging a meeting with commercial fishing stakeholders, Wildcatch. I would also like to thank the office of the Hon. Ian Hunter, Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, for providing my office with comprehensive information about the proposed bill from its perspective.

Unfortunately I am unable to support the proposal at this time. Dignity for Disability believes that the small percentage of South Australian waters (6 per cent) that are now zoned marine parks do not need to be further scaled back. While the Wildcatch fishers told me they were reliant on parts of these zones for commercial fishing, I do not believe this can viably be the case at this point. Yes, some of the 6 per cent that are zoned marine parks contain very diverse and significant fish populations, but you would expect that to be the case.

We have to be proactive to protect our precious marine environment for our children, our children's children, and the generations that will follow that. Many conservationists and marine biology experts that advised on marine park zoning during the consultation process wanted up to 20 per cent of South Australian waters zoned as marine parks. I also understand that some 6,000 submissions were received and considered. There was clearly debate and there was compromise. We ended up with only 6 per cent of our waters zoned as marine parks.

If in 10 years we find that we do not need the scale of marine parks that we currently have, we can rezone, but to do so now is far too risky for our marine environment. We have already done untold damage to Gulf St Vincent through human activity since the English invaded the Adelaide

Plains some 180 years ago. I do not think that we should risk any further damage to our marine environment, so Dignity for Disability will not be supporting the bill at this time.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (17:00): The government strongly opposes this bill, and perhaps against my better judgement I congratulate the Hon. Mark Parnell on his comments. I was going to say I agree with much of what he says, but I suspect he is just agreeing with me before I say it.

The bill seeks to significantly reduce environmental protection provided by our state's marine park network. Under this bill, some of the most iconic sites and unique creatures and habitats in our state will be at risk. There is some irony in the opposition campaigning to weaken this environmental protection legislation, particularly given that marine parks were first proposed by the Liberal government more than a decade ago. In fact, the underlying principles guiding the development of marine parks in this state were established by the Liberals. Now the Liberal Party is seeking to undo more than a decade of work and choosing to ignore the science and years of community consultation, but perhaps this is not surprising given what we are seeing from their federal Liberal colleagues in this area.

Australia has the world's third-largest marine estate. It is larger than the Australian landmass and extends from the tropical seas of the north to the subantarctic waters of the Southern Ocean. The former Labor government proclaimed at the time the world's biggest network of marine reserves, protecting more than 2.3 million square kilometres of ocean environment on 16 November 2012. The network was designed to protect habitat necessary to support many of the world's threatened and endangered animals, including green turtles, blue whales and southern right whales, Australian sea lions and whale sharks.

The previous federal Labor government used the best available science, talked to the public over a number of years, made and revisited plans based on community consultation and delivered the world's most comprehensive marine reserve network, with only around 1 per cent impact on commercial fisheries. During the 2013 election campaign, the federal Liberals released a fisheries policy that has already had devastating implications for commonwealth marine reserves.

To implement this policy, in December 2013 the federal Liberal government announced a marine reserves review which they have stated will 'restore confidence in the Commonwealth marine reserve planning process'. This federal review is nothing but another blatant attempt by the federal Liberal government to conduct a relentless campaign of environmental vandalism. To facilitate the review, the commonwealth marine reserves were reproclaimed, which invalidated the management plan signed off by the previous Labor government, to have the effect of stopping exclusion zones that would have come into effect in July 2014, while keeping the parks and their boundaries.

The federal Liberal government alleges that its intention to create new management plans to protect the marine environment was based on what they say is 'science and...consultation with stakeholders and local communities'. The federal Liberal government and particularly its leader have demonstrated a track record of ignoring and demonising science, famously declaring the accepted science on climate change to be 'crap' and then deciding that science is of so little value and such an annoyance to their policy positions that they became the first government in generations to completely do away with a science minister. A similar attitude is behind this bill: trying to dismantle a historic, science-backed conservation initiative with mindless politics.

The commonwealth marine reserves were only established after an unprecedented consultation process. There were five rounds of consultation on marine reserves over a period of four years, including more than 250 public stakeholder meetings around the country, attended by approximately 2,000 people. I understand that more than 750,000 people participated in the public consultation process and provided feedback. Environmental groups are quoted in the media as being dismayed that the federal government has quietly removed management plans from the world's largest marine-protected area network.

The South Australian Labor government does not share the state and federal Liberal contempt for the marine environment. The South Australian Labor government recognises that, with balance, conservation and economic prosperity can coexist. The South Australian government is committed to protecting South Australia's unique marine environment. This government has committed to providing an extra \$1 million a year to ensure South Australia's network of 19 marine parks is effectively managed. This includes a doubling of the funding currently set aside for marine

park monitoring to \$750,000 and a doubling of the funding for habitat surveys and mapping in sanctuary zones to \$100,000 a year, as well as more money to collect and process data.

The \$1 million funding boost also includes new money to develop educational materials to promote the results of monitoring and targeted compliance activities in key monitoring locations. We want to protect our marine environment and we want to ensure this state has well-managed marine parks with effective monitoring and compliance programs. This is in stark contrast to the state and federal Liberals, who only want to rip apart the marine park network. That is just the tip of the iceberg.

The federal Liberals want to dump waste onto the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, a move that has attracted significant concern from the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and condemnation from environment groups. They also tried to delist more than 70,000 hectares of forest from Tasmania's world heritage area, a move that was rightfully rejected by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee. The federal Liberal government has embarrassed Australia on the world stage and now the state Liberal Party is seeking to do the very same. We strongly oppose these moves.

The opposition has strongly criticised the consultation process for the government's establishment of marine parks, but I understand that the proposed changes reflected in this bill result from very limited conversation with interested people. I am sure that the opposition will have trouble outlining their formal consultation process and I am sure it will be embarrassing compared to the years of consultation that this government has undertaken in arriving at the marine parks as they currently stand.

The government's consultation has been very extensive. The consultation steps have been covered in this place on numerous occasions. However, for the benefit of members considering this legislation, I think it is important to outline some of the key steps. In 2006, there were three months of consultation on the marine parks bill. In 2009 statewide consultation occurred on the outer boundaries of the marine parks. From late 2009 to May 2011, 67 local advisory group meetings were held around the state, supported by numerous out of session informal meetings. In April 2012, draft sanctuary zones were released publicly, followed by the release of the full set of draft zoning in July 2012. Draft marine park management plans were also released for eight weeks' consultation, supported by 41 public information days and numerous meetings.

In addition, ongoing consultations occurred with the commercial and recreational fishing industries, the environmental sector, the Marine Parks Council, the scientific working group, local councils and a wide range of other stakeholders. More than 8,600 written submissions were received during the final round of community consultations, and as a result more than 50 amendments were made to the draft zones.

Of particular note is that 85 per cent of the respondents supported increasing the number of sanctuary zones to strengthen conservation outcomes. In spite of this overwhelming public support, the opposition has proposed a bill which actually decreases the number of sanctuary zones. This is clearly at odds with community expectations on this issue. I also note that a significant proportion of the advice from local communities and key stakeholders was incorporated in the final marine park zoning that we currently have. In fact, I am advised 83 per cent of the final sanctuary zones were derived from local advisory group advice, and yet the opposition still refers to this process as 'a complete sham'. The real sham is that the opposition appears to have only consulted with a select few in the development of a very ill-considered bill. This will undo years of work designed to benefit the entire state.

I understand that there are some who may be unhappy with the final marine parks plan. Notwithstanding the efforts to minimise the impact on commercial fishers, the government recognises that there may be some unavoidable impact on the industry. To deal with this, the government has made a firm commitment to buy out sufficient fishing effort through a voluntary market-based process. I can advise that the voluntary catch effort reduction program was completed late last year for five of the six fishing sectors affected.

The effort reduction targets for the relevant fisheries were calculated by the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) aquatic sciences, using peer reviewed methodology and the best available data. SARDI consulted with the commercial fishing industry and used historical catch and effort figures, as well as additional information provided by the industry, to estimate the average displacement as a result of sanctuary fishing zone restrictions.

I am advised that Primary Industries and Regions SA then determined the amount of displacement catch effort that should be sought for removal during the voluntary catch effort reduction program. For information, it is worth pointing out that the reduction targets set by fisheries are as follows: for the central zone abalone, 38 quota units or just over 3 per cent of the total; for western zone abalone, 93 quota units, again just over 3 per cent of the total; for southern zone rock lobster, 40 pots or one-third of 1 per cent of the total; for northern rock lobster, 225 pots or 5.7 per cent of the total; for the marine scale fishery, 12 licences or just under 4 per cent of the total; and, for charter, six licences or 5.2 per cent of the total.

These catch effort reduction targets have been achieved in the initial phase for charter marine scale fish western zone abalone, northern rock lobster and southern zone rock lobster, and I am advised that negotiations with central zone abalone are continuing. Re-establishing fishing access to some of the sanctuary zones would be ridiculous, given the amount of effort and public monies recently expended on the voluntary catch effort reduction program.

The opposition has also made a number of claims about the supposed economic impact that will result from the implementation of fishing restrictions in sanctuary zones on 1 October 2014. In speeches to this place there were some very specific estimates of suggested impacts on some fisheries. For example, the quoted impact for the rock lobster fishery is taken from a report prepared for industry by Mr Ian Knuckey in 2012 on the potential impacts of the draft management plans. I understand that the government considered this report in detail, together with information provided during the public consultation period, and as a result draft sanctuary zones at Cape Du Couedic and Cape Borda were significantly reduced in size to further reduce impact on the rock lobster and abalone industries.

The Cape Du Couedic zone was decreased by 67 per cent and the Cape Borda by 35 per cent, which reduced estimated impact on commercial fishing in the Western Kangaroo Island Marine Park by 60 per cent, whilst still maintaining a conservation outcome at this iconic biodiversity and tourism hot spot. The final sanctuary zones have been available since November 2012, yet the opposition has used old estimates on sanctuary zones that do not currently exist, but in the context of this debate that is hardly surprising. Using the wrong information, peddling misinformation and misrepresenting the facts has become the preferred mode of operation of the opposition in large aspects of this debate.

They also like pretend there is no science supporting marine parks. Either that, or they simply choose not to understand the science. Marine parks are about conserving areas in their most pristine state. They are about ensuring we protect some of our state's waters most unique and valuable marine assets before they are damaged. This is a real point of difference. Marine parks in South Australia are not only set up to address directly current damage but are designed to protect our marine environment before the damage is done.

The Liberals approach of 'wait until it's broken to fix it' will result, if this bill is passed. It puts our environment at risk and is completely at odds with the overwhelming scientific evidence available on marine parks. As others have done before me, I urge honourable members in this place to consider thoroughly the science on marine parks before making a decision. South Australia's marine parks have been developed on the best and soundest local, national and international science.

As recently highlighted by the Minister for Environment in this place, marine parks have also been developed with the input of our state's most respected marine scientists. The scientific working group is comprised of 12 independent, highly-regarded scientists who have expertise in a range of scientific fields, such as marine ecology, marine biology and marine oceanography, yet the opposition, particularly the shadow minister, refuses to acknowledge their contribution.

A large range of scientific and other materials was made publicly available during the marine park planning process. Some of this material included: the 14 design principles that provide the scientific basis for the marine park program were developed after consideration of three decades worth of Australian international marine protected areas scientific and management experience; a complete technical report explaining the process of determining the outer boundaries of the proclaimed marine parks; value statements for each marine park were released, which provided complete information about ecological, social and economic values of each park; and, comprehensive ecological, social and economic impact statements were prepared for each park.

These documents and a wealth of other scientific information have been readily available on the marine parks' website, and I query whether the opposition, particularly the shadow minister, has consulted much of it at all. I also have a list here which, if time permitted, I would read out completely. It consists of pages of scientific papers and reports that have informed the development of marine parks in South Australia. If any honourable members are interested, I would be more than happy to give them the list, but many in the opposition would dismiss this, as the federal government has in its attack on science.

The science on marine parks is very clear. Relying only on addressing existing damage is not the best way to protect our marine environment. A management system that is a comprehensive, adequate and representative system of marine parks (CARS) produces the best results. That is what the science tells us. If the opposition is to continue their attack on marine parks, I think that it is incumbent on them to identify the flaws in the science that give rise to the marine parks. They need to identify the authority and cite what better science they use for their conclusions. Unless they can properly demonstrate the flaws in the accepted science the government relies upon, their current campaign and, indeed, this bill will be seen as a poorly thought-out political stunt.

As I mentioned earlier, the development of marine parks is based on the conservation of ecologically important areas, and sanctuary zones are critical to the marine park networks. These zones are much more than 'no fishing' areas. They ensure against the emerging impacts of climate change, coastal development and increasing demand for natural resources. Removing sanctuary zones is like having a car without an engine. Sanctuary zones are also good for fishing and fishing tourism. They underpin the health of the sea and protect the places where fish breed and grow. Sanctuary zones are also good for the state as a whole. The bill before us, however, proposes to reduce the protection for 12 sanctuary zones, leaving only 4 per cent of our state's water in sanctuary zones. This is a reduction in protection of one-third. Removing these protections, as proposed by the opposition, would place at risk numerous areas of significant ecological importance.

I draw members' attention to some of what is at risk. In the Nuyts Archipelago Marine Park (or park 2), the Nuyts Reef and Isles of St Francis sanctuary zones will help protect and conserve breeding sites for Australian sea lions; habitats for birds, such as the endangered osprey, rare rock parrot, rare Cape Barren geese and the little penguin; biodiversity hotspots known for their local fish species; King George whiting spawning habitats; and Australia's short-tailed shearwater breeding colony.

In Investigator Marine Park (park 4), the Pearson Island group sanctuary zone will help protect and conserve a variety of mammals, fish, birds and algae; large fish that are becoming uncommon in such heavily fished locations; and species of conservation concern, such as the white-bellied sea eagle and the great white shark.

In the Sir Joseph Banks Group Marine Park (park 6), the Salt Creek sanctuary zone will help protect and conserve a complete ecosystem, including the Salt Creek estuary mouth, adjacent sand flats, seagrass meadows, and deep water sandy plains habitats. It will also protect coastal habitats used by at least five migratory shorebird species protected under international treaties.

In the Neptune Islands Group (Ron and Valerie Taylor) Marine Park (park 7), the North Neptune Island sanctuary zone will help protect and conserve globally significant great white shark habitat and aggregation area; South Australia's most important New Zealand fur seal pupping site; Australian sea lion sites; key destinations for protected migratory seabirds; and a habitat for endangered white-bellied sea eagles and the endangered fairy tern. The Neptune Islands Group is known as the Ron and Valerie Taylor Marine Park, and I will quote from Valerie Taylor about marine parks. She recently said:

South Australia has so much to offer underwater. The range of biodiversity is just incredible. The opposition wants to undermine sanctuary zones and destroy it all.

I think that is a very telling quote for our debate.

In the Upper St Vincent Gulf Marine Park (park 14), the Clinton Wetlands sanctuary zone will help protect and conserve habitats critically important to the entire gulf; nursery and breeding grounds for blue swimmer crabs, western king prawns, whiting, garfish and snapper; and some of the most significant seagrass meadows in the entire marine park network.

In the Encounter Marine Park (park 15), sanctuary zones will help protect and conserve very important habitats for the protected leafy sea dragon; protected habitats for shorebirds; seagrass meadows, which are nurseries for commercial and recreational fish species such as King George whiting; habitats supported by strong currents and reefs that have a very diverse range of fish species; and regionally important settlement areas for many species.

Finally, in the Western Kangaroo Island Marine Park, park 16, the Cape Borda and Cape Du Couedic marine zone will help protect and conserve not only tourism experiences for the area but one of only two known breeding sites for Australian fur seals, eight breeding sites for New Zealand fur seals and nesting sites for the endangered white-bellied sea eagle.

I am advised that loss of protection for habitats of some of our most iconic and ecologically significant plant and animal species could compromise the integrity of the entire marine parks network. This is what the opposition is prepared to risk. The opposition appears to place no importance whatsoever on the conservation of these areas.

As I mentioned earlier, it is also important that members consider that these changes from the opposition have been proposed without any broad public consultation. When you compare that to the massive consultation that has occurred previously for the marine parks, it ought not be supported without greater consultation. Nor has there been any proper consultation with the majority of key stakeholders and other bodies such as the Marine Parks Council.

Members may recall that in 2010 the government amended the Marine Parks Act at the request of the fishing industry to ensure that management plans could not be amended without parliamentary scrutiny. This amendment was made to ensure that critical decisions about marine park zones could not be the result of secret deals behind closed doors. In fact, the shadow minister was a member of the Select Committee on Marine Parks. This committee repeatedly advised of the importance of ensuring all community members were fully involved in the development of marine parks and management plans; and now the opposition, who supported this amendment and the select committee, proposes to amend zoning without undertaking proper community and stakeholder consultation.

This bill also provides that the marine park management plans that include sanctuary zones must be reviewed every two years. This is a ludicrous and extraordinary proposal and is evidence that the opposition has failed to consider the impact on business and local communities. A two-year review cycle would effectively mean that marine parks would be in a constant state of review. This type of uncertainty would severely disadvantage the full range of business interests working in marine parks. Future developments, aquaculture businesses, recreational fishers, tourism operators, local communities and even the vast majority of commercial fishers would also be severely damaged by this ongoing cycle. There would be no certainty for anyone and there would be no ability to implement long-term arrangements to secure their economic futures.

The opposition has failed to consider the potential impact of this bill on a wide range of stakeholders and local communities. The Marine Parks Act already establishes proper consultation to assess the effectiveness of marine parks. Management plans must be reviewed within 10 years, and it is through this process that the government, stakeholders and the community can properly determine whether any changes are needed to the zoning or other management arrangements.

During the shadow environment minister's speech referring to marine park 14, she stated, 'I do not believe that there are any environmental credentials for the way the whole process took place.' With ridiculous comments like that, it is hard to see how this bill can be supported given the lack of consultation that has taken place.

I know that the shadow environment minister regularly interjects in this chamber and castigates the Greens for preferencing Labor in some seats. With such blatant anti-environment and anti-science views as expressed in this bill, and on such an important issue like this, it is little wonder that the Liberal Party in South Australia has trouble attracting any support from those who care about the environment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Marine parks represent a wealth of opportunities for our state that the opposition refuses to admit. Marine parks will complement our existing measures to manage our

fisheries and to boost our state's reputation as a source of clean, healthy seafood. They will also ensure that marine areas are protected for current and future generations.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Mr President, I know the opposition do not consider this a particularly important issue and are making light of it and having fun and laughing, but I think this is a very important issue for our state. For the reasons presented here—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Just give your speech; do not react.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I know that members opposite are keen to try to make a mark on these sorts of issues, and I know that the shadow minister in particular is concerned at the low mark she gets in the annual media rankings of various ministers, but this issue is far too important to play politics with. There are much better issues to try to make a mark on. For the reasons presented here today the government opposes this bill in its entirety, and condemns the Liberal Party's ongoing campaign to erode environmental protection laws in this state.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:25): I rise to make a very brief contribution to this bill on behalf of Family First, and I apologise to members that my name was not on the whipping sheet; it was an oversight.

Very briefly, I indicate Family First supports the bill as proposed by the Hon. Ms Lensink. Members would be aware that I was the chairman of the select committee that looked at the establishment of marine parks originally, and then at the changing boundaries that were done subsequent to the public outcry over the initial proposal for marine parks as they stood. Two things stood out to me as chairperson of that committee. First of all, in all my time in parliament—it is my ninth year now in this place—I had not seen such public outcry to any single issue.

Members would remember that there was the Burnside Town Hall meeting, where it was estimated there were approximately 2,000 people. I was there that night, and I would have thought it was probably in excess of that. As I said, there was enormous public outcry against the original proposal. Yes, the heat has gone out of it to some extent, because I think the government saw the response from people who would be affected—and even from people who would not be directly affected—and, as result of that, changed the boundaries substantially, which I think perhaps not all but most members would support.

As I said, two things stood out to me on that committee. We have heard a lot of talk about the extensive consultation that took place. Any member of that committee could, I think, reasonably walk away from their time on that committee with some very serious questions about the consultation process. We had witnesses claim that minutes from the so-called LAG meetings were actually doctored, changed or went missing. These are very, very serious allegations which are all documented in the report—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: That is the problem, sir. We have just heard from the government that they are 'made up', but there were several allegations to that effect. They are not just single allegations; we heard of at least half a dozen people. I cannot recall exactly how many, but there were at least half a dozen, possibly in the order of 10 or 12.

The Hon. J.M. Gazzola: Doesn't make it right.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: So the allegations are all lies? I am afraid I do not accept that. These are serious allegations and I think the consultation process was lacking in many regards. While it was broad—and credit where credit is due, it was a broad consultation process—there were substantial holes in the process. People did not come to that committee and tell lies: they told the truth.

The other thing that is difficult about the entire marine parks process—and this is the second point that the committee consistently heard—is that people were worried about the impact on their economic livelihood. We heard from the various district councils, we heard from the industry, we heard from recreational fishers and tourism-affected businesses, right across the spectrum, that they were genuinely concerned about the impact on their livelihoods.

I think that in the current situation with the state economy we need to be very careful about anything that has a potentially negative impact on the level of employment in our state. That is something I have grave concerns about. I think there will be, and the government acknowledges that there will be, a negative impact on economic activity as a result of the marine parks, and that is regrettable.

Finally, there has been a great deal of debate about the science; what we saw in the committee was that there was a good deal of disagreement about the science. Yes, there was science from the environment department. You would expect them to have their point of view; they were themselves pushing the agenda from the start. Equally there were scientists presented by the industry—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Non-scientists.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: They were not non-scientists; they have PhDs in the field. How can they be non-scientists? They are PhD-qualified people in the particular area of science we are talking about.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Name the studies.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Name the studies? Off the top of my head I will.

The PRESIDENT: Let's not engage in any debate, Hon. Mr Hood.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: I will not respond to that interjection, sir. It is out of order; that is right. There were questions raised about the science and I think it is something that deserves further inquiry. The main allegation, of course, was that the approach has not been based on a threats-based approach, which has been something the industry has called for. Regardless of all that, I think the issue has a long way to run yet. As I indicated at the start, Family First supports the bill.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:30): I rise to make some remarks. I would like to start by thanking my colleagues in this place for their contributions: the Hon. Mark Parnell, the Hon. John Darley, the Hon. Kelly Vincent, the Hon. Kyam Maher and the Hon. Dennis Hood. In due course I will respond to some of the comments they have made. At the outset, I remind the chamber of the obligations of Australian jurisdictions. In a letter from the Hon. Tony Burke MP, former federal minister for sustainability, environment, water, population and communities, dated 25 January 2011, he is referring to the targets which are required in relation to marine parks under the Convention of Biological Diversity, otherwise known as 'the Convention'. He says:

The biodiversity targets recently agreed under the Convention are contained in the Convention's new Strategic Plan. That Plan notes that all targets are 'aspirations for achievement at the global level and a flexible framework for the establishment of national or regional targets'. As such, the specific targets are not binding on Australia. The Australian Government does not interpret the target that you are referring to (target 11) in the new Strategic Plan of the Convention as requiring at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas to be strictly protected as no-take areas.

The government often refers to the issue of the length of time of consultation, and that is true, but the truth of the matter is that there were the initial out of boundaries which were put out—and I have been through all of this before, I am not going to repeat it all—the large zones that were put out as, I believe, an ambit claim which scared the living daylights out of most of South Australia which resulted in a so-called reset process in April 2012.

The Hon. Dennis Hood has referred to the local advisory group process, and that was established following the great big zones that scared the living daylights out of most of South Australia and all of the input into that. So, after years of trying to express their views to the government this was leaving people quite cynical and tired. What we had in that April 2012 reset process was that the local advisory groups, which were representative of all the stakeholders in the regions including the conservation sector, some of them had come up with unanimous proposals, some had come up with some which were majority, but by and large I think they were all majority. Quite frankly, if the government had gone with that position we would not be here debating this issue now.

What happened was that there was a rather cynical collection of stakeholders who were numerically in favour of having larger zones. There was only one representative of the commercial sector there who objected a number of times and who was told later that minutes did not exist,

Minutes were then obtained under freedom of information by the leader of the Liberal Party, Steven Marshall, which that representative said were incorrect as well. So, the government has form on this and it is no surprise that they try to hide behind saying that this is all about conservation when in fact they have gone through an unconscionable process to land at this position and have the Greens complicit in their pocket on this issue.

So, at a whim of a small group of people who happened to be invited to attend that reset meeting in April 2012, the boundaries were changed. Again, we have this bogus kind of consultation that the government talks about, which was not consult and decide, it was announce and defend, because there were absolutely minimal changes over that six-month period from April 2012 as a result of them being advised of the reset process.

There have been broken commitments, and I would just like to quote a couple of them. On 29 January 2009 the then minister for the environment, the Hon. Jay Weatherill, wrote to commercial fishing licence holders. I am not going to read the two pages, but I will just read several paragraphs which are germane to this debate. He says:

There will, however, be some small zones within each park where conservation is a priority and where resource extraction and certain other activities will not be allowed.

Under a few items, point 3:

The following commercial fishing opportunities will be maintained within marine parks;

It goes on:

- (b) Rock lobster fishing in important lobster fishing blocks, specifically:
 - i) west of Kangaroo Island;
 - ii) around the toe of Yorke Peninsula; and
 - iii) between Coffin Bay and the Thorny Passage on the lower Eyre Peninsula.
- (c) Existing haul net fishers in the following key locations:
 - i) shallow waters (less than 5 metres) at the Upper Spencer Gulf Marine Park;
 - ii) shallow waters (less than 5 metres) of the Upper Gulf St Vincent Marine Park; and
 - iii) shallow waters (less than 5 metres) of the Franklin Harbour Marine Park.

Another one from one of the departmental officers who went on the ABC South East, Mr Chris Thomas, who says:

We just need to work out with the community where some small areas we can put aside for the long-term conservation of our habitats and marine species. So, through a three-year process of consultation, we can certainly minimise any impact on commercial and recreational fishers, while still achieving a solid conservation outcome. So, it is about getting that balance between conservation and use, which is a three-year task.

Then further he says:

...I guess the important thing is, we need to make sure that the community, which holds valuable information, particularly about use and activity, that we capture that information and we build it into a marine parks program...trying to determine where are the really important fishing spots, so we don't actually end up putting them in no-take areas.

Then he talks about trying to minimise displacement of commercial fishers. The economic impact on regions was the subject of an EconSearch report which was commissioned by the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources dated 20 August 2012. In the executive summary, under 'Economic Impacts', it states:

In summary, the proposed draft zoning is expected to have the following economic impacts on the following sectors of the regional economy: potential positive impact in the tourism sector in the medium to long-term; neutral impact in the aquaculture, property, marine infrastructure and operations, mining and coastal development sectors; and short, medium and long-term negative impacts in the commercial fishing sector.

At that point I pause to note that the government's own report identifies that it is the commercial fishing sector which is the one that will be taking the greatest economic impact in the implementation of these zones. Under the heading 'Commercial Fishing' it says:

In aggregate, it was estimated that the impact of marine park zoning will generate the following loss of regional economic activity on an ongoing basis:

- Approximately \$12.6 million in gross state product (GSP) which represents 0.02 per cent of the state total...
- Approximately 124 fte jobs...
- Approximately \$7.89 million in household income...

Impacts are based on SARDI's average annual displaced catches...

Under 'Tourism' it says:

...the perception that recreational fishing opportunities will be restricted by implementing 'no-take' zones is real.

That goes to vindicate the select committee establishment. Under 'Coastal Development' it says:

Marine parks will not prevent coastal developments approved under the Development Act.

I think this is relevant to the fact that development is one of the main contributors to harming our marine environments. Under 'Social Impacts', it says:

The main group impacted within these communities will be commercial fishing. Commercial fishing is one of the four top industry sources of regional employment for all but two economic regions (Upper Spencer Gulf and Fleurieu & Coorong), and contributes significantly fewer jobs than does tourism in all but two economic regions (Lower Eyre Peninsula and Franklin Harbour)...Most of the sanctuary zones are in low use areas for recreational fishing...with quite localized impacts in six marine parks (Far West Coast, West Coast Bays, Upper Spencer Gulf, Eastern Spencer Gulf, Encounter and Lower South East Marine Parks). A critical factor in determining the ultimate impact of marine parks is how well local communities are able to adapt to change and how cohesive they are in supporting each other through the change.

Further, it has a table (table 4) which lists the specific marine parks and states that the highest impacts will be within the Nuyts Archipelago and the Encounter Bay marine parks.

Wildcatch Fisheries, who were represented at the recent briefing, have done a summary which I think is useful to read into the record:

Commercial seafood harvesters rely on a healthy, unpolluted, productive marine environment to maintain their livelihoods and support their families; hence conservation of marine biodiversity is their number one priority.

The private member's bill proposes to remove 12 high impact sanctuary zones out of a total of 84; a minor amendment that will reduce the regional impact by more than half while going a long way to restoring the community stewardship necessary for a successful marine park network.

The Department for Environment—

the following words are underlined—

did not follow the accepted guidelines for establishing marine protected areas by identifying threats and risks. The process and outcome became purely political, therefore politically is the only way it can be corrected.

I think that that is a very useful statement, because if the government had taken the opportunity—it could correct these zones if it wished—we would not be here debating this issue. I have been forced in effect to stick up for regional South Australia and try to have some amendments made.

Local advisory groups appointed by the Minister for Environment were established with a very diverse cross-section of the local community. These 12 high-impact areas are representative of the minister and Department of Environment's willingness to ignore the recommendations of the local advisory groups. The impact on the regional coastal towns has been assessed by the Department of Environment's own commissioned report undertaken by EconSearch, which I have already referred to.

If I can just refer to some correspondence I have received from Mr Andrew Ferguson of Ferguson Australia, who said:

The only...impact of these sanctuary zones is to impact on sustainable, renewable, high-value, export fisheries. No-where else in...this country, or internationally for that matter, have we seen such an approach adopted. Is there no regard for State fisheries managers who have spent years of research to produce harvest strategies for the setting of sustainable [total allowable catches] etc.?

At this point, I might interpose and say that South Australia's fisheries are sustainable and well managed by PIRSA Fisheries, and this has been something that has been completely ignored by the government. He goes on to say:

The Premier states that 6% of state waters are to be closed to sanctuary zones but forgets to mention this targets over 30% of highly productive fishing grounds within the 6%.

This is important because it goes to the issue of sustainable fisheries management, and that in order to be sustainable effort is best rotated over the broadest possible area so, if you like, you give those areas a rest, but if you close those off then that reduces that opportunity. Mr Ferguson goes on to say:

...the process to establish the quantum of displaced commercial fishing effort, and its subsequent removal, was undertaken within an extremely compressed time frame.

This is a reference to the period April to November or December 2012. Wildcatch has recently written to the minister, and I will quote from their letter from 5 June. They say the following:

The persistence of the Department for Environment, Water & Natural Resources (DEWNR) to ignore the outcomes of the Ministers own appointed Local Advisory Groups process only highlights a lack of integrity; opinions supported by the findings of the Legislative Council Select Committee on Marine Parks in South Australia. Unfortunately, this bullish process has alienated key stakeholders and irreparably undermined the local community stewardship required to successfully manage extensive marine park zoning.

WFSA fully supports that any catch/effort displaced by Marine Park zoning (commercial & recreational) must be removed to ensure sustainability of the state fishery resource.

And so on. The Premier has highlighted his own lack of understanding of how marine parks should work in his recent replies in the House of Assembly question time. He said on 22 May:

The ambition of the marine parks scheme for South Australia is not to cost jobs: it is to actually grow jobs in regional South Australia.

Yet his own EconSearch report, which was commissioned in 2012, says that there will be a loss of 124 FTEs. He then goes on to talk about urban development, run-off from agriculture, fishing and other activities. He says it is how bait is left behind in fishing grounds, ropes are left behind, lines are left behind. These are things that are managed through other means already. Certainly, the issues of urban development and run-off from agriculture are not remotely addressed by these marine parks.

He referred to Gulf St Vincent and the damage that has been done to the marine environment. It is an interesting point to note Gulf St Vincent, because we know that there has been seagrass loss and that has not had anything to do with fishing. That has been to do with stormwater and wastewater that runs into the gulf. Indeed, it was one of the areas that Karen Edyvane covered in her report, which really did outline the science, and I have spoken about this before. In the late 1990s she identified Gulf St Vincent as one of the biodiversity hotspots and yet it was completely omitted from the outer boundaries and it was completely omitted from the sanctuary zones. I think that just goes to show that there is no scientific integrity. They have ignored their own advice.

The Premier then went on to talk about regions being able to promote themselves to the world and businesses on the West Coast which will promote themselves as having grown their fish in marine parks. Yet this again is contradicted. I would like to quote from Dr Gary Morgan, an individual who is consulted by other countries around the world in establishing marine parks. He is quite involved in the issue of overseas marketing and he says the following:

On the issue of the continued claims that commercial fishers will benefit from being able to claim their product was caught in a marine park...I was a guest speaker at the Australia/China Business Council's Food Summit in Sydney on Friday—

so this was about 24 May or a bit earlier—

(...Barnaby Joyce and Craig Emerson were also there) and there was a lot of discussion around the 'image' that Australia projects in China and what 'Brand Australia' means in an agribusiness environment.

The issue of marine parks was briefly brought up in this context and the general reaction from the Chinese side was that product labelled as being caught in a marine park would be seen as a negative influence because of the confusion it would create. They think ALL of Australia is pristine and would question why fish caught in a marine park is any better than one that is not and would anyway consider it 'bad' to catch fish in a marine park because marine parks in China are strictly no-go areas.

I had discussions later with Mrs Jihong He, the President of the China Food Association who confirmed that promoting things like regional branding, marine parks and the like would create enormous confusion in the market.

Incidentally...the Australian rock lobster industry...now accounts for over 10% of Australia's total food exports to China, which makes it larger in this market than either the wine or dairy industry.

As a major export industry not only for the State but for Australia, it worries me that comments such as this coming from Government officials...could undo a lot of the work the industry is doing (with DFAT and Austrade as well as with New Zealand) around branding and marketing.

EconSearch looked at some of the environmental impacts, and table 3.1 on page 11 of that particular report has quite an extensive list. Under the title 'Extraction of living resources' we have examples of uses as fishing activities, water extraction (for instance, desalination) and aquaculture. Under 'Modification of fauna behaviour' is berleying, mammal interactions, including noise and provisioning trawler bycatch discards.

Under 'Pollution of water/sediments' we have industrial discharges, wastewater, stormwater, coastal and catchment land use and spills; under 'Modification or destruction of habitat' we have coastal engineering (such as marinas, pipelines, dredging, trawling and mining). Under 'The introduction of pest species and diseases' we have shipping, recreational fishing and boating, imported products and aquaculture. Under 'Climate change' is a broad range of activities, mainly land based, that result in the generation of greenhouse gases, acidification, temperature change and sea level rise.

I note that that list, which I think is probably quite a comprehensive list, also includes berleying, yet berleying is allowed within marine park sanctuary zones, while scientific research has been deemed illegal and requires a permit. I have had some feedback since I tabled the bill from some of the recreational fishing sector, who have said that, in particular, the Investigator Marine Park, sanctuary zone 2 at Pearson's Island, is a huge tourism charter area, and for recreational fishing also provides shelter.

Most of Thorny Passage was agreed upon by the LAG, and that is not included in this particular bill in any case. For the North Neptune Islands, which the Hon. Kyam Maher referred to, the response is:

This is unbelievable to think it can be a sanctuary zone. It's used by all fishing groups, including the shark diving crews. Fishing is what the shark diving crews do when they are waiting for the sharks to turn up. A massive impact on their business, the area provides great shelter with the anchorages. It's hard to understand how we are not allowed to feed dingos, but are allowed to burley and tease the most dangerous predator in the water (great white sharks) and then say we are not changing the behaviour of this species.

I note that the CSIRO has said that berleying does in fact change the behaviour of great white sharks. Rapid Head, in Encounter Marine Park, is a very important launching area for recreational fishers.

That gets me on to the issue of RecFish, which I understand oppose this bill, and that is because they have a particular view about what happens in Gulf St Vincent. This issue was put directly to the Director of Fisheries, Professor Mehdi Doroudi in the marine parks select committee. When I said to him, 'You would be aware that RecFish have been critical to do with garfish management in the top of the gulf, which they say justifies the sanctuary zone,' he said, 'I do not agree with their position, and I have been in contact with them.' He goes on to talk about a range of management measures that have been put in place.

A recreational fisher, who has extensive knowledge of fishing has said to me that, in relation to RecFish's support for that zone, the chairman is under the belief that the zone will provide significant stock management benefits through additional protection for spawning or juvenile fish, but this is not supported by scientific research. The previous officer of RecFish, which used to be known as SARFAC, is Mr Trevor Watts. He sent me an email in response to the tabling of this bill in May, stating:

I have just read your [marine park] amendment bill, thank you for sending it...I still have an interest in fishery management in SA and have been appalled and ashamed at the way SARFAC [that is RecFish SA] have conducted themselves since my retirement.

SARFAC had a good reputation with the media and public and was respected by Government but we never expected to be liked because anglers views were always different and that they felt they were always 'duded' by those in power. And there is plenty evidence to support that.

Along with the now retired Chairman, we together since 1998 and before spent most of our time gaining the public's respect with professionalism and expertise. I now read this as all going down the drain.

I note that a fair chunk of the government's commitments to environment spending in the election and in the budget relate to recreational fishing, which speaks to me of a stinky deal, particularly at a time when we have record debt levels. Quite frankly, some of that funding would be better off being

spent on re-establishing seagrasses in the gulf. What I say to people who may be involved in RecFish SA is that, if you care for your reputation, run for the hills, run now, and run fast.

It has got to the point where Mr Holmes, the CEO of the department, in his recent remarks in relation to large funding cuts to the department, has said that the public will have to become primary custodians of marine parks, which is certainly what we have been saying for some time. It is hard to understand how those regional communities which have been so mistreated by this government are going to be remotely interested in dobbing in anyone because they are very cynical.

The Greens, I think it is fair to say, have for many years seen campaigns as a mode of conservation. What I would like to say to them is that the model of Landcare is the one that has been sustainable in many ways over many years and imposing a 'we know best' approach, which is what DEWNR did, is going to result in a backlash. I think that, in some ways, there are DEWNR staff who, from what I have been told, would certainly have breached public sector codes in some of the things they said and did in this whole process.

I think the modus operandi for this campaign style does not work, and it leads to the term 'green' being a pejorative term. Most of us would like to say that we are green. We recycle and, if you are a landowner, you try to preserve your soils and your native vegetation. But this program, primarily between this process and NRM, has led to the massive loss of confidence in DEWNR by the right wing of the Labor Party, and we see those cuts now, which are being implemented. We have seen the right wing Treasurer making jokes in budget lockups about getting rid of the department, so I think that is a message for the conservation sector that they need to work more collaboratively in the future rather than allowing this 'we know best' approach.

In response to some of the remarks that were made, the Hon. Mark Parnell misrepresented me when he said that this was at the behest of the commercial industry. It has not just been the commercial industry; there have been recreational fishers and regional representatives who have also spoken to me. I note that, even in the government's own report, they identify that the biggest impact will be on the commercial sector. He also said, quite mischievously, that the commercial sector does not like marine parks. That is just not true in any way, shape or form; in fact, some of them have actively campaigned for marine parks. This process, I think, was overtaken by some agendas within the environment department.

I have also talked about the furphy of the long consultation. The Hon. Mark Parnell talked about compromise. Well, a lot of people compromise with the LAG process. In my second reading explanation, I went through a whole range of zones I had not included in the bill because some people had said that they were not very happy but that they could live with it, and those regional communities have already compromised.

We are at the point where decisions are being made about closing fish factories, selling vessels and shutting down operations. Be it on the head of the Greens and this Labor government if changes are not made to the boundaries.

He has also—and the government, as well: they are one on this—tried to portray this as anti-environment. It is not anti-environment. Quite frankly, the Edyvane approach was not used from the start. We have not used a threats-based approach. The major impact that is going to be implemented when these come into force on 1 October is on fishing. It would be nice if the honourable member would speak to people who understand fisheries management and how they are sustainable and also speak to people in regional communities who have undertaken measures over the years to implement fisheries management so that those stocks are sustainable.

This is where the Hon. Mark Parnell and I really see this approach to conservation quite differently. He talked about easy in, hard out. I can understand why the conservation sector feels that way because there are probably numerous examples over the years where the environment has lost out to things. But there is a major difference between terrestrial and marine conservation. The biggest threats to terrestrial biodiversity are land clearance and invasive pest species.

We have set aside parks. If anybody goes walking around Morialta Conservation Park or Mount Lofty conservation park, or a number of conservation parks, you can see why people did not necessarily want to use those as arable land because they are so steep. Historically, the legacy of some of the earlier proclaimed terrestrial parks that we have are there because they were not really

of much use for growing things on. Now we are at the point where in the Adelaide Hills we need to revegetate if we are going to maintain those species.

A lot of our marine environments are pristine and that is not going to change in a lot of cases because of fishing. It is going to be other factors. It is going to be invasive species and more run-off, and those areas. To try to just randomly lock away areas I think does the conservation cause no good at all because it just makes people cynical.

I also say to the people of South Australia, and in particular to the Hon. Kelly Vincent, that those with a social conscience and those who care for the environment should be wary of the Greens and the Labor Party because their views are often based on misplaced understanding.

The Hon. K.L. Vincent: I like to make my own decisions.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Well, I am just saying that as a point of warning.

The Hon. K.L. Vincent: I don't need to be warned about making my own decisions, thank you very much.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Okay, that's fine. One example is the Kangaroo Island local advisory groups who pointed out to the department an area where there is a particular leafy sea dragon habitat which was just not even included. I think there are a lot of examples where there were locals who tried to point out good areas to the environment department that should have actually been included and would have provided some benefit but that was not done, for whatever reason.

Finally, I would like to thank the many South Australians in regional South Australia, particularly, who have continued to speak out, through the select committee process and others, at the unjustness of this process. My door was open to anyone and everyone. There has been no secret about this bill. It is no secret that I had hoped to be the minister at this point in time and that we would be able to undertake a complete review, but that is not the situation before us. The best I could do to force the government's hand is come up with this piece of legislation which reverts the sanctuary zones.

It is not like we are suddenly going to be opening the sanctuary zones to people who go barging in with a *Margiris*, or anything like that. It is just that there will be habitat protection zones, for which there are a number of protections already, so it will be a higher level of protection than they have now. The passage of this bill will be a win for common sense and, if the government had followed the LAG advice, we would not be debating it.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes 10
Noes 9
Majority 1

AYES

Darley, J.A.

Lee, J.S.

McLachlan, A.L.

Wade, S.G.

Dawkins, J.S.L.

Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

Ridgway, D.W.

Hood, D.G.E.

Lucas, R.I.

Stephens, T.J.

NOES

Finnigan, B.V.

Gazzola, J.M.

Ngo, T.T.

Franks, T.A.

Hunter, I.K.

Parnell, M.C.

Gago, G.E. (teller)

Maher, K.J.

Vincent, K.L.

PAIRS

Brokenshire, R.L.

Kandelaars, G.A.

Second reading thus carried.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (18:10): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 18:11 the council adjourned until Thursday 3 July 2014 at 14:15.