

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 17 September 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 (14:16): I bring up the seventh report of the committee.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills (Hon. G.E. Gago)—

Southern Select Super Corporation Charter 2014-15

ANSWERS TABLED

The PRESIDENT: I direct that a written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

Question Time

TAFE SA

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question about TAFE.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Members would be aware that TAFE SA was requested to prepare a submission to the federal House of Representatives inquiry into the role of the Technical and Further Education system and its operation. On 14 April 2014 a ministerial liaison officer was involved in the submission's preparation and wrote to the TAFE's chief executive officer stating that 'the minister is not going to want to sign off on this once she reads it'. She then goes on to say that the minister will need to acknowledge a conflict of interest. Significantly, she states that she has added material regarding the minister for TAFE and DFEEST, and that TAFE is entitled to its own view. She expects that this comment specifically is likely to be disapproved of by you, the minister.

On 10 June 2014 a TAFE SA employee wrote to a colleague stating that, following a discussion with you, the minister, and the TAFE SA board, certain text from the submission was considered too sensitive and removed from the final copy that went to DFEEST. She then commented that a 'minister-endorsed version' of the submission 'representing the TAFE message' was prepared.

Further, I note that there was an inquiry hearing at the Regency campus of TAFE on 12 June 2014, and an email of 3 June 2014 confirms that the retired chief executive of TAFE, Mr Jeff Gunningham, was set to appear at that hearing but did not, following a conversation with the chair of the board. Minister, earlier this year, you stated in an answer to a question on TAFE SA that you are:

...responsible to ensure [the TAFE Board] meets its statutory obligations but all other matters—all its operational matters...are for the board to consider.

My questions, then, are:

1. Did you acknowledge a conflict of interest in the first version of the submission which was put to you?
2. Did you and your office have any discussions with the board or the chairman regarding the content of the draft submission?
3. Did you or your office remove, or request the removal of, certain sensitive information originally appearing in the TAFE draft submission?
4. Did you or your office have any communication with the chair of the board about TAFE participating in the inquiry hearing?

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) (14:20): I thank the member for his questions. In relation to, I think it was the first question about conflict of interest, I do not know; I cannot recall, but I am happy to take that part of the question on notice and bring back a response.

In relation to the issue of the written response to that committee—and I am pretty confident I have already put this on record in this place before—it was the government's decision that it would coordinate a government response to that committee rather than have separate submissions. We did not hide from that, Mr President; we were overt about that. I expressed clearly to the board that that was the intention of government, and they were invited to forward any material that they wanted me and the government to consider in relation to including in a submission.

There would have been differences between the document that was sent in by TAFE and the final document because, as I said, what was coordinated was what the government believed was the most suitable response to go from government. We do not hide from that. So, Mr President—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: And that is exactly what we did do; that is, we coordinated a government response to that committee and we put into that submission an appropriate response. If I recall—anyway, I am not sure about that so I will move on. In relation to the hearing that took place, I have already put on record in this place that the TAFE was able to provide whatever verbal submission and presentation to that hearing that it wanted to.

It was, to the best of my knowledge, never directed, or there was never any request, to the best of my knowledge, otherwise. There was, to the best of my knowledge, complete liberty for whoever wanted to attend from TAFE to represent them in whatever capacity they deemed fit. As I said, I am pretty confident I have put that on the record in this place before.

So, there was no direction, request or anything of the kind. There was no interference whatsoever in relation to that verbal submission. The former chief executive's decision and the board's decision in relation to his presence were purely a matter for the board. I have regular meetings with the chairperson and the chief executive, and they did not discuss in any detail matters with me around that.

I recall that the chair, Mr Peter Vaughan, informed me verbally at one of our meetings that a decision was made by the board that they would not attend that hearing, whereas they had informed me that they were going to present at the hearing. I never questioned either piece of information as to why or why not. It was information that was simply passed on to me. It was a decision of TAFE whether or not they wanted to participate at that level, so to suggest otherwise is simply misleading.

As I have said, I have already put on the record in this place that there was no interference in relation to that hearing; TAFE, as I have said, was at liberty to submit whatever they liked. So, if there was anything in their written submission that they believed may have been left out or did not reflect their full intention, they were completely at liberty to present that verbally at that hearing. As I have said, the government made it very clear that, in relation to a written submission, the government was responsible for coordinating what it believed was an appropriate written response by the South Australian government, and we did that.

LAKE ALBERT SCOPING STUDY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:26): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Water and the River Murray questions on the subject of the Lake Albert scoping study.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The official document, 'Lake Albert Scoping Study Outcomes' makes the following statement:

Community generally see this [referring to the cycling option] as a slow and non-effective process.

Further, I note that the minister, in his media release, has described water cycling as the 'best management option', even though the report itself says:

The Coorong Connector delivered substantial improvement in Lake Albert's salinity...Lake Cycling was the only other option that resulted in salinity improvement, but less so than the Connector over the same time period.

My questions to the minister are:

1. What quantity of water is used per cycle?
2. What market price would be put on that quantity of water in today's market? Does the minister have an estimate of what that would cost in a drought?
3. Has the minister spoken to upstream states about releasing more water, considering that the cycling option would rely on 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) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions if not for her selective quoting of the report, and I will come to that in a minute. I also have to put on the record that some of the comments on this issue are a little curious, because what is the point of having a scientific study if you don't pay attention to the outcome? That is something I would highlight to members opposite: there is no point criticising a scientific study unless you have read it and, of course—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Well, that's another thing altogether; we can't help people there. There is no point in having a scientific study and then ignoring the results of that study. But, of course, this is bread-and-butter behaviour for the Liberal Party in this study. This is the modus operandi of the Liberal Party. They have caught the scientific ignorance bug from their federal colleagues, and it is well and truly spreading to the South Australian Liberal Party's heads in the sand sort of behaviour.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Answer the question.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I am being invited to answer the question, Mr President, so I will. Again, on 1 September 2014, a scoping study investigated potential solutions to manage Lake Albert's salinity levels, and it was released at that time. After extensive community engagement and investigation of five options, the study has recommended the preferred practice of lake cycling. The effective long-term management of the Coorong, the Lower Lakes and the Murray Mouth region in general remains a top priority for this government and, indeed, for the Murray-Darling Basin Authority.

Whilst it is declining, I am advised that salinity levels in Lake Albert are above the historic average of 1,500 EC. As at 5 September, the salinity in the lake was approximately 2,200 EC. It is worth remembering, of course, that, at the height of the drought, salinity in Lake Albert passed 20,000 EC.

In November 2012, funding of up to about \$740,000 was approved for a study into the long-term management of water quality issues in Lake Albert and the Narrung Narrows. At 30 June 2014, approximately \$650,000 has been spent on the study, I am advised, to date. That money, of course, came from the Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth Recovery project, which this government, under this Premier, Jay Weatherill, fought so hard for and achieved for our state by uniting the river communities, against all the advice from the Liberal opposition, which was recommending to us in government that we should be supporting the Mazda model that was on offer from the federal

government and the Liberal states. Instead, we went for the Rolls Royce and won it. The Lake Albert scoping study commenced in—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Again, Mr President, these people over here want to ignore all the scientific advice. They want to ignore all the best evidence that is available to government, and that is their practice; that is their practice. You get scientific advice and it changes the facts, changes the position, and it is incumbent on policymakers to change their views in relation to the new advice. Not the Liberal Party—they like to stick with what they know (or what they don't know) and any new advice, any new science that is presented to them, they turn away and they turn a blind eye, because they do not know how to understand science. That's their problem and thank goodness they are in opposition and will stay there for some time.

The project considered management actions against the basin plan 2,750-gigalitre per year scenario: the base case of do nothing; the dredging of the Narrung Narrows; the removal or modification of the Narrung causeway; a permanent water regulating structure in the narrows; or a Coorong connector, be it a pipe or a channel or some other temporary process like reset pumping; and, of course, lakes cycling.

These considerations include those suggested by the Meningie Narrung Lakes Irrigators Association in its five-point plan for the management of Lake Albert. The project included a literature review, a community requirements study, a legislative review, a qualitative engineering investigation, modelling studies, on-ground investigations, engineering feasibility and cost-benefit analysis. This is the point the Hon. Michelle Lensink left out of her quote of the study: the cost-benefit analysis.

The options paper involved extensive consultation, which of course the Hon. Michelle Lensink does not do. She doesn't have extensive consultation when she brings something into parliament—to destroy the marine parks, for example—but we did. The options paper included extensive consultation, including the development of the community requirements study undertaken by an independent market research company to capture community opinion on potential management actions and their requirements regarding the management of Lake Albert.

Cultural considerations of the proposed management actions were also taken into account, and a number of discussion forums were held with the Ngarrindjeri in the formation of the position paper. In recommending lakes cycling as the most feasible option for managing Lake Albert salinity, the options paper does not support a Coorong connector due to the anticipated costs and the time frame required to deliver the benefits, which when compared to the lakes cycling option would not have been any sooner. Other engineering solutions are also discounted due to those options being either cost prohibitive or not technically feasible.

The local and interstate irrigation community has often raised the construction of a Coorong connector as its preferred option and has raised concerns over the lakes cycling option. That is true. Recently (last August) I referred to the need for additional water in the context of the lake water level cycling, because the report said that whilst there is adequate water in the plan for lake level cycling, it also recommends more active consideration, more active cycling, and to that end we will need to have possibly more water, or to in fact do more active cycling in conjunction with other watering events that may be happening upstream and piggyback on that. That is something that it would be very sensible to do, and the report recommends that we investigate that.

I understand that a number of people have been in the media commenting on this since the release of the options paper supporting or opposing the lakes cycling option, but, again, I recommend to people to read the report, understand what the science is saying and, particularly for the Hon. Michelle Lensink, understand the cost-benefit ratios that are applied, because there is no point in spending \$19 million on a piece of infrastructure which won't deliver benefits for several years. We can get those benefits more cheaply and earlier through the report's recommendation.

LAKE ALBERT SCOPING STUDY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:34): Supplementary question: can the minister actually answer my questions, which were as follows: what is the quantity per cycle and what would the lower

and upper prices be considering whether we are in drought or whether there is adequate water in the market?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:34): I have nothing more to say than the answer I have already given.

LAKE ALBERT SCOPING STUDY

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Given the lake cycling option, when does the minister expect that the local economy will recover to the pre-drought activity?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:35): That really does depend on the environmental conditions that we face into the near future. As much as I like to be in charge of my portfolio areas, I cannot be in charge of the weather.

TAFE SA

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question relating to TAFE.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In response to a question from me on TAFE staffing on 18 June, the minister asserted that TAFE is an independent statutory board run and managed by its own independent board. Specifically, she said that decisions on staffing are made by the board and not by the government. The opposition has obtained a Treasury document dated 6 August 2014 which apparently shows that TAFE is operating under an FTE cap and that we will see a reduction in the FTE cap from 2,319 in 2014-15 to 1,799 in 2017-18. I ask the minister:

1. Is TAFE operating under an FTE cap?
2. Is TAFE free to employ staff beyond the FTE cap?
3. Does she stand by her statement that TAFE is independent and that staffing decisions are made by the TAFE board?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:36): I thank the member for his question. Indeed, TAFE is an independent statutory authority, and operational matters such as decisions about staffing and training delivery are made by the independent TAFE board. The staffing numbers that I think the honourable member refers to that were quoted by *The Advertiser* recently I understand are derived from a Treasury calculation reflecting the budget savings task for TAFE SA as a staffing FTE estimate. That is an administrative way that savings tasks are expressed, and there is nothing unusual about that.

I have been advised that staffing across TAFE SA is dependent on the obvious things like the revenues that they earn from fee-for-service and also a growing international business as well as obviously state subsidies. TAFE SA engages staff to support its business activity, making regular assessments about its yearly training needs and also the reallocating of its budget for FTEs and other areas as needed. So, there is that ability, as their revenues grow, for instance, if they so decide, to put on additional FTEs.

It is highly likely that that FTE figure that we saw expressed in the paper will be very different to those quoted in that article. Also, TAFE SA's teaching model, as we know, continues to evolve in order to provide more flexible delivery options for students, particularly taking advantage of the latest technology. Using improved IT technologies, as I have talked about in this place before, that changing face of education tends to rely less on traditional face-to-face teaching models.

The vocational education and training sector in South Australia is robust. It had more than 200 qualified training providers meeting the training needs of over 165,000 people in 2013, according to our National Centre for Vocational Education and Research.

The state government continues to invest considerable additional resources into the vocational education sector, including \$27 million in the 2013-14 budget and \$63 million in the 2014-15 budget. These additional resources are leading to more training outcomes in TAFE and other training providers, so much so that we have reached our training target of an additional 100,000 training places three years earlier, and exceeded it by 50 per cent. As I have stated in this place before, the state government has provided strong support for TAFE in the past, and we are committed to doing so in the future as well, including up to \$240 million in new infrastructure.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I would like to welcome students from the Moonta Area School. It is good to see you all.

Ministerial Statement

GILLMAN LAND SALE

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): I table a copy of a ministerial statement by the Deputy Premier, John Rau, on the Adelaide Capital Partners archives deed conditions precedent.

Question Time

CISCO SYSTEMS

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:40): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Science and Information Economy a question about the potential benefits of recent agreements signed with the US computer company Cisco.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: I understand that both Flinders University and, quite separately, both the City of Adelaide and the state government have recently signed agreements with the large US computer firm Cisco, which will bring several exciting new developments in information and communications technology to South Australia. Can the minister please update the chamber about the consequences that will flow from the recent agreements between Flinders University and Cisco Systems, and also the City of Adelaide and the state government and Cisco Systems?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for his most important question, and I am very pleased to advise members that in recent weeks two agreements have been signed locally that involve Cisco Systems, the large American ICT company. The first of these agreements between Flinders University and Cisco Systems includes a \$14 million agreement for a significant ICT upgrade, which will install 2,000 wi-fi access points across the campuses. The upgrade also includes the capacity for high definition video conferencing.

The agreement also contains a MOU to facilitate collaboration between the university and Cisco on the Internet of Things. I know the Hon. Ian Hunter will be very interested to learn about the Internet of Things. I am sure our young visitors in the chamber would probably know more about the Internet of Things than the honourable member, but I know that he is very interested to learn, and that is why he is sitting there listening so intently.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Open to new things, unlike the opposition.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Very open to new things, unlike the opposition. Included with this MOU is the establishment of an academy at the university's new Tonsley Park building. The expression the Internet of Things may not be familiar to all in this chamber, but it refers to the emerging trend in which most of the devices and objects around us will soon be or have the potential to be connected to the internet and be capable of interacting with each other.

We are all very much familiar with the internet and the way people are able to talk to other people via the internet. This new wave of development is using the internet for devices to be able to speak to other devices. Increasingly, things like sensors, which register things like changes in temperature, light, pressure, sound, motion, or even the presence or absence of people, will be embedded in the things around us. The data they record and report can then be acted on or used in many thousands of very creative and innovative ways. This new wave of technology is likely to really change the way our everyday lives operate, and is also a vehicle for huge future developments.

For instance, it might mean—and I know many honourable members will be interested in this—that the weight and blood pressure sensors that might be in our shoes might one day be able to speak to our refrigerator, so that when you open the fridge and take out that slice of chocolate cake the fridge will help you to reconsider that decision, given the weight and body mass indicators. Or it could automatically modify the grocery items on next week's grocery list order that is automatically submitted each week via the internet to your local grocer, ensuring the appropriate kilojoule and fat intake.

Or perhaps the Hon. Robert Brokenshire's herd of cows will each have sensors in them to be able to monitor a whole range of things, including their health status, their weight and suchlike, which the honourable member would be able to read from his smart phone here in the chamber and, using his iPhone, he could respond to that information by, for instance, adjusting feed supplements that might be delivered to the cows later on in the afternoon. The possible outcomes are limitless.

The number of things connected to the internet exceeded the number of people in the world in 2008 and, by 2020, will total some 30 billion things. By that year the global industry, spawned by the Internet of Things, is estimated to be worth some \$A9.5 trillion. This technology has massive implications for health care, energy efficiency, environmental monitoring, ease of domestic living and much else besides. Cisco Systems is one of the largest global players in this rapidly expanding industry.

Even more recently the state government, the Adelaide City Council and Cisco signed a three-way memorandum of understanding which initiates an Internet of Things innovation hub here in the Adelaide CBD. In the process of becoming the first, we are the first Australian capital city to enter into such an agreement and give such a commitment—the first. As I said, it is quite a groundbreaking area. It was very disturbing that we had the launch of the Internet of Things innovation hub MOU signing, where we invited the media to attend, and unfortunately not one of our local media outlets attended. We had media from Sydney, media from Melbourne, all being teleconferenced in, and they have all run articles interstate but, unfortunately, there was not one local media. That was very disappointing.

This agreement enables the city and state to initiate work, creating a physical space for entrepreneurs and start-ups to collaborate, develop and test applications for new methods of smart communication. The innovation hub will attract the best and brightest minds to develop new ways of living in the connected world. As a test bed for new ideas and a magnet for young entrepreneurs, it sends out the right messages. We welcome—

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I have a point of order. Mr President, given that yet again we have had an eight minute answer, this time to a Dorothy Dixier, I wonder whether you would bring the minister's attention to concluding her answer.

The PRESIDENT: Do you want to complete the answer, minister?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Thank you, Mr President. We welcome a smart future where people and businesses thrive. Interestingly, Cisco said that Adelaide was the ideal city for the Internet of Things hub because of its connectivity through the existing AdelaideFree WiFi (which we launched earlier this year) and investment between Internode, I think, the Adelaide City Council and the state government.

CISCO SYSTEMS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:49): I have a supplementary question. Which media were invited to the launch and what communication methods were used and what was the hash tag?

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) (14:49): It was the standard media press notice that goes out. My understanding is that it goes out via the business emails to all the media outlets. It was distributed via the usual means that our media releases and our media notices are circulated.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I would like to welcome the Adelaide Secondary School of English to the chamber.

Question Time

INCOME MANAGEMENT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:50): I seek leave to make an explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, representing the Premier, on the topic of the Forrest report and income management.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: On 1 August a federal government review of Indigenous training and employment was undertaken and delivered by Andrew Forrest. It called for the introduction of a healthy welfare card to dictate how up to 100 per cent of welfare payments should be spent for Australians who are of working age and in receipt of welfare. This card, in its recommendations, specifically prohibits the purchase of alcohol, cigarettes and gambling.

The recommendation was described by ACOSS on the day as of concern and as an unwelcome 'return to the 1930s'. That concern and caution was echoed by the federal Leader of the Opposition, Bill Shorten, who in an ABC radio interview that day stated:

Well, later this morning I'm going down to Alcoa near Geelong, where hundreds of men and women who have worked hard their whole lives are losing their jobs. I don't think these people need income management and cash management. I think it's a one size fits all approach that underestimates people.

I am not sure whether or not Bill Shorten headed off to Alcoa and then took the workers to the bar to shout them a beer, but I am sure his words that morning were of more comfort than the Premier's round at the Old Spot late last year, particularly when the Premier's words a fortnight on in response to the proposals put forward in the Forrest report were reported in *The Australian* of 15 August 2014 as, 'There is some fine detail that needs to be worked through, but we want to offer the broadest possible support for this package.'

He went on to say that the review needed to be adopted in full, with bipartisan support, and said that his government would now turn to lobbying opposition leader Bill Shorten to find common ground. He stated that he would also ask the state's Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement to talk to regional communities. My questions to the minister and the Premier are:

1. Why did he not ask the commissioner to undertake those consultations before and not after so enthusiastically endorsing the full Forrest report?
2. What consultations did cabinet undertake before coming to their decision of support?
3. Did the cabinet consider the 2012 commonwealth Parliamentary Library's research paper, 'Is income management working?', which states that there was 'an absence of evidence relating to the effectiveness or otherwise' of income management programs?
4. Were any community groups or NGOs consulted by the cabinet? For example, was SIMPIa (Stop Income Management in Playford) invited to put their perspectives to the cabinet or was it only Mr Forrest who was invited to put his position?
5. Has the Premier since lobbied his colleague the federal opposition leader Bill Shorten on this issue?

6. Will school raffles, charity fund raisers and so on be prohibited under a healthy welfare card?

7. Finally, when the good men and women currently working at Holdens, who, of course, are set to lose their jobs in 2018, head down to the Old Spot Hotel, will the Premier be insisting that they refrain from buying beer and in fact have to order water or a softie at the bar? Will they not be allowed to buy a ticket in the meat raffle or will the Premier head down to the Old Spot for one last round on the government's corporate card?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:54): I thank the member for her questions and am happy to pass those questions on to the Premier in another place and bring back a response. I know what the Premier does want: he wants to address the shocking disadvantage that continues to occur with our Indigenous Australians. I know that he is very keen to explore ways to overcome that disadvantage.

In relation to income management, we know that it is one of the commonwealth government's initiatives to address disadvantage and ensure that income support payments are spent in the best interests of children, families and individuals, and this was reflected in further work of the Forrest report.

We recognise that income management has the potential, as an early intervention measure, to help increase financial stability, reduce problematic spending or financial exploitation and thereby strengthen and preserve families. We know that it is also being currently trialled in a number of places, and we certainly watch with great interest to see the outcome from those trials. I understand that the Premier has asked for further consultation to occur, but I do not have those details with me here, so will pass those detailed questions on to the Premier and bring back a response.

INCOME MANAGEMENT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:56): By way of supplementary question, does the minister understand, in her capacity as the minister for this area, that recommendation 5 applied to all Australians and not just Indigenous Australians?

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): Yes, I did; of course I did; I have read the report.

ANIMAL WELFARE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Will the minister please update the chamber about the government's commitment to animal welfare and steps it is taking to protect animals and their owners?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. According to the RSPCA, Australia has one of the highest rates of companion animal ownership in the world. Approximately 59 per cent of Australian households include a dog or a cat, and quite simply, as we all know, our pets are part of our ordinary way of life in this country. As any pet owner will tell you, pets are good for our health and good for the health of our communities.

Because pets are such a part of our daily lives, it is incredibly upsetting when we see instances of animal cruelty. The government takes its responsibility for animal welfare very seriously indeed. This is why we took a series of commitments to the recent state election in March of this year that clearly outlined our plan to improve conditions for companion animals and address animal cruelty. These commitments were clearly articulated in a public document called 'Let's keep building South Australia'. I would like to briefly recap our election commitments in this important social area.

We are committed to increasing the RSPCA's annual funding to \$1 million per year, indexed, in recognition of and to strengthen the invaluable role the organisation performs. We undertook to amend legislation to establish a mechanism for cats and dogs sold through the commercial pet trade

to be microchipped before being sold and to conduct 12-month education campaigns to ensure that pet shops, breeders and prospective owners understand their responsibilities. We also committed investing \$200,000 towards a business case for a single publicly accessible database for all microchipped animals, including the details of an animal's breeder, pet trader and subsequent owner.

This will, of course, make it easier to reunite lost animals with their owners, and I am sure the local government communities around the state will be pleased with that initiative. It will enable cases of aggressive behaviour or health issues to be traced back to the breeder or trader, allowing us to check that puppies and kittens are being treated properly and not coming from puppy farms.

Finally, we undertook to introduce a new code of practice to be developed in consultation with community and industry that will ensure that pets have come from healthy and humane conditions. These commitments also form the basis of the government's response to the final report of the Select Committee on Dogs and Cats as Companion Animals. Our commitments were articulated publicly as far back as March, and I need to stress articulated even earlier than that, and address many of the concerns highlighted in this select committee's recommendations. However, it is clear that ongoing consultation with the community will be necessary to ensure that state legislation and regulation effectively contribute to these objectives.

This is precisely what we undertook to do: consult thoroughly and amend the legislation when it is deemed necessary. In fact, we aim to undertake public consultation on a draft bill very soon. This is why I was particularly pleased on 1 September to read the South Australian Liberal Party's press release announcing their plan to introduce puppy farm legislation. I did for a moment think I was experiencing a short burst of *déjà vu*; their policies seemed very familiar indeed, but this should not surprise us too much, because those opposite are not known for developing innovative new policies.

In fact, Animals Australia undertook a comparison of all major parties prior to the 2013 federal election. They found that while the federal Labor Party had a formal written animal welfare policy the federal Liberal Party did not. In the lead-up to the state election, the Labor Party outlined a clear vision to keep building South Australia, including a plan to address the mistreatment of companion animals, and the Liberal Party failed to have any policies of any substance. Now, the Liberal Party is clearly trying to compensate by using our election commitments as their animal welfare policy.

As I said before, companion animals are a big part of our South Australian lives. We know that, and when it comes to welfare standards for breeding companion animals, the majority of registered breeders in South Australia raise their animals in appropriate conditions. We need to be careful and diligent in our consultation when we plan to introduce significant changes, precisely because this is a policy area that touches so many people.

What we definitely do not need is draft legislation that is rushed through without consultation with the community. I hesitate to point the finger at members who have done that in the past, when they tried to destroy, slash and burn marine parks. They do not consult with the community, but we in the government understand thoroughly our need to take the community along with us. We understand the implications that are involved. Our objective remains to eliminate cruelty to dogs and cats, and reduce the number of unwanted animals being euthanased.

I am very pleased that the state Liberal Party clearly agrees with the government on these issues. I look forward to the support of the state Liberal Party when this Labor government surely introduces its own bill. After all, Mr President, I suppose we must recognise that, in adopting the Labor Party's values, the Liberals are really picking the best out of what they can from around the country, and I congratulate them on that. I suppose, really, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

ANIMAL WELFARE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:02): Supplementary question: in relation to bringing the community along with him, will the minister commit to coming to the marine parks rally tomorrow morning?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:02): This stunt being organised by the Liberal Party—I've got to say, it is very attractive to me

to come along and tell the facts, but of course the Liberals do not believe in facts, and they certainly do not believe in science.

As I said before in this place, when they are confronted with evidence and new information, they turn a blind eye to it. They do not want to know about science and scientific information, marine park innovation and biodiversity studies; they do not want to know about it, Mr President. I have got to say, they have people just like them who are stuck in their ways, who are not open to scientific information, and those people—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The Hon. Michelle Lensink might be turning out, but I can say, Mr President, if you look at—and I think I have it here today. In fact, a leaflet was put out on the steps or Parliament House just today. I think it was talking about a recent survey into—here we are:

...Majority of South Australians Support marine Sanctuaries...

QUESTION 1

Marine sanctuaries are parts set aside within marine parks to protect marine life and ecosystems. Sanctuaries don't allow fishing or mining but do allow recreational pursuits such as swimming, diving, surfing and boating. Do you think marine sanctuaries are a good idea or a bad idea?

Good idea: 75%

Seventy-five per cent percent of respondents, and of that is 66 per cent of fishers. People who fish think they are a good idea.

QUESTION 2

The South Australian Government plans to establish sanctuary areas inside the state's 19 existing marine parks. These sanctuary areas would cover up to 6 per cent of South Australia's waters. Do you support or oppose these marine sanctuaries?

Sixty-eight respondents support, and of that, 57 per cent are fishers. They support sanctuaries and marine parks. Fifty-seven per cent of fishers support sanctuaries.

QUESTION 3

Do you think covering six per cent of South Australia's waters with marine sanctuaries is about right, too much or too little?

Forty per cent said about right; 24 per cent said too little. So, where are all these people in the consultation the Hon. Michelle Lensink is supposed to have had? They certainly haven't been listened to by the Liberal Party in this state.

QUESTION 4

There is a proposal to reduce the amount of area protected in marine sanctuaries. Would you agree or disagree with reducing the area covered from 6 per cent to 4 per cent of South Australia's waters?

Twenty-nine per cent agreed with reducing the area; 57 per cent disagreed. So, all of the people in South Australia—clearly, by this poll, a large majority—are not the ones being listened to by the Liberal Party; they are not the ones being consulted by the Liberal Party in this state. Why are we not surprised by that?

ANIMAL WELFARE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:05): Supplementary arising from the original answer on companion animals: did the minister deliberately mean to denigrate in his answer the work of the member for Fisher in bringing up the issue of companion animals and, indeed, these law reforms we are now considering on all sides of parliament or did he forget that it was the member for Fisher who first had a private member's bill on this issue?

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): What a very silly question. I invite the honourable member to go back and read *Hansard* this afternoon and try to find any reasonable pretext for that supplementary question and come back and ask it again.

ANIMAL WELFARE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:06): Supplementary arising from the original answer: with the increase of money to the RSPCA, what portion of that increase is tied to the inspectorate or, indeed, is tied in any way to the RSPCA's enforcing animal welfare laws?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:06): That money is provided to the RSPCA to carry out functions that the government wishes the RSPCA to do on our behalf.

ANIMAL WELFARE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:06): Supplementary: why then did the minister previously tell this place that that money was untied?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:06): I can't remember doing that. If the member would like to give me evidence of that, I will correct it.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I refer the member to *Hansard* and, if you like, I will pull the date up, but I can read your words out to you if you like.

ANIMAL WELFARE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:07): Supplementary: would the minister like to examine the House of Assembly *Hansard*—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I can't hear the Hon. Ms Lensink.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Would the minister like to examine the House of Assembly *Hansard* from 1 November 2012, in which the Hon. Bob Such, the member for Fisher, tabled the Animal Welfare (Companion Animals) Amendment Bill?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:07): I don't understand the point of the honourable member's supplementary question. How on earth—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, will you please sit down. There are a number of people who want to ask questions today, so let's try to get a bit of order into this. The minister is on his feet answering the question. Minister, finish the answer so that we can get on with the next question.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Mr President, I don't understand how the honourable member can get out of my original answer to the question any criticism of a member in the lower house. All I am doing is reflecting on the opposition and their ability to actually come up with innovative policy.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Darley.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Darley has the floor. The Hon. Mr Darley.

SHACK SITES

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:08): Thank you, Mr President. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation questions regarding crown shack sites.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: From the late 1990s, lessees of crown shacks were given the opportunity of purchasing the land freehold if certain conditions for the site were met. These

conditions included addressing drainage and flooding issues and installing sewerage systems, etc. My questions are:

1. Can the minister advise the number of shack sites that currently meet conditions but have not been freeholded and the location of these shacks?
2. Can the minister advise the total unimproved value of these shack sites?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his questions and his ongoing interest in this matter. I have mentioned this issue in this place many times in the past. As I understand it, there are fewer than 300 life-tenure shack leases on crown land and about 100 in national park reserves extant.

As many of you already understand, because many of these decisions were made by a former Liberal government, of course, the crown land subject to shack leases has been assessed a number of times, most significantly in 1994, under the then Liberal government's shack site freeholding policy. I do not recall who the minister was at the time, but I can find out if the honourable member has an interest.

The intention of this policy was to permit freeholding, that is, the purchase of land, wherever possible. Following on from this policy, most shacks on crown land were sold to the occupants under this process, I am advised; several thousand of them. Six criteria had to be met for a shack to be eligible for freeholding. All shack sites were assessed to identify those suitable for freeholding, taking into account criteria including public health requirements, continued public access to waterfront, flood and erosion issues and planning requirements.

As I have already said many times, the sites that met the criteria were sold to the occupants. Those that did not meet the criteria were issued with non-transferable life tenure leases, which means that the lease expires when the last lessee passes away. From the Liberal government's own policy on shacks, wherever possible they were offered to the occupants for freeholding.

I note the Crown Land Management (Life Lease Sites) Amendment Bill that was introduced in the Legislative Council by the Hon. Michelle Lensink some time ago. The Hon. Michelle Lensink also introduced the National Parks and Wildlife (Life Lease Sites) Amendment Bill to provide for longer term tenure over shack sites. We all know what happened to that bill. As I can say, there are periodic evaluations of the shacks and periodic evaluation of the requirements, but we've—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The Hon. Mr Brokenshire, of course, has no consideration for local issues in terms of the shacks, in terms of the public health requirements. I wonder; maybe it was the Hon. Mr Brokenshire who was responsible for the policy in the first place. I can't remember.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: I strongly supported the freeholding of the shacks.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: He might have done in the first place, and then perhaps he strongly supported at the same time the not freeholding of these few shacks. Perhaps that was the case, Mr Brokenshire. Perhaps we can go back and research *Hansard* when he strongly supported the freeholding of shacks and see if he strongly supported the exemptions that were granted to these remaining shacks. Let's go back and see what he said about that, and we may find the Hon. Mr Brokenshire ends up supporting this current government's policy.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Darley has a supplementary question.

SHACK SITES

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:12): Is the minister saying that none of the remaining 450 shack sites are eligible for freeholding?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:12): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary. As I said, we are sticking to the policy adopted by the previous Liberal government.

SKILL SHORTAGES

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:12): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question regarding bricklayer shortages and apprenticeships in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: On 30 June 2014, the Australian Brick and Blocklaying Training Foundation issued a media release revealing that there is a growing shortage of skills and availability of bricklayers in Australia. Despite this, the number of apprenticeship commencements in construction, particularly bricklaying, has not improved over the past year. Indeed, the shortages are so severe that in July of this year the federal government added bricklaying to the skilled occupation list for migrants in an attempt to address this growing skills shortage.

My question to the minister is: given that the Australian Brick and Blocklaying Training Foundation has issued a press release in respect of this issue, and given that the federal government has now added bricklaying to the skilled occupation list for migrants, can the minister advise the chamber what measures the state government is taking to address the low apprenticeship numbers in this particular trade?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his question. Just for his information, to the best of my knowledge I am not aware of being approached by any of the construction groups, either training groups or construction associations, indicating a shortage here in South Australia in this particular area. I have not been approached in respect of that.

In relation to how we generally deal with the skills required in this state, we have a process whereby we engage with industry. Our task group has a key role in doing that and they engage regularly with industry groups and business groups to be able to ascertain not only what sorts of skillsets are required but also the sorts of quantities that we might need them in as well. That work is very important work.

Our Training and Skills Commission is responsible for coordinating most of that work. It has launched its 2013 annual report, and there is an updated focus on the demand for qualifications over the five-year period, including a detailed analysis of the skilling requirements for specialist occupations. The plan was updated following extensive consultation with industry and community stakeholders. As I said, we continue to conduct that work and we continue to try to balance the industry needs right across all the sectors, not just the construction sector, with the training placements. We continue to work in that space.

COMMUNITIES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION DEPARTMENT SCREENING UNIT

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:16): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Education and Child Development a question regarding the waiting period for child-related employment screenings.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Much has been said in the media of late of the increase in the backlog for screening as a result of the screening unit now being required to undertake relevant history checks, which we make no criticism of. But according to Peter Bull, executive director of the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion, approximately 10,000 screening checks are being processed per month. Much has been said about a possible lack of staffing and resourcing of the unit as well in the media generally, and we have also heard reports of people waiting upwards of four months for clearances in some cases.

The Advertiser yesterday reported that classroom support and office staff in schools are being sent home on leave with pay as their screening checks have not yet been processed and they are not able to take their positions formally. Understandably, schools are very concerned with this development, as has been communicated to my office. Not only does this pose financial difficulties for them with respect to additional funding requirements to fill the temporary positions that become

available, but obviously children are not receiving the continuity in their learning environment as well. I am informed that the education department has begun sending initial reminder notices to staff six months in advance of their clearance expiry, which may be a step in the right direction. My questions to the minister are:

1. What advice in relation to waiting times for clearances is given to staff in the initial reminder notices that are being sent out?
2. How many staffers are required to undertake multiple screenings within the prescribed three-year period?
3. What policy, if any, exists regarding multiple screenings of the relevant staff?
4. What steps are the minister and the government taking to ensure valuable classroom support and office workers are processed and cleared as expeditiously as possible?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and his ongoing interest in this area. I undertake to take his question about time relating to employment screening checks to the Minister for Education and Child Development in the other place and seek a response on his behalf.

WILD DOG STRATEGIC PLAN

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation a question regarding the Wild Dog Strategic Plan.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: The South Australian Wild Dog Action Group (SAWDAG) was established by the minister and held its inaugural meeting in December 2013. The 12-member group was appointed by the minister to take a statewide view of wild dog management and represents landholders, industry, Indigenous groups and conservation groups. SAWDAG's terms of reference include providing advice to the minister on improvements to wild dog management in the state, proposing sustainable funding models for long-term wild dog management in South Australia, the monitoring of the National Wild Dog Action Plan, and the development of a State Wild Dog Strategic Plan.

On 18 July this year SAWDAG reached its first milestone and provided a draft five-year Wild Dog Strategic Plan for South Australia to the minister. However, since the original communication with the minister two months have passed, and the action group is yet to receive a response or indication of if or when the draft plan will go out for public consultation. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will the minister advise the council when he will respond to SAWDAG regarding the draft five-year Wild Dog Strategic Plan for South Australia that has been provided to him?
2. Will the minister advise the council if and when the draft five-year Wild Dog Strategic Plan for South Australia will go out for public consultation and, if so, what form will the public consultation take?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. Wild dogs are, of course, a national issue. South Australia has endorsed the National Wild Dog Action Plan, which was released by the commonwealth on 4 July this year. The plan has been put together by industry, through WoolProducers Australia, and it is important that the livestock industry has continued their leadership as they are prime beneficiaries of wild dog control, of course.

In November of last year I established the South Australian Wild Dog Advisory Group, as the honourable member has said, to provide recommendations and oversee the implementation of priority action for South Australia under state and national wild dog plans. The group has met on five occasions, with a focus on determining policy actions and investigating opportunities for long-term

funding models to improve the management of wild dog impacts in South Australia. The advisory group is charged with finalising the South Australian Wild Dog Strategic Plan and implementing this, in coordination with the National Wild Dog Action Plan.

My office has received a draft of the state strategic plan and a report on potential improvements to wild dog management from the SA Wild Dog Advisory Group. I am waiting on advice from my department on the draft plan and the accompanying report. I look forward to receiving the advice shortly and engaging with the community on the issues that are raised.

Matters of Interest

AUSTRALIA NETWORK

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:21): I rise to draw to members' attention the termination of the Australia Network, Australia's international television service. Australia Network, along with ABC International Development and Radio Australia, is a division of ABC International, which was created to encourage communication across cultures, establish and foster partnerships within the region, and build awareness of Australia as a friendly neighbour.

The network has successfully broadcast our content, our ideas, our language and our world view 24 hours a day, seven days a week into more than 46 countries in the Asia-Pacific region and India. With the cooperation of nearly 700 re-broadcast partners, Australia Network has reached up to 130 million people. These are important links, representing invaluable soft diplomacy. We should be proud of Australia Network, but it will cease broadcasting this month.

Why? Because, as part of its 2014 budget, the federal government, filled with ideological zeal, rescinded the network's 10 year, \$22 million per annum contract with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade with eight years left to go. The contract's termination, with just 90 days' notice, represents a major loss in jobs, skills, contacts, and of course revenue for our highly respected and much loved national broadcaster.

Though that is bad enough, there are other ramifications. Through the Australia Network we have engaged in a conversation with our neighbours through which we can help to encourage peace and harmony in an increasingly fractious and difficult world. During my travels to Vietnam and South-East Asia, a number of people have told me about different shows they have watched about Australia. As ABC Managing Director, Mark Scott, pointed out recently:

Countries around the world are expanding their international broadcasting services as key instruments of public diplomacy...It sends a strange message to the region that the government does not want to use the most powerful communication tools available to it to talk to our regional neighbours about Australia.

I find it a particularly strange decision considering that the Prime Minister recently came back from India, where he was promoting uranium trade with our Asian partners. We are constantly being told that Australia's future is in Asia. One example that has a particular resonance for Adelaide is the OzAsia Festival, which I had the privilege of attending. It was co-launched by our new Governor, His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le. OzAsia is not being broadcast into Asian households this month because of the federal government's cut to this program.

I ask honourable members to imagine the excitement and the powerful message it would send to millions of our neighbouring friends by broadcasting that we have an Asian-born governor. It would show that South Australia and Australia is a friendly place to live, visit and do business. This represents a missed opportunity and it disappoints me greatly. That is why I want to place on the record the fact that I applaud this visionary initiative by the ABC and DFAT and deplore its termination.

Before I finish, I would like to support and acknowledge a rally held at lunchtime today, which was organised by ABC staff, listeners and viewers to save 150 broadcasters' jobs. These planned job cuts by ABC Sydney management is due to the federal government cuts to the ABC's funding. I ask that the management consider the views of ABC staff and whether there is a better way of handling the cuts to lessen the impact on workers.

CHINESE MID-AUTUMN FESTIVAL

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:26): It is with great pleasure that I rise to speak about the many activities associated with the Mid-Autumn Festival in Adelaide, including the OzAsia Festival and many events organised by our vibrant Chinese and Asian communities of South Australia. Let me start by sharing a poem by the renowned Chinese poet and Confucian scholar, Li Bai. It is titled *A Quiet Night Thought*. The translation goes something like this:

In front of my bed, there is bright moonlight.
It appears to be frost on the ground.
I lift my head and gaze at the bright moonlight
I lower my head and think of my home town.

Since its conception during the Tang Dynasty, *A Quiet Night Thought* remains one of Li Bai's most famous and memorable poems. This poem is still taught at schools in present-day China and in Chinese schools across the world.

It is during the Mid-Autumn Festival period that Chinese migrants who are living abroad admire the moon from afar while remembering their family and friends of their home town. As a migrant of Chinese heritage, I have a deep appreciation of the poem. I dedicated the poem to the members of the Teo Chew Association of South Australia in my speech at the Moon Festival gala dinner on Sunday 14 September.

A significant number of guests knew the poem by heart and could recite it with me on the night. It was a meaningful gesture because it allowed Chinese migrants to reflect on their own story of migration to Australia, to keep their loved ones in their thoughts and prayers and also to preserve the important culture of the Mid-Autumn Festival in South Australia.

It was great to see the Hon. Tung Ngo at the dinner as well. I am sure he agrees with me that it was a very enjoyable evening. I place on record my special thanks to the Teo Chew Association for their warm and generous hospitality. I would also like to express my gratitude and acknowledge the Chinese Welfare Services, the China Business Network of South Australia and also the Overseas Chinese Association for organising events to celebrate the Mid-Autumn Festival with their members and the broader Australian community.

In addition to a luncheon and two dinners that catered for their members, both Chinese Welfare Services and the Overseas Chinese Association demonstrated exceptional leadership by working together with the Confucius Institute and the Migration Museum to present a full day OzAsia program called Infused: All About Tea. It was wonderful to have the new Governor, His Excellency Hieu Van Le, and Mrs Lan Le as the honoured guests on the day. His Excellency is a great inspiration to all and a wonderful asset to South Australia.

The Hon. Stephen Wade and the member for Unley, David Pisoni, were also at the Migration Museum event. I am sure they witnessed the overwhelming affection and respect from the public towards the new Governor. The number of requests for photos with His Excellency is equivalent to a rock star being chased by paparazzi—very impressive.

Many people would know that His Excellency Hieu Van Le was the patron of OzAsia prior to his appointment as the Governor. The OzAsia Festival is a celebration of cultural diversity; a showcase of many talented and exciting artists in Australia and from Asia. I am a proud ambassador of the OzAsia Festival and its recognition of the nation's most outstanding Asian/Australian cultural engagement festival. It is now in its eighth year and it is becoming bigger and better each year. Congratulations to Adelaide Festival Centre, particularly to CEO Douglas Gautier and former OzAsia Festival director, Jacinta Thomson, for their great artistic vision and leadership.

OzAsia is connecting Australia to our closest neighbours, Asia. This year focus is on South Australia's sister state, Shandong. This sister state relationship has been in place since 1986. Shandong is a coastal province and one of the most populated and affluent provinces in China. It is most well known as being the birth place of Confucius.

I would like to share some of the highlights of many OzAsia events. The opening show was the Australian premiere of *Red Sorghum* by Qingdao Song and Dance Theatre Company. It was a passionate and exquisite dance drama from Shandong—a moving drama of courage and patriotism. One of my favourites is *Dream of the Ghost Story*—ghosts, foxes, immortals and demons are brought to life in an outstanding performance with breathtaking acrobatics. It is a fantasy love story by Shandong Acrobatic Troupe.

The other favourite is the Silk Legacy, a showcase of Chinese embroidery tradition. Congratulations to Margaret Lee for her masterpiece of His Excellency Hieu Van Le who comes to life in a silk portrait. It is amazing. A day which is coming up and to which I am looking forward is the Emperor's Feast, which features Cheong Liew, our master chef from South Australia, and the Imperial chef from the Fangshan Restaurant in Beijing. It is just fantastic to see.

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (15:31): Today I wish to speak about our regions. Over the winter parliamentary recess I have had the opportunity to spend a great deal of time in South Australian regions, including visits to the Lower South-East, Yorke Peninsula, Mid South-East and Murray Mallee to meet with those involved in primary industry, local mayors and councillors, and business and community leaders. I have been impressed not only with the dedication and resourcefulness being shown by many but also the level of optimism and commitment to long-term planning for the future.

Many members in this place would understand just how important the Yorke Peninsula is to us though. Its climate makes it an extremely high quality grain producing region. In the past, this region's farmers have been synonymous with growing some of the best malt barley in the world, and while this continues to be the case, many farmers are now growing a wide range of crops, including bread wheats, canola, faba beans and various types of lentils.

I had the distinct pleasure of attending the Agricultural Bureau of South Australia's annual dinner and field trip on 14 and 15 August, which coincided with the bureau's annual general meeting of members from right across the state. I would like to thank Richard Murdoch and the agricultural bureau chair, Mark Grossman, for their invitation and very kind hosting of me. The bureau's annual field trip was an excellent opportunity to visit some of the regions successful farming enterprises and to meet with primary producers to discuss current and future plans, challenges and, in particular, to learn of the many innovative practices being adopted to maximise efficiency in crop yields.

For example, the Collins' family farm provided a good insight into the changing nature of farm storage and how this can maximise farmers' returns on investment by delaying the need to deliver their product to market immediately. In the Collins' case they store lentils for a period to maximise the price they can sell the product for. In addition, they shared their experiences this season with pests such as snails.

The need for farmers to continue to improve their business skills and understanding was emphasised here. Peter Farrow is a fourth generation farmer whose family operates a farm at Wool Bay. He provided bureau members and me with a good opportunity to discuss the merits and challenges that genetically modified seed present to broadacre farmers in South Australia. He also demonstrated machinery he has modified or built specifically to suit his needs and conditions.

Ben Wundersitz's business, Anna Binna enterprise, has been steadily growing and employing best practice farming methods. In particular, Ben and his team have been involved with the farm at the Aboriginal community of Point Pearce, significantly investing in land upgrades and new infrastructure and, importantly, providing employment opportunities for the Point Pearce community. I also visited the Point Pearce Aboriginal community and was encouraged to see firsthand the significant improvements and increased opportunities available, not just at the Point Pearce farm but in the community generally.

There is a significant level of optimism about the future right across the peninsula. It is expecting a bumper crop this year, with yield per hectare crop production expected to be 2.85 tonnes. This is up significantly on the 10-year average of 2.3 tonnes per hectare. A new mine is planned just outside of Ardrossan and, whilst this was a topic of much conversation, and while there is certainly

some opposition, a significant part of the community is looking forward to the economic opportunities it will bring.

The future is looking good for the next generation of those on the peninsula involved in agriculture. One such person I met was Renee Farrow, the 2011 recipient of the Lois Harris Scholarship, who, as part of her agricultural studies, has spent time in many different parts of the world, adding to her experience and learning world's best practice. She has accomplished all this in addition to driving B-doubles of grain from the farm to the port.

I also had the opportunity to visit the impressive new offices of the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* and meet with the managing editor Michael Ellis and the enthusiastic news editor Amie Price. In my work in country areas I keep coming across daughters of members of this council, and often I am significantly more impressed with the daughters of members here than with their fathers. This paper, the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*, has served the community since 1865, when it was established in Wallaroo, and continues to serve the people and the business community today. As with many country areas, the local paper is an integral and trusted part of the community.

Country shows have long been synonymous with regional South Australia. Attending the Kadina show was a highlight of my time on the Yorke Peninsula. The Kadina show was established in 1871 and is one of the longest running shows in the state. The show had something for everyone, and it was a pleasure to meet with the team of Community Radio Gulf FM, who were doing a great job broadcasting live. It was fantastic to see the important work being undertaken in the regions, and I congratulate all those involved in the Agricultural Bureau and the Kadina show and look forward to catching up with the secretary of the show society next time I am in the area.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:37): I rise today to speak about World Suicide Prevention Day and R U OK? Day. There has been a significant recent focus on suicide prevention and mental health in the South Australian community in the lead-up to World Suicide Prevention Day on 10 September and R U OK? Day on 11 September. World Suicide Prevention Day was launched in 2003, and the organisation R U OK? was established in 2009. I think both days, but the organisations that work towards marking those events, promote greater awareness, discussion and conversation around suicide and mental health issues.

Certainly I know from personal experience that some people I know very well, even in this place, probably feel more comfortable with asking someone, 'Are you okay?' than actually asking the question, 'Are you having suicidal thoughts?' If the R U OK? message has got to more people than the other message, the straight-out suicide message, then it is a good thing that we are developing the conversation.

On 1 September I was pleased to speak at the Welcome to Adelaide of the R U OK? bus on its national conversation tour, and certainly that got quite a lot of publicity as it toured in and around Adelaide. I know it also had a particular welcome in the Hon. Mr Lucas' home city of Mount Gambier. On 3 September I attended, along with the Hon. Mr Ridgway, the Freemasons Foundation Centre for Men's Health breakfast. In concert with the University of Adelaide some terrific work is being done in men's health, and particularly in men's mental health. The breakfast featured an excellent presentation from the former Premier of Victoria, the Hon. Jeff Kennett, chairman of *beyondblue*.

On 8 September, along with my colleagues the Hon. Mr Wade and the member for Hartley in another place, and my personal assistant Stacey Caruso, I was pleased to attend the MATES in Construction breakfast here in Adelaide. As I have mentioned previously, MATES in Construction is doing terrific work in the construction and mining industry, providing suicide prevention training right across that industry, and has excellent support from industry groups, unions, superannuation bodies and a range of other groups that have an interest in that area.

On 10 September, World Suicide Prevention Day, I was pleased to attend the Wesley LifeForce memorial service at Semaphore. There were over 200 people there. It was the first one of its kind run by Wesley LifeForce in South Australia, and it was a very fitting memorial for the families who have been bereaved by suicide and for many others who work in the area. I give great thanks to those people who organised that event.

On 11 September, I was delighted to join the Suicide Intervention Life Preservation Action Group (SILPAG) at Port Augusta for a wonderful walk through the Commercial Road business district, up to the wharfside plaza and then to the eastside foreshore, where the 100 or more people present stood on the beach on the letters 'R U OK?' We then had our photograph taken, suitably from the Joy Baluch AM Bridge.

There are a large number of events that I think we as a community can support to get more people engaged in suicide prevention work. In closing, I would just like to indicate that this year's World Suicide Prevention Day has also marked the release of the World Health Organisation's World Suicide Report, and that the aim of all 194 member states is to reduce their suicide rates by 10 per cent by 2020.

CHRONIC PAIN

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:42): Today I would like to speak about the issue of chronic pain in South Australia, because it is one of our many hidden disabilities that leads to stigma that you do not necessarily find with your average chronic illness or disability. Like mental illness, or people with stoma (urostomy or colostomy bags), people with chronic pain often find that they face significant stigma from family, friends and colleagues, the general community and even medical professionals. People just do not seem to believe that the person is in fact experiencing chronic pain.

The thing about chronic pain is that it is invisible. If someone has had their leg amputated or uses a wheelchair, then you can see there is an issue, but for many with chronic pain, the issue is hidden and makes it all the worse. If someone is losing their hair from chemotherapy, you believe them that they are having treatment for cancer, but it seems to be human nature to not necessarily believe, understand or empathise with someone else's experience if we cannot see it ourselves.

I use a wheelchair and no-one questions whether I have a disability or not, but for people with chronic pain and other invisible disabilities, they find themselves constantly subjected to the allegation that they are making up the pain or that it is all in their head. In addition to trying to manage pain, often with limited treatment, access to drugs and support, coping with the stigma of others is soul destroying. Chronic pain can be absolutely debilitating, leaving people experiencing it unable to work, live or even participate in family life. The World Health Organisation says that chronic pain is one of our most underestimated health problems worldwide. This is certainly the case for South Australia, when you consider:

1. the lack of a chronic pain strategy for the state of South Australia;
2. the unacceptably long waiting times to see SA chronic health specialists in SA Health;
3. the failure of South Australia to adopt the National Pain Strategy 2010—and I am at pains to state that we are the only state not to have done so;
4. the failure of SA Health to include chronic pain in any strategic planning documents that are publicly available;
5. the process for approving and prescribing schedule 8 medications in the very small percentage of people who require a very high dosage of opioid medications; and
6. the lack of proper review and appeal processes and principles of natural justice being absent when access to schedule 8 medication is denied.

One in five Australians under the age of 65 will experience chronic pain and one in three Australians over the age of 65 will experience chronic pain in their lifetime. Yesterday, I had the pleasure of hosting and facilitating a meeting that has been a long time in the making. Following many constituents who were experiencing chronic pain contacting my office in the preceding three years, the South Australian health minister, the Hon. Jack Snelling MP, finally agreed to meet with some of these people. I certainly do appreciate the health minister's efforts to attend the meeting for an hour yesterday but also appreciate senior SA Health officers making themselves available. However, I will say this: unless we address some of the failings I mentioned earlier in SA Health's current approach to chronic pain, we will face a further crisis in the coming years.

As the South Australian population ages, the rate of chronic pain experienced will only increase. Unless we acknowledge that this is one of our major health system failings, we will face a chronic pain issue of epic proportions. I do hope that the minister pushes his bureaucrats in SA Health to rectify the current malaise we seem to have around chronic pain in this state. The meeting was certainly a welcome first step, and I appreciate the efforts of my constituents in coming into parliament to meet with the minister and myself, and I look forward to continuing this action in this very important area.

LABOR PARTY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:46): I rise to talk about the arrogance of the Weatherill government, Premier Weatherill and his ministers in relation to a series of issues relating to the community and to the parliament and, in particular, to the Legislative Council.

The arrogance of treasurer Koutsantonis, for example, in relation to the ESL has been evident to anyone. Anyone who has expressed any concern about the impact of the ESL has been treated in an arrogant and dismissive fashion by Mr Koutsantonis. For example, when CFS volunteers complained about the impact on them, he dismissively referred, on Channel 7, to this issue by saying, 'Who is really worried about this? Thousands of people will line up to replace those who might not continue as CFS volunteers.' That was the attitude adopted by the Mr Koutsantonis. The ESL, as I have indicated before, is a political carcass hanging around Mr Koutsantonis's neck and, no matter how hard he tries, the political stench will remain with him from between now and up until the next election in 2018.

The arrogance of other ministers is well known. Minister Rau, minister Gago, minister Hunter and others and, before that, minister Atkinson (now Speaker Atkinson) have engaged in a relentless attack on the Legislative Council as an institution and on Legislative Councillors as individuals. There have been many references to comparing members of the Legislative Council to the bar room scene from *Star Wars* and other unflattering descriptions as well.

The arrogance of minister Hunter and minister Gago has been evident for many years now in this chamber, in particular during question time. We have seen minister Hunter's dismissive, patronising arrogance towards individual members of the Legislative Council when difficult questions are put to him. We have seen the arrogance of minister Gago, for example, raised again yesterday when the Liberal Party highlighted the fact that a question had been asked about Mr Lance Worrall's employment back on 7 May and that an answer had been prepared for the minister on 8 May and the minister arrogantly decided not to provide that answer to the parliament until it was leaked to the opposition, and it was highlighted in question time yesterday.

We have seen the arrogance of ministers Gago and Hunter in refusing to answer not just the Worrall question but literally dozens and dozens, possibly hundreds, of other questions without notice during question time unless further pursued. Some members have waited years and have still not received replies to questions in relation to particular issues. We have seen the arrogance of the ministers refusing to answer more than 3,000 questions on notice, some for more than 10 years. The arrogance of the ministers and this government towards the Legislative Council as an institution and individual members sadly knows no bounds.

There has been great concern expressed from the community and the parliament, but now from within the Labor Party, on the left of the Labor Party, about minister Gago's performance. The fact, for example, that her own department has now leaked confidential briefing notes that have been provided to the minister, such as the one that was placed on the record yesterday, is an indication that she has lost the faith of her own department in terms of her performance.

There is also significant division, as we know, with the left faction of the Labor caucus. We saw that in the exchange earlier this year, which was highlighted, between the Hon. Mr Gazzola and the Hon. Mr Maher, when the Hon. Mr Gazzola dismissively referred to the Hon. Mr Maher as part of the new left where attributes such as loyalty were no longer attributes that you could associate with the left of the Labor Party.

We are advised that minister Gago has now been told that she has reached her political use by date and she has been told that she will leave the ministry by no later than March or April of next

year. That is because her 13 years will be up. She started service on 9 February 2002. At that time she will be eligible for voluntary retirement, should she choose to take voluntary retirement after she loses the ministry.

The deal—the fix is in that the Hon. Mr Maher is going to come in and take over as a minister from the Hon. Ms Gago. That particular model has worked well for the Labor Party, hasn't it, in the past? One remembers the Hon. Mr Holloway being told that he had to resign, and the Hon. Mr Finnigan took over as a minister, and we know how well that worked for the Labor Party. The rumours are that the early favourite to replace Ms Gago was Simon Blewett, but his star has waned and there is now a proposal or pressure to find a female left union representative to replace Ms Gago when she goes.

URBAN MYTH THEATRE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:52): I rise today to pay tribute to Urban Myth Theatre. As members would know, Urban Myth Theatre, which started its life as Unley Youth Theatre, has been a mainstay, not only of the arts fabric of the South Australian community but of the youth opportunities of this state, for some 34 years. It has had more than 10,500 active participants and it has produced more than 160 plays. The company, however, has announced that it is looking to liquidate and the next show that is coming up—*Warren*—may not even be an Urban Myth show; it may have to move to becoming a community production.

This is a sad day. As members would know, Urban Myth is something of a legend, and I am here to say we should not let Urban Myth become something of legend in South Australia. I know that the Hon. Kelly Vincent is a strong supporter, and certainly our state government has been a strong supporter of Urban Myth and provides annual funding of some \$97,000 a year, but unfortunately the Arts Council, a few years back, discontinued what is its key organisation funding to that organisation.

Urban Myth Theatre may well be no more, and I think that is something that we cannot afford to lose in South Australia. Its only hope now is some sort of last-minute reprieve, whether that is through government funding or I know it has a possible campaign running on one of the parents' Facebook pages.

The value that Urban Myth has brought to this state is incalculable, but we can look to people, actors like Hugh Sheridan, to see how much value Urban Myth can provide for the talent and investment and the pride of our state. We are a state which prides itself on the arts and support for the arts, and yet this next generation of artists coming through will not have Urban Myth there to help them.

Urban Myth also gives children who do not fit into the mainstream a chance. If they do not play competitive sport, they have an ability to express their creativity and imagination. I have read several letters from young children and I stood on the steps of this parliament one Saturday morning during the winter recess of this place and listened to young people in tears about the loss of this theatre company.

It means far more to them than simply putting on a show. It is their place, where they can be themselves, discover themselves and find other people who are like them when they come from places and schools and communities where they have thought that they were the only one. Whether that is regional communities—and amazing young women like Alysha Herrmann come to mind—or whether it is our local schools in the metropolitan area, Urban Myth gives these kids hope, and I think we should be giving the kids from Urban Myth hope.

We should be standing up for them and making sure that not only does the show go on with *Warren* but that Urban Myth goes on. We pride ourselves in this state on investing in the arts and the film industry. I ask: where will the film industry be in some years if we do not have that talent? You need look no further than Closer Productions. Many members may be aware of the film that has received enormous international accolades in the past few years, *52 Tuesdays*.

Not only is pretty much the majority of that Closer Productions crew Urban Myth graduates, if you like, they say (and through Sophie Hyde who spoke on the steps of parliament that day) that they learnt their way of working from their experience in Urban Myth. They learnt their collaboration

skills and they also built their community that way. Many of the people involved in not only 52 *Tuesdays* but a range of Closer Productions initiatives have actually come through that Urban Myth training.

Another person who has come through the Urban Myth model is Finegan Kruckemeyer. I can say that name because he is a good friend of mine and I am proud to call him a friend. He is a former member of Urban Myth who has had 52 commissioned plays performed on five continents. He credits joining Urban Myth as his biggest and most formative step.

Certainly when I think of Urban Myth, I think of people like Finegan Kruckemeyer, and when I think that we are going to lose Urban Myth, we will not have the Finegan Kruckemeyers, we will not have the Sophie Hydes and we will not have the Hugh Sheridans coming up and making South Australia proud. Let's not let Urban Myth fall into legend; let's make sure Urban Myth continues on. With that, I know my colleague Senator Sarah Hanson-Young is writing to all federal and state South Australian MPs and I urge all members of both this council and the House of Assembly to step up in support of Urban Myth.

Bills

ANIMAL WELFARE (COMPANION ANIMALS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:57): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to Animal Welfare Act 1985. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It is probably a bit of a no-brainer to say that most people universally like animals. Australia has high levels of ownership of pets, and the figures from the select committee, which I will refer to extensively and which reported in the House of Assembly last year, found that nationally 36 per cent of households have dogs and 23 per cent have cats. South Australians are great pet owners and we are fortunate to have many dedicated breeders who operate best practice to provide healthy animals that bring joy to their owners. We also have some fantastic shelters in the state that look after animals, improve their health, microchip them and so forth, and provide them to people who are looking to adopt. South Australians are, however, rightly concerned about exploitation and neglect of animals by unscrupulous individuals, and it is important that our laws reflect this.

While there has been a lot of publicity about puppy farms and hoarding, I find it personally remarkable that some households still do not undertake basic health, welfare and prevention practices for their pets, such as desexing, vaccinations and microchipping. I am hopeful that new laws will improve community understanding so that these become standard practice within our state. I have at times been accused of being Dr Eleanor Abernathy MD JD, otherwise known as the crazy cat lady from *The Simpsons*, but we only have two cats in our house and we do not throw them at people.

There are a disturbing number of animals euthanased in our shelters, and this is something that certainly struck me when I first became the shadow minister for the environment some years ago. Large animal shelters, such as the Animal Welfare League, can receive, on average, 20 dogs and 100 cats a day. Some of the euthanasia rates have been 80 per cent of cats, because they cannot find homes. The RSPCA rates, I note from the report in 2011-12, were 21 per cent of dogs and 54 per cent of cats, which is still, I think, far too high.

There is an issue with what is known as semi-owned animals: the typical stray that hangs around someone's house and gets fed but is not actually officially owned by someone, and some of those animals can be prolific breeders. In this, compulsory desexing is an important tool that I think would send a very strong message into the community to make sure they are doing the right thing.

There are also some unfortunate myths that proliferate throughout society, and you still hear them, such as that a cat is better behaved if it has had a litter. I do not think that has been thought

through to its logical conclusion that hopefully the litter of kittens is wanted by enough households, because that would just see numbers increase exponentially.

In this whole issue that was brought to my attention by the shelters in particular several years ago, a number of options have crossed my mind, such as cat registration, but I think that has been found just to penalise the responsible owners. The history of the SA committee, as we have discussed today in question time, is that the Hon. Bob Such tabled a bill—the Animal Welfare (Companion Animals) Amendment Bill—on 1 November 2012. It was based to a degree on the Victorian model, which has since been amended, which regulated the breeding of companion animals for profit, and that profit angle has been changed in the Victorian legislation.

A committee was established in response to that and received input from 124 individuals, 34 organisations and 10 breeders. It reported in July 2013 with a series of recommendations. Both major parties committed to the implementation of the committee recommendation during this year's election. I would like to congratulate the members on their bipartisanship and for doing a great deal of groundwork, because people can come up with all sorts of ideas on things which sound good at the time but which in practice do not necessarily work. The terms of reference were:

- (a) options for the regulation of welfare standards for breeding companion dogs and cats;
- (b) adequacy of regulation of the source in relation to sales;
- (c) whether a cooling off period should be provided;
- (d) adequacy of the regulation of pet shops; and
- (e) considering registration, microchipping and desexing.

The report did a comparison of interstate laws, which I would commend people to read for themselves. It also looked at what the laws in this state are, obviously. There are three instruments that govern companion animals in South Australia: we have the Animal Welfare Act, the Dog and Cat Management Act, and an instrument known as the South Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Management of Animals in the Pet Trade, which I will refer to subsequently as the pet trade code, but there are some fairly clear gaps in all those instruments.

As noted by the committee, the breeding of companion animals is largely unregulated in South Australia. There are existing general provisions in the Animal Welfare Act in section 13 regarding ill treatment of animals. The Animal Welfare Regulations require breeders to comply with the pet trade code, which applies to people selling animals for profit and animals held for the short term—which I note would only apply to newly-acquired animals or very young animals, so clearly it is missing quite a few gaps. I note that a review of that code was established in 2009, which reported in July 2010. It is referred to in Appendix 1 of the report, which has not been progressed.

The Dog and Cat Management Act does not recognise animals under the age of three months and is largely a management tool for councils, so it is not particularly useful in this context. For very young animals this is obviously a vulnerable time, for their health, immunity and so forth, so clearly some parts of the picture are missing, in a legal sense.

This bill pretty much lifts out the recommendations, except for the ones that are too difficult to address by legislation, such as minimum qualifications for pet shop staff. There was also a recommendation about advocating the use of the Found Pets app (or application). I note that there are a few sites on social media which are very active in a similar space: Lost Dogs of Adelaide on Twitter or on Facebook.

Within this bill a number of details have been left to the regulations which will require the government to advance them following the passage of the bill, assuming it gets up. In relation to term of reference A, which is options for the regulation of welfare standards for breeding companion dogs and animals, the first recommendation was to introduce an enforceable standard for the breeding of companion animals, which is new clause 5E and 5F of the bill, which establishes it under regulation. The government, in forming this regulation, must consult with what are known in the bill as prescribed peak bodies, including the RSPCA SA, the Animal Welfare League of SA, the Local Government of SA, Dogs SA, the Feline Association of SA, or any other organisation as defined by the regulations.

I note that there probably would not be any other prescribed peak bodies but it has been left open just in case.

The committee recommended that the enforceable standard be based on the New South Wales code for breeding cats and dogs, with the insertion of the relevant provisions within the Dogs SA and Australian National Kennel Council codes, which are currently not legally enforceable, with the only penalty, if you like, for breaching them being exclusion from that organisation. The committee further recommended that the standard cover animals across the full spectrum of the breeding cycle, from puppies to post-breeding adults.

Further, the committee recommended that all breeders should be subject to random unannounced inspections. Its second recommendation was to introduce a licensing scheme for breeders, which is clause 15G, which states that a breeder's licence is required subject to a range of conditions; new clause 15H, which relates to revocations and the suspension of breeders' licences; and clause 15I, which makes it an offence to breed or mate companion animals without a breeder's licence. At page 22 of the report the recommendation was quite detailed, and I will read it for the record because I think it is important. It states:

The committee's preference is for every owner of an entire (not desexed) animal to be recognised as a breeder, and assigned a unique breeder licence number. The committee recognises that this detail would need to be the subject of consultation and regulatory impact assessment.

The committee recommends that the scheme would require people intending to purchase an animal for the purposes of breeding to acquire the licence before acquiring the animal.

Enforcement would occur through a combination of animal welfare inspections...and the committee's recommendation...that at the point of advertising or sale, a breeder licence number must be displayed.

The committee recommends the scheme contemplate the inclusion of provisions for temporary licences to cover owners whose animals incidentally become pregnant, or who wish to breed one time only, and consider a sliding scale of fees to reflect the varying scale of breeding operations.

The committee recommends that the scheme be integrated with existing animal registries to maintain the link between breeder licence numbers and microchip numbers of individual animals.

Such an initiative is only likely to be successful if done in concert with the introduction of a proper enforceable code of practice as a regulation of the Animal Welfare Act.

In relation to the second term of reference, which is adequacy of regulation of the source (in relation to sales), the committee noted that the source of animals is currently also unregulated. The Pet Trade Code only refers to animals that are available for trade or profit and only makes reference to the customer having their pet desexed after purchase and the need for dogs to have current vaccination certificates. Its concern with not being able to reunite unmicrochipped animals with their owners, the large number of surrenders to shelters and high euthanasia rates, poor breeding practices leading to defects led the committee to recommend that the breeder's licence number and the animal's microchip number be identified in advertising and at point of sale.

Clause 15K in the bill requires that companion animals must be desexed, with the regulations to prescribe the period in which this must take place and the maximum or minimum age at which this takes place. A person or prescribed companion animal may be exempted. Licenced breeders are exempt from this requirement.

On that note, I might discuss the issue of at what age animals should be desexed, because clearly people are buying puppies and kittens that are eight weeks of age. Traditionally, I think the veterinarian schools have recommended that animals not be desexed until they are six months of age, which makes the possibility of requiring desexed animals quite awkward. I would like to commend the Hon. Tammy Franks who last year organised the SA Companion Animals Shelter Seminar here in Parliament House, in which she brought a range of stakeholders together to discuss no kill.

The keynote speaker was a veterinarian from the Pennsylvania in the US, Dr Michael Moyer. He was a fascinating person to listen to. He spoke about the fact that, in the US, they are desexing animals at quite young ages—six weeks in some instances—and that it probably requires a change to the training in Australia of our veterinarians to undertake this practice. The RSPCA, which has a number of policies, is actually advocating for earlier desexing of animals, and so I think there is some

significant shift to supporting that practice, which I think has to be a good thing if we are to fulfil the commitment that, when animals are adopted by their new owners, the vaccination, microchipping and desexing is all done at the same time, rather than having a rather loose commitment that someone may desex their animal down the track and then not get around to doing it.

New clause 15L makes it illegal to buy or sell companion animals unless they are bred according to the laws. Clause 15M makes it illegal to sell an animal unless it is vaccinated, wormed and microchipped. Term of reference (c) was whether a cooling-off period should be provided. The committee noted that the SA Pet Trade Code requires the proprietor to supply the new owner with a range of information about care and welfare matters for the new pet but is silent on returning the animal. Rather than adopt interstate practices which allow animals to be returned, or within seven days for health reasons, the committee stated:

The committee considers a better solution is to have the cooling off period after formally giving notice of intention to purchase an animal and before actually taking possession. This minimises the stress on the animal itself and allows the purchaser time to properly reflect on the appropriateness of the decision to purchase a pet. This is the procedure employed by the rescue groups and members of pedigree clubs.

The committee recommended a cooling-off period, with an exemption for organisations and breeders who have what they describe as a 'self-imposed cooling-off period', such as Dogs SA or members of ANKC and shelters because they already provide a matching service.

New clause 15N provides a cooling-off period for 10 days, so that the seller must take the animal back within 24 hours. Term of reference (d) was the adequacy of the regulation of pet shops. They often come under fire, and I think they probably do vary greatly in the manner in which they treat animals. I am sure some are excellent, but some are probably quite dodgy. Someone rang me after this story was released and told me about one that I should quietly go and have a look at. But the committee did not think there was any value in preventing people from selling through pet shops, and if these measures are taken up that will take care of that.

I note that there is a proliferation of sales online through websites and the classified advertising, and a dedicated place such as a pet shop potentially is better than what people may be doing through those facilities. Term of reference (e) was to consider registration, micro-chipping and desexing, which is clearly one of the recommendations. The euthanasia rates alone are one of the reasons why we must surely take up some greater regulation. The Dog and Cat Management Board's estimate was that the cost to councils in regard to issues arising from unmicrochipped dogs was in excess of \$1.33 million in the 2011-12 financial year, because thousands of dogs are impounded every year and a large number are not returned home.

In that same period 47.7 per cent, so less than 50 per cent, of dogs were reclaimed, and only 3 per cent of cats were reclaimed. The Dog and Cat Management Board notes that the voluntary desexing rate for dogs appears to have stopped at about 66 per cent and not gone further. I note that they made comments in relation to cat owners. They say that there are two categories of cats: some are truly feral and have no contact with humans; some are urban cats or part-owned cats; but, by and large, most cats are owned by someone, well looked after, microchipped and desexed. The estimate (because cats are not registered it can only be an estimate), is that it is probably in the 80 to 90 per cent range.

The other term of reference, which is fairly standard in all committees, is quote 'any other matter', and a number of recommendations were made in relation to further education. I note that the Dog and Cat Management Board runs a number of programs to assist people to understand how to ensure their pets are healthy, do not become a nuisance or pest to other people, and so forth, and I commend them for that work.

In relation to consultation, I have formally written to—and I note that this bill is out for consultation, so I am seeking input, and if there are particular clauses people think should be amended then we would like to hear from them—the RSPCA SA, the Animal Welfare League, the Australian Veterinary Association, the two associations that are responsible for the purebred animals, Dogs SA and the Feline Association of SA. I note through their submissions to the committee that both support more regulation of the Local Government Association of SA. The member for Fisher, the Hon. Bob Such, was very pleased to know that something was finally being done on this issue.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: 'Hear, hear,' says the Hon. Tammy Franks. She deserves some commendation; although I have not formally written to her, she will receive the bill, of course. Mia McKenzie from The PAW Project I think I met first at the Hon. Tammy Franks' conference last year.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: At the Companion Animal Shelter Summit.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: At the Companion Animal Shelter Summit—thank you for that reminder of the title. Paws & Claws Adoptions on Magill Road at Stepney I recommend to members—I love that place. It is quite unique, with lots of cats lounging around, very relaxed. It is quite different from—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Cool cats.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Cool cats; well, they are very chilled. I have to say if people turned up to where I live and saw my cats—well, they would not see the cats, because they would bolt. But, these cats lounge around on lounges. My husband donated a piece of his old bachelor furniture that I was quite keen to see moved on, and they love it. It is a chaise, and they lounge on that.

I would like to commend Miriam Schiller, who is an amazing volunteer. They run these desexing clinics through there, they have a café and they have a microchipping day, and they do this all with volunteers. They are truly to be commended for their work. I have also written to Rempoter Kennels and the Law Society of South Australia.

So far, I have received some preliminary responses from the RSPCA, who were very quick off the mark. They are very supportive of implementation of the committee recommendations, particularly breeder licensing, but they are concerned that the breeder licensing scheme must be done in a certain manner so that there is no way that the regulation can be circumvented.

They cite that there has been some experiences interstate where that may have taken place. In particular, they also say that there should be user-pays system in relation to that, physical inspection of breeders, no exemptions from the code of practice, independent drafting of codes of practice, a fit and proper persons test for holders of breeders licences, and the ability to revoke or suspend licences.

The Australian Veterinary Association supports licensing and microchipping but has some concerns about mandatory desexing because they say it will prevent pet owners from having the occasional litter.

I now refer to the clauses of the bill. I have described most of them already, but there are some new definitions, such as 'prescribed companion animal', 'prescribed peak body', a definition of 'purchase', 'sell' and 'seller', and 'owners' who are either the last registered owner of a dog or the last person recorded through the microchip him, or whomever is habitually the apparent owner.

There is new clause 15D, whereby the minister may approve an animal welfare organisation; 15E and 15F, which relate to codes of practice for breeding; 15G—breeders licences are required subject to a range of conditions; 15H—revocations and suspension of breeders' licences; 15I—offence to breed or mate companion animals without a breeder's licence; 15K—companion animals to be desexed (with the regulation standing order prescribe the period in which this must take place and the maximum or minimum age at which this must take place); 15L—illegal to buy or sell companion animals unless they are bred according to laws; 15M—illegal to sell an animal unless it is vaccinated, worked and microchipped; 15N—cooling off period for 10 days; and 15Q—exemptions, such as for shelters, where the minister can exempt them from selling an animal that is being bred in a puppy farm, because clearly they are the ones who would be involved in fostering and rehoming them.

The penalties are set at \$10,000 generally. I note that in the existing act the penalties range from \$2,500 to \$50,000, and it is a matter of whether that penalty is sufficient or whether it needs to be increased, and whether there should be some expiable offences. There are also some changes

to the evidence provisions and exemption for working dogs due to the animal husbandry section within the current legislation.

I have to say I was a little bit disappointed at the minister during question time today—I mean, I am most days, because he is kind of churlish and arrogant, and it is almost as if someone has taken away his lolly or something. But, to put on a bit of a performance like that is just—this was a bipartisan committee, as the Hon. Tammy Franks reminded us in question time today. It was in response to the concerns that were brought to the parliament by the member for Fisher, and I think that the committee worked very effectively together. We have been waiting for some time.

The minister has had more than enough time to do something about this, given that the committee reported in July last year. I do not think that the issues are particularly contentious. There may be differences of opinion in the community over aspects of the licensing and at what age and whether desexing should be compulsory, but I would have thought that it was the job of I will not say a re-elected government but a re-formed government to just get on with things, and we have not seen that. Then when a member of the opposition gets off their backside and gets a bill drafted, we just get mud thrown at us. I hope that is not the future way forward for this debate, because I do not think that it is particularly useful to anyone or to any animal, for that matter. With those comments, I commend the bill to the house.

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

Motions

MUSIC INDUSTRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:25): I move:

That this council—

1. Affirms the importance of the music industry to South Australia;
2. Commends the establishment of the Music Development Office and the Music Industry Council;
3. Notes the cuts to the VET music programs previously offered at Noarlunga TAFE and currently offered at the University of Adelaide; and
4. Urges timely action to ensure a breadth and depth of entry level professional development vocational opportunities are secured from 2015 and into the future.

I am happy to move this motion standing in my name affirming the importance of the music industry to our state and, indeed, commending the government on its actions to not only establish the Music Development Office but also the Music Industry Council and to be willing to work with that council. Certainly, it is a good week for South Australian music and the music industry.

Yesterday, we saw at Adelaide University Paul Kelly receive an honorary doctorate. We should be justly proud of his achievements and claim them as our own. Even though perhaps his song *Adelaide* is not necessarily the best reflection on our fair capital city, I am sure that it speaks to many of us in many ways. It is also a wonderful time where we are seeing the likes of Sia Furler leading the world and being an outstanding success. In these past weeks, we have seen the fruits start to come from the work of the live music Thinker in Residence.

I am very pleased that the Hon. John Gazzola is in the chamber; he has been a great supporter of not only live music but also music in general. A former staff member of mine referring to John Gazzola as the Ayatollah of rock'n'roll is possibly not parliamentary, but it is certainly meant to be complimentary.

This has been a great time for celebration. I attended the Sounds X South Australia launch on the weekend, where the Premier spoke and, indeed, we had the live music Thinker in Residence return to our state to see some of his work. I do thank him also for his kind words to me personally in his recognising that it was indeed a Greens amendment to the gaming fund that has substantially injected funds into the music industry. I hope that in no small part they have gone to some of the great things that we are seeing come out in this state at the moment.

We saw on Saturday night a showcase of the Stigwood Fellows, those artists who have received awards. Indeed, one of the members of the band Echo and the Empress received a

Stigwood Fellowship. I had heard a rumour on the grapevine that that band, having gone to Glastonbury and having started to climb that festival circuit, was indeed thinking of folding and going their separate ways. But she said to me, 'No, the Stigwood Fellowship means that I think that we're going to go on and we're going to keep trying as a band.'

That is a band that we should be justly proud of and, indeed, we should be supporting, and this is an industry we should be supporting. It is an industry of entrepreneurs. It is an industry that is a creative industry. It is the way of South Australia's future. We cannot continue to think that the manufacturing sector, in the ways of the past, will be our future and that, indeed, the creative industries must be invested in, which is why I draw the attention of this council to the music course cuts in VET education.

Last year, Noarlunga TAFE students received an email; in fact, they all received exactly the same email addressed to somebody called Simon. Nobody is quite sure who the student Simon is. Certainly Emily Retsas received an email addressed to Simon, as did her fellow students, informing that their courses in music at Noarlunga TAFE were to be cut and also advising those students that they could go elsewhere.

The options that were given to them included Salisbury, which as many people will be aware is not geographically close to Noarlunga. They were also told that they could go to Adelaide University. Currently there is a cert III and a cert IV at Adelaide University, and a diploma, which is often seen as a bridging course or a bridging pathway into the Con, the Elder Conservatorium there.

What Emily has now found, to her dismay, is that not only was it too late to apply to study at either Salisbury or Adelaide Uni, but next year, should she wish to continue her studies at Adelaide University, the cert III, the cert IV and the diploma are no longer going to be offered. I understand that the Skills for All funding that the state government provides to Adelaide University will not continue to be offered. I do not understand the politics of it.

Certainly, I have heard many versions and many stories. What I do know is that those students in South Australia will not have an option of those certificate and diploma courses in music at Adelaide University from 2015. In fact, it looks like Salisbury TAFE will continue to be the only option at that level. There are Music SA courses; they are at a lesser level, if you like; and there are university courses; they are at a higher level.

Particularly for working class students, country students or students who have gone to schools where they have not had the opportunity to study music, that means that the pathways have been cut off. That is why I held a public meeting at the Jade Monkey, an iconic live music institution in this town, particularly as it was threatened with being closed down forever and indeed was the subject of a very long battle to be re-established.

That public meeting at the Jade Monkey was an eye-opener. I invited minister Gago to that public meeting, and I also cc'd that invitation to the Minister for the Arts, Jack Snelling. I understand that neither was able to attend. I know that people cannot be in all places at all times, but I certainly thought I would come and share, not only with those ministers but with members of this council, some of the goings-on at that meeting.

I asked local councillor for the Norwood, Payneham and St Peters council, Sophia MacRae, to play a little bit of saxophone to open the meeting. I thought it would be a nice touch. Zac, who is the manager of the Jade Monkey, came up and said, 'Oh, Tammy, you didn't tell me you were going to have somebody play a live instrument in the band room. That means I have to close all of the glass doors. Now, if she wants to play out in the courtyard in the street, we don't have to close a single door, but if she's going to play here on the stage without enormous amplification, we have to shut all of the glass doors.'

That is an indication that, yet again, liquor licensing is impacting on live music in this state in a way that it should not. However, Sophia, Zac and I plodded on. Sophia not only played some music to start the meeting, but she then went on to say a few words. She said:

Music is not an easy career, it is not an easy business, but it is so important because we are humans, we're not just rational creatures needing facts and figures, we are emotional creatures, we need music, and a city without music is not a place where I want to be, or where any of us want to be.

If we lose these training opportunities, we are going to lose the opportunity for people to be musicians in our town and to contribute to it.

She was followed by Jim Glasser, who is currently an Adelaide University student at the Elder Conservatorium. Jim has actually rallied his fellow students and been petitioning the university to keep these courses going. Jim spoke about why he as a student enrolled in the cert IV at Noarlunga. He said:

Having only decided to pursue music half way through yr 12 I didn't have the grounding in theoretical music that most people have when they go through yr 12 music so I enrolled in the Noarlunga cert 4.

He is now at Adelaide University, and he is now in several bands, one of which is now at the Coffee Pot on a Thursday night, where they have a residency, he was not ashamed to tell us. He is working his way through that course and is a working musician. Without that cert IV, he would not be in that situation.

He is concerned because the Elder Conservatorium has previously been a prestigious music school and should continue to be, but many who were there on that day noted that if we lose these courses from the Elder Conservatorium we are losing around a third of what is currently on offer there. The critical mass that you have and the connections that you make in that context may indeed be more valuable than simply these courses as stand-alone ones.

Emily Retsas, who I mentioned before (who is not Simon, as I also mentioned before), said that she had applied to attend Noarlunga and do the certificate IV because every musician she met who was touring internationally, playing with bands, working full-time, where music was their full-time job, had actually said to her, 'You need to go to Noarlunga. The lecturers there are amazing; they will get you the skills you need to be a working musician so you can get the type of opportunities that we currently have.' She went on to say that she is looking to apply not just interstate, but overseas.

She has told me that she has spent many years saying, 'No, no, stay in Adelaide,' to her peers, 'Let's make Adelaide work.' But she now advises them, 'I am looking overseas for my opportunities. Perhaps you should look interstate or overseas,' because, indeed, the opportunities aren't going to be in Adelaide in the future. She says that she is looking to a great music school in Los Angeles where in fact John Butler went and got in. She says that if you want to be involved in the contemporary music scene there are not the options there for you at the moment. She has gone back to her day job this year and next year she will seriously be reconsidering whether or not she stays in our state.

Further speakers went on to talk about how they would never have been able to get into the Elder Conservatorium had there not been bridging paths through the TAFE and through those other pathways. In particular, they pointed out that they came from working class backgrounds and so they did not have the privilege of private music lessons and they had not been to the schools where music was a focus. There are a few public schools in this state where there is a music focus, but they are few and far between.

I certainly say to not only members of this council but members of this government, when I commend you for this investment in this industry—and it is a multi-billion dollar industry, let's make no mistake—yes, it is fun, yes, it is enjoyable, but there is big money here to be made, and this creates entrepreneurs. When we do not have jobs, perhaps we should be looking at creating entrepreneurs, and music is certainly a great way to do it. I say to this government: if you are going to see the loss of those courses from 2015 at Adelaide University—the certificate III, certificate IV and the diploma—and last year you presided over the cuts to those music offerings at Noarlunga, then how can you get up with a straight face and launch something like Sounds x South Australia and say that you are investing in this industry.

I commend the work, and the Music Development Office is a great step forward. Treating music as an industry and taking it out of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and putting it in the state development jurisdiction is another step forward. The investment and support for Musitec is a great, fantastic new initiative with a global focus and another great step forward. The St Paul's Creative Centre is an iconic, brilliant stroke in the city of churches, to take an old church and turn it into a music creative hub. It is fantastic work, but where are the people going to come from in the future to fill these positions and to create these opportunities and to be the Sia Furlers of the future

to the Paul Kellys of the future to the Hilltop Hoods of the future? Where are they going to be coming from if we cut this very industry off at the knees?

I urge those members of parliament who have the power to revisit this issue where we have seen the Adelaide University withdraw these courses. Perhaps there is no way that we can restore them at Adelaide University. I am certainly open to whatever options we can put on the table to solve this problem before it becomes even bigger. In 2015, these opportunities will be severely diminished, and I believe that we will see the results in coming decades in the diminution of this industry.

With those few words, I look forward to working with all members of this parliament on this issue and I hope that this has raised this and put it on the radar. I was certainly told by some staffers in the past weeks when I have been trying to have conversations with them about this issue that it was just not on the radar, that it just was not creating a noise. Well, as we know, musicians certainly create a noise, and I am hoping that that sound will be a beautiful one, not a discordant one.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee.

WHITE RIBBON DAY

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

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.

(Continued from 2 July 2014.)

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:42): In supporting this motion I would first like to congratulate the Hon. John Dawkins for putting it on the *Notice Paper*, because it does give members of parliament a chance to reflect on the White Ribbon campaign and also on the task that is ahead of us in eliminating violence against women in our society. Many of the men in state parliament are White Ribbon ambassadors, which is appropriate, because we are in a unique position, or at least an uncommon position, where we are often invited out into the community to speak with community groups, service clubs, churches, schools and the like.

For me, I usually keep my white ribbon on one of my jackets, even if it is not White Ribbon Day, because it helps to remind me when I am speaking to these groups—especially university students and secondary students—to make sure I mention it in my remarks, to explain why I wear the white ribbon. At these occasions we are often invited to talk about our role as a member of parliament and the work that we do in this place. I think it is important for us to explore with our constituents the whole range of issues that we champion, including the White Ribbon campaign. Most people are familiar with the green party badge that I wear, but it does disappoint me that a number of young South Australians have not heard of the White Ribbon campaign, because it is a message that I think is particularly important for the next generation.

One of the biggest White Ribbon events every year is the annual White Ribbon breakfast, and this year the breakfast will be held at the Adelaide Convention Centre on 24 November. Numbers get bigger and bigger every year, and each year they have to find a bigger venue. I think they have about reached the biggest venue in South Australia. The guest speaker at the next White Ribbon breakfast will be someone who I have not heard speak before, but have heard a lot about, and that is Lieutenant General David Morrison AO, who is the Chief of Army.

Lieutenant General Morrison is perhaps best known for a three-minute speech that he delivered, which features on YouTube, which has been viewed by around 1½ million viewers. In that brief speech he gave Australian soldiers a directive to leave the forces if they did not accept that women had to be respected and treated as equals; or in his words, 'If that does not suit you then get out.'

Exactly a year later Lieutenant General David Morrison shared a stage in London with British Foreign Secretary William Hague and also Angelina Jolie, who is the UN Special Envoy at the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict. According to reports of that event, David Morrison's was a very powerful message. He labelled gender inequality in militaries a 'global disgrace'. He said:

...every soldier has a simple, terrible choice: to be a protector or a perpetrator—there is no other choice, either in cases of a soldier witnessing a rape by another soldier, or by civilians in war zones. I have deliberately

excluded a third choice, to be a bystander while others commit sexual violence. There are no bystanders—the standard you walk past is the standard you accept.

For those of us who are not in the military, I think the same standard applies. That is why the white ribbon message is for men to swear an oath never to commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women. There can be no bystanders. The standard you walk past is the standard you accept.

I would like to give a special acknowledgement to Cintra Amos and Gillian Lewis, who are the co-convenors of the Adelaide White Ribbon Breakfast Committee. I urge all members to get behind White Ribbon Day and get along to the breakfast. Tickets go on sale on 30 September and, if previous years are anything to go by, if you do not get in early you will miss out. I commend the motion.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (16:46): I rise to support the motion of the Hon. John Dawkins recognising the White Ribbon campaign and to emphasise the importance of ending violence against women. I commend the Hon. John Dawkins for bringing the matter before the council. I do so as a White Ribbon Ambassador myself.

On 6 December 1989 a man entered an engineering school in Montréal, Canada, carrying a duffel bag. Over 45 minutes he systematically separated 14 women from their male colleagues and murdered them. Dozens more women were injured during the attack. The event had a major impact on the Montréal community, so much so that two years later, on the second anniversary of the event, three men in Toronto decided to act. They decided to act as men to end gender-based violence. They chose the white ribbon as a symbol for men to show their commitment and their collective responsibility to eliminate violence against women. In that first year nearly 100,000 men wore a white ribbon.

The White Ribbon movement has spread throughout the world. It is a movement with a number of dimensions. I would like to highlight those dimensions in my comments tonight. First, the White Ribbon movement is essentially a men's movement. It is a movement of men for men to challenge men on their ideas and actions, to identify policy questions, to educate men and boys and to raise public awareness.

The movement accepts that male violence against women is a men's issue. It is up to men to be community leaders, to be peer supports, to be fathers and guardians, to be decision-makers who work to stop male violence. It calls on men to speak out or step in when their friends or relatives abuse, attack or insult women. I am strongly of the view that the prospect of successful change in male culture is significantly enhanced if that change is brought on and supported by men.

The second aspect of the White Ribbon movement is that it is a pro-women movement. White Ribbon is fundamentally an opportunity for men to challenge other men who assert male power over women as a cultural norm by challenging that power in its crudest form, that is, violence. Violence is often not about violence: it is about power. I still remember a postcard that I saw as a young person. It said that rape is about power, not sex. If a person hits you with a spade, you would not call it gardening. Violence, sexual or otherwise, is often an assertion of power. We need to challenge beliefs and attitudes that deny women equality of opportunity in our society.

Thirdly, the White Ribbon campaign is an antiviolence movement. In Australia, the White Ribbon campaign is in fact the only national male-led antiviolence campaign and, in that, the White Ribbon campaign is part of an emerging network of movements that collectively work against violence. By rejecting violence in any form in our society, they support and reinforce each other.

In particular I pay tribute to the great work of the Sammy D Foundation both in South Australia and its sister organisations around Australia. As an antiviolence organisation, White Ribbon does not deny that men and boys are victims of violence too and it does not condone such violence. White Ribbon simply says that it is one aspect of a wider effort to reduce and eliminate violence.

I am very proud that, at the 2014 election, the Liberal Party in this state committed to implementing a task force against violence in our community. Coupled with the gun reform stemming from the Howard government and our ongoing commitment to reduce alcohol-fuelled violence in its many forms, the Liberal Party supports many of the values that the White Ribbon campaign seeks to promote in our community.

Fourthly, I put to the council that the White Ribbon movement is a pro-family movement. One of the most baffling aspects of male violence is the proximity of the victim. Male violence against women generally does not occur between strangers. It often occurs in the home or amongst family members and undermines the institution of the family and the community relationships.

About six South Australians die from domestic violence incidents each year. Violence destroys families; violence destroys homes; violence destroys communities—in the very places where people turn seeking security and safety. Violence is a breach of trust that eats at the fabric of our society. It deprives children in particular of a stable, nurturing environment that they need to grow and prosper.

In Australia, a lot of progress has been made but we also have a lot of work to do. Still around one in three women will experience physical violence; still almost one in five has experienced sexual violence since the age of 15. In June this year the federal government released the Second Action Plan 2013-16, and that was endorsed by the Australian states through the Council of Australian Governments.

Building upon the foundations laid in the National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children released in 2011, the plan aims to strengthen ties with other national reforms, seeking a holistic response to reduce violence. The national plan focuses on stopping violence before it occurs, supporting women who experience violence, stopping men from committing violence and building the evidence base so that we learn more about what works in reducing domestic and family violence and sexual assault.

As I conclude, I remind the council that the white ribbon is a symbol: it is fundamentally a symbol of a man's pledge to never commit, condone or remain silent about violence against women. It is a personal commitment to never commit violence, but it is also a collective social commitment to never condone or remain silent about violence. I hope that, over time, White Ribbon will continue to grow and that the impact on our society will be that we will be a stronger and safer community.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (16:53): On behalf of Dignity for Disability I will put on the record a few brief words in support of this admirable motion by the Hon. Mr Dawkins and certainly thank him and acknowledge his ongoing work in support of this area. I speak on this issue from a number of angles, I suppose one could say: as a member of parliament wanting to better society, as a woman and as a woman who in fact grew up in a domestic violence situation.

Of course, I am not going to go into the details of that on the floor here today but I do want to acknowledge that and I want to do that for a very specific reason; that is, because silence about these issues condones these issues. The more that victims or those who have experienced domestic violence either as a witness within a family or other situation, or as a direct victim of violence, are pushed into silence either by our perpetrators or by society as a whole, the farther away we are from solving these issues.

Of course I also speak in support of this motion as a woman with disability, and I believe it is very important that we acknowledge, not only in this chamber but as a parliament and as a state, that women with disabilities and deaf women are at least twice as likely to experience domestic violence than our non-disabled counterparts.

There are arguably a few reasons for this. One may be our lessened ability to physically defend ourselves. It also comes to the inaccessibility of women's shelters for those wanting to escape domestic violence situations. We may have a greater than average financial dependence on our partner or other perpetrator of abuse, or we may have very real physical dependence on the perpetrator of that abuse as well.

Whether it is a professional supporter or an intimate partner, if the person getting you out of bed and dressed in the morning, for example, is the person perpetrating the abuse against you, you are of course far less likely to be in a position where you are able to escape that abuse. Similarly, if public transport is inaccessible to you due to your disability, and you rely on that to get away because the car may be jointly owned by the person perpetrating the abuse (or you may not even own a car), then that further disadvantages you.

So, it is important that we acknowledge that women with disabilities, and people with disabilities in general, are more likely to experience this abuse than our non-disabled counterparts. While we acknowledge that, we certainly should not accept it. We certainly need to work together constructively as a parliament and as a society to eliminate the additional barriers that people with disabilities can face in escaping domestic violence situations while we work on creating a situation where we do not find ourselves in violent situations to begin with.

I want to make very clear that, while this particular movement has my full support as what the Hon. Stephen Wade rightly called a pro-women movement, I do acknowledge that men and boys can also be victims of violence and aggression, but I believe that, while society as a whole sees victims of violence mainly being women, and therefore seeing male victims of domestic violence as being somehow weak or abnormal, the reason we need to push this as a pro-women movement is to make that space more free for men and boys to come forward if they are experiencing domestic violence because, until we address this issue for women, it will not be a safe space for men to acknowledge and seek support for any issues they may be experiencing.

The other point I make is that this is not a movement about blaming men. This is about raising the bar for men and acknowledging men as potential leaders and mentors in this area and as creatures who have the capacity to not settle for anything less than a non-violent society. Often we hear an excuse from many male activists saying, 'Well, not all men perpetrate this abuse, thankfully, so why should we all be tarred with the same brush?' I believe that we should not settle for the excuse of 'not all men' but should be aiming for a society where we can say 'no men'. We should not accept that not all men do this but accept that no man should do this.

I acknowledge the many ambassadors for White Ribbon, not only in this chamber but also in this parliament, in both houses, and also the many ambassadors for the cause out there in the community. This movement has Dignity for Disability's full support for the reasons I just outlined, and I hope we can continue to work together constructively on this issue.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:59): I rise today to support this motion put before the council by the Hon. John Dawkins, who is of course a White Ribbon Ambassador, and following on from the words of my colleagues Mark Parnell, who is, again, a White Ribbon Ambassador. I have long held the view that this is a men's movement, and so I have not previously spoken to a White Ribbon motion.

I must say the breakfasts are a little early but I have been to a few of them, and I am certainly happy for men to take the leadership. I commend those men in this council who have, and they are: the Hon. Robert Brokenshire, the Hon. John Darley, the Hon. John Gazzola, the Hon. Ian Hunter, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. Stephen Wade, and the Hon. Russell Wortley (Mr President). Thank you, and I commend you for your roles as ambassadors for this White Ribbon movement.

I am certainly very familiar with the start of this movement in Australia. It was somewhat contentious in the women's movement because we were thinking, 'Why do we have to do all the work yet again if these men are going to stand up and have a White Ribbon Day?' I certainly remember being part of the organising group federally for that first White Ribbon Day, but I must say that men and boys have certainly taken it in their stride and are taking the lead, and that is a fabulous thing to see. Indeed, I remember Andrew O'Keefe being one of the very first public figures to stand up, and he is doing you proud as an ambassador; he is certainly changing the conversation.

I rise today, though, not just to support this motion, but to call on the government to take action. As would be no surprise to you, I am calling on the government to take action on that recent Coroner's report into the murder of Zahra Abrahimzadeh.

That report has been presented to the Premier, and we await the action on that report. For those who have not read the Coroner's report, and for those who are less familiar with the circumstances, I will say this: in 2010, Brooklyn Park resident Zahra Abrahimzadeh was stabbed to death by her estranged husband. He had been physically and psychologically abusive to Zahra and their three children since their marriage began in 1984.

Around a year before her death, Zahra packed her possessions in a car and left her husband after he assaulted her and one of her children and threatened to kill them. Despite Zahra reporting

this incident to the police, her husband was never arrested or reported by the police, or dealt with by the criminal justice system in any way for these actions. To quote the Coroner:

One of the most powerful influences that police can have in a context where a person has been violent, or threatened to be violent, is the power of arrest and charging. If that power is not exercised expeditiously, or worse still is not exercised at all, there is a real danger that the offender will think that he...has 'got away with it'...

Just over 24 hours after they fled the family house in 2009, the Abrahamzadeh family had been placed in temporary housing. In the early hours of 26 February, Atena Abrahamzadeh, one of Zahra's very young daughters, called the SAPOL call centre on 131 444. This is a transcript of the call:

Operator: Good morning, SA Police.

Atena: Hi, we've been placed in a domestic, in temporary housing from Domestic Violence services but the house doesn't actually have electricity to it and we're really, really, really afraid because we're scared of my dad. We got a restraining order against him but every time a noise—there's a noise, we get scared. I'm actually—I drove to the Henley Beach Police Station just to maybe sleep here or something for the night but there's no-one here, like the office is closed.

Operator: That's right.

Atena: Yeah, so we were just thinking, is there any other police station around we can go in because my mum doesn't feel safe at all in that house because it's really dark and there is no electricity for the night.

Operator: Who placed you there?

Atena: Domestic Services people. They thought that—

Operator: You need to take that up with them tomorrow. You can't sleep in the police station.

Atena: I know but it's just because, honestly we have gone out a few times by now my mum was about to have a heart attack every time there was a noise.

Operator: I'm sorry, what—

Atena: She's crying and—

Operator: What do you want me to do?

Well, Premier, I want to ask you: are you giving the Abrahamzadeh family and all families in this state the same response to those who are escaping domestic violence that that operator gave Atena? 'What do you want me to do?' Well, I think that the Coroner's report has outlined clearly not only what the Abrahamzadeh surviving family want our government to do but also what many South Australians want to happen.

Over the next 12 months, Zara continued to receive threats from her husband. He taunted the children with the pointlessness of their having gone to the police in the first place, saying that he was still at liberty months later. He attended at the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court on numerous occasions, as the domestic violence restraining order worked its way through a contested hearing.

Each time he knew that his presence must have been obvious to the police prosecutor and other police at the precinct, yet he was not arrested and he was not charged. Finally, when the contested hearing took place, he was able to gain a significant concession: it expressly permitted him to attend the Persian New Year function, where he followed through on his threat to kill Zara.

When handing down his report, the Coroner chose to direct the findings of the Zara Abrahamzadeh domestic violence murder case to the Premier rather than the police commissioner. In his recommendations, the Coroner recommended that risk assessment must actually be applied, not merely recited as a mantra. The government must also heed this recommendation.

This is not the first coronial inquiry into domestic violence-related deaths. In the past three years, there have been four coronial inquests into such deaths. The 2012 Coroner's report into the death of Robyn Hayward found that Robyn was shot by her partner, Edwin Durance, in 2009. Durance had a history of domestic violence and was known to local police in the Riverland. When Hayward was murdered, Durance was on bail for an assault against her.

In February 2012, the Coroner delivered findings into the death of David Wyatt and his toddler son Jakob. The Coroner reported that, if the family safety network had been in place at the

time, he believes that it could have prevented this homicide and suicide. One year later, in February 2013, Coroner Johns delivered findings into the death of Shane Robinson. Robinson was in breach of his parole orders and, while evading police, went to the home of his partner and assaulted her. The Coroner will soon hand down his report into the death of Jeremy Harding-Roots. On the morning of Mr Harding-Roots' death, he went to his ex-partner's house and attacked her with a metal pole. The statistics in this area are alarming, and these are just a few of the many stories.

It is fantastic to see White Ribbon doing the great work that it is doing, but we need more. We need to look at this as a national emergency, as Natasha Stott Despoja, Ambassador for Women and Girls, has called for. We need to treat this with the seriousness that it deserves. I am heartened to see that Daniel Andrews, the leader of the Labor Party in Victoria, has said that this is a national emergency and that he will have a royal commission into domestic violence and violence against women if he is elected Premier. That is the seriousness with which we should be taking this issue, not sitting and receiving a Coroner's report and making no response, not accepting the words of a police commissioner who says that these things have all changed since the Abrahimzadeh incident.

We know that, in the past few months, we have seen a young child killed in the eastern suburbs. When the response was given to the media, we also know that they said that there was no previous contact with child protection or Families SA. I know for a fact that is untrue. I know people who know people—this is Adelaide. I know that that is an untrue fact. That family was already known, and there was clearly a reason why the mother of that child was panicked that his father had taken him that morning. It should have not been responded to in the way it was by the authorities in this state.

I also draw attention to the murder of a woman and her children by her husband and their father last week and the way in which the media handled that. The stories of his being a good guy, the stories of their being a perfect family, that is a slap in the face for that family and for those victims, those victims who were murdered. He killed them, and we know that for a fact. What the circumstances were and the media discussion around that, focusing on how he was a good bloke, do not help the cause of really addressing domestic violence and treating it like the crime it is. He was a domestic criminal. With those few words, I commend the motion.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:09): I rise briefly to indicate my strong support for this motion and also commend the work of the Hon. John Dawkins in bringing this motion to the house.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (17:09): I rise to support the motion of the Hon. John Dawkins that this council recognise White Ribbon Day. As a recently appointed White Ribbon Ambassador, I have seen first hand some of the work that the White Ribbon organisation does and I have attended a number of their events. White Ribbon is Australia's only male-led campaign to end men's violence against women. Starting in 2003 as part of UNIFEM (now UN Women), White Ribbon became a foundation in 2007. Its goal is to make women's safety a man's issue as well. It recognises that it is up to men to stop the violence and recognise the positive role men play in preventing violence against women.

White Ribbon and its ambassadors observe the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women on 25 November each year. The day also signals the start of 16 days of activism to stop violence against women, ending on Human Rights Day on 10 December. The organisation's work is primarily through raising community awareness, with programs in schools, workplaces and social events challenging the attitudes and behaviours of a minority who use or condone violence against women.

One of the examples of some of the work of White Ribbon is an event I recently attended, a workshop which was followed by a public forum which was conducted in conjunction with Flinders University. White Ribbon was providing training in preventing all forms of violence. The workshop was on bystander intervention. I should mention that the member for Mordialta, who is also a White Ribbon Ambassador, was in attendance at that day.

The forum was hosted by Dr Shannon Spriggs, who is a fellow of Griffith University in Queensland. She is a leading expert on bystander intervention, a program originally created in 1993 in the United States. The program uses the bystander approach to violence prevention. The training session allowed participants to become proactive bystanders, equipping them with options to

prevent, confront and interrupt violence that they may witness. Working with both men and women, the training is an open dialogue and aims for participants to think critically about domestic violence issues. As an example, one of the issues that was raised during the training is how many women are constrained from going out in the evening, while we men generally do not have to consider our personal safety at night. That is quite confronting.

The public forum hosted by Flinders University was conducted on the same day and opened by the Hon. Ian Hunter on behalf of the Premier, Jay Weatherill. Both are White Ribbon Ambassadors. The forum sought to enhance efforts in South Australia to prevent family and domestic violence. It was hosted by leading researchers and the deputy commissioner of SAPOL. The forum created further awareness of the need for men to end violence against women.

Violence against women is a serious community issue. Two out of five women have experienced physical and/or sexual violence perpetrated by somebody known to them in their lifetime, and sadly this figure is not declining.

There was a report released today, which was the National Community Attitudes towards Violence Against Women Survey. It was commissioned, I understand, by VicHealth. The report, after surveying 17,500 people via telephone interviews across Australia, compared results from previous surveys in 1995 and 2009, and sadly violence against women is not declining.

The survey actually brought up some interesting issues. There is a tendency for Australians to minimise the impact of living in an abusive relationship. Despite efforts by organisations such as White Ribbon and Amnesty International to dispel the myth, three-quarters of Australians find it hard to understand why women stay in abusive relationships, and half of all Australians believe that women could leave if they really wanted to. One in five Australians believe violence can be excused if the offender later regrets.

Despite community education on law reform in Australia to promote a model of consent based on mutual negotiation and respect, one out of 10 Australians agree that if a woman does not physically resist or even if they are just protesting verbally, then it is really not rape. Well, that is not the case: it is rape. We have to work harder at changing these attitudes. Another one: the culture of denial exists in Australia, with more than one in three people believing women make false claims of rape. Finally, the report also shows that there is a concerning rise in the number of Australians who believe that both men and women are equally responsible for partner violence. In reality, 95 per cent of all violence against both men and women is committed by men, so it is a men's issue.

It is not all bad news. Australian governments have invested heavily in campaigns and plans to reduce violence against women over the past 10 years. More Australians recognise that violence and abuse include coercive and controlling behaviours in addition to physical and sexual abuse, although we still have a way to go in recognising emotional and financial abuse. Just 17 per cent recognise that denying a partner money in order to control them constitutes abuse, so we still have a long way to go. These results from this survey are quite shocking and they are another incentive for us as males in this and other places to do more to address this issue.

Research conducted by the World Health Organisation has shown that, by promoting social equality, we can work to reduce violence against women, and that is a critical issue. It is attitudes that we have to change—male attitudes to women that need to change. I commend the work of White Ribbon and its ambassadors in seeking to directly challenge negative men's behaviour and encourage all men to swear on oath to never commit, excuse or remain silent about violence against women.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (17:19): Firstly, I would like to thank the eight members of this chamber—it is probably not unprecedented, but it is certainly unusual for as many people as that to speak on a non-controversial matter—who have spoken on this debate, and also the others who have supported me in putting this motion without wishing to speak. I mention in that regard, obviously, the Hon. Mr Hunter and the Hon. Mr Gazzola, who were responsible for me first being involved in the White Ribbon movement, so I thank them for that.

I was also very pleased that, for a significant portion of the debate, the Leader of the Opposition in another place, Mr Steven Marshall, was able to be in the President's gallery, because

last year he also became a White Ribbon Ambassador and I know he supports the White Ribbon movement very much. I think it is a great movement, because it is increasing public awareness about these matters. It is increasing the consciousness of the community to make sure that we avoid that traditional silence.

We have an opportunity to make sure that the younger generations do not get into the habit of that silence that has plagued the generations that most of us come from, and it is not just about domestic violence; obviously it is about mental health issues, it is about suicide and it is about sexual abuse. There was this attitude that if we do not talk about it, if we push it back there behind us, it will go away.

We know darn well that does not happen in any of these matters, and it is certainly the case with domestic violence. I am heartened in that regard by the increasing number of younger men in recent times who have become involved in White Ribbon, and it is important that more of that younger generation take charge of this work. However, I think it is also important that we, as members of parliament, make sure that we engage many more people in the community.

I know that you, Mr President, have shown a commitment to it and I think it is important that we, not only as members of the community but also members of parliament, make sure that that message gets out: that White Ribbon is a very important movement, that it does very strongly stand up against domestic violence against women, but it also stands up very strongly against silence about those matters. With those few words, I commend the motion to the council and once again thank the large number of members who have contributed or have provided private support to me on this matter.

Motion carried.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (ASSAULTS CAUSING DEATH) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 August 2014.)

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (17:23): Continuing on from the last sitting Wednesday when I introduced this bill, it is based on a lot of reasons, and there are precedents now for looking at this legislation, such as that in New South Wales. Talking about New South Wales, Thomas Kelly died in 2012 from a coward's punch. He was only 18 years old. It was his first night out in Kings Cross. Kieran Loveridge received a four-year sentence for that manslaughter.

Daniel Christie was in a coma after being hit in Kings Cross on New Year's Eve. The attacker, Shaun McNeil, a 25 year old, has been charged with maliciously inflicting grievous bodily harm over the attack. McNeil also faces charges over attacks on four other people on the same night. An article on news.com.au detailed 13 incidents of coward's punches in 2013 across the country. I want to refer to some media quotes. On FIVEaa on 5 August 2014 the police commissioner, Mr Gary Burns, said:

We've had concerns about alcohol fuelled violence for a long time now and we're really sure that the way that needs to be progressed is that people take responsibility for their actions and using the excuse of drugs and alcohol, to me, isn't taking responsibility.

A statement from Ralph and Cathy Kelly, the parents of Thomas Kelly, states:

Too often, alcohol abuse and excessive drinking is actually used as a defence in court as an excuse for their criminal behaviour. The time for excuses is over.

The Prime Minister, the Hon. Mr Tony Abbott, weighed in on the debate in January 2014, describing coward's punches as 'acts of gratuitous violence which are unprovoked' committed by 'brutal people' indicating a 'vicious, horrible change' in society. He further went on to say that 'the police, the courts, the judges ought to absolutely throw the book at people who perpetrate this kind of gratuitous, unprovoked violence'.

One-punch legislation is in other jurisdictions. I have based this particular aspect of the legislation on some broader legislation that the New South Wales government passed in the

parliament, supported also, I understand, by the Labor opposition. New South Wales legislation requires mandatory imprisonment for eight years for coward's punches, a 20-year maximum sentence for anyone who unlawfully assaults another who dies as a result of the assault, and a minimum of eight years if the person was intoxicated by alcohol or drugs. This increased the existing maximum sentence by two years.

I understand that Queensland is currently considering such legislation and has a bill before the parliament. The Newman government's draft plan to tackle alcohol-related and drug-related violence would create an offence—unlawful striking causing death—to deal with one-punch killers. The courts will also have the right to ban offenders from nightclubs across the state for life.

The most recent statistics from the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education on alcohol-related deaths show that there are 70,000 victims of alcohol-related violence in Australia per year and 14,000 victims require hospitalisation. Figures relating to alcohol-related deaths range from 376 to 5,500.

Family First supported the government's proposal for a 3 o'clock lockout. The government put that 3 o'clock lockout in because it was concerned about drunken behaviour and the risks of that behaviour to the community generally. We are pleased that we supported that 3 o'clock lockout. The evidence is clearly there that that initiative has paid off.

In fact, the police say that the number of incidents that they have to deal with after 3 o'clock have reduced dramatically. Hospitals, particularly the Royal Adelaide Hospital, say that they are seeing fewer people coming in as a result of being attacked in Adelaide and the surrounds because of this 3 o'clock lockout. So the government needs to be commended for that initiative because it has worked. We supported that initiative because we could see the need to curb this violence.

I understand that the model in Whyalla has worked. I also understand that the Newcastle model has worked. However, what worries me as a legislator and as a parent is that there seems to be a cultural change in Australia, where it is almost a badge of honour for some people (gutless thugs, I would say) to go around the city with what we call king hits or coward's punches, deliberately trying to gain notoriety with their peers at the expense of totally innocent victims (most of the time), mainly young victims.

We saw a tragic case in New South Wales, where a lad was just walking with his girlfriend and another girl. A guy came up and hit him and he died. That is not what it is about. We want a vibrant city in Adelaide, but we also want a safe city. I believe that as legislators we need to give the police and the courts not only the tools but the direction in which the parliament on behalf of the South Australian community wants us to go not only to ensure that we can have vibrancy, a good time, economic strength in our nightclubs, hotels and restaurants but also knowing that we can be proud in South Australia that Adelaide is a safe city in which to go about both recreation and business. That is why I have introduced this legislation.

I commend all members and the Leader of Government Business in this house who have championed the White Ribbon ambassadors. I signed up for that quite a long time ago. We do not want violence against women but we do not want violence against anyone. I think we have to send a very strong and loud message to the small percentage of people who cause permanent injury, or worse, death to an innocent individual who is just enjoying the locality in which they happen to be. Therefore, I strongly commend this bill to the parliament.

This bill creates a minimum mandatory sentence. I know that some of the criminal lawyers and others in the legal fraternity will say, 'No, no, no, we cannot have minimum mandatory sentencing.' We already have minimum mandatory sentencing. We have minimum mandatory sentencing for drink driving, for example. There was an example of that last night. A woman in Port Pirie, who, fortunately, the police picked up, breath tested at 0.258, or some incredible amount—nearly six times the legal limit. She automatically, as a minimum, lost her licence for 12 months and still has to face the court.

The reason why the parliament passed that legislation was the risk to innocent motorists and their passengers when someone decides to drive a car, after drinking, when we know that the risks of having an accident are so much higher. I do not buy the argument that the parliament should not

be setting minimum mandatory sentencing. If you talk to the community, the community are saying they want minimum mandatory sentencing; not guideline sentencing, but minimum mandatory sentencing. That does not mean that we take the discretion away from the courts.

The minimum mandatory sentence proposed in bill is eight years and a maximum penalty of 25 years, so there is a lot of discretion that we need the courts, the judges and also juries to deliberate on, but we are sending them a strong message. This is for assaults causing death where the offender is intoxicated on drugs, alcohol, or a combination of both, and is 16 years of age or older. As I said, the maximum penalty is 25 years. An additional offence of assault causing death carries a penalty of not more than 20 years. The penalty is lower because this provision does not have the aggravating feature of intoxication.

I am dealing with a family at the moment whom I do not want to name. I know that family; I have met with the siblings. I will be meeting with the mother very soon. They are a loving, caring family who live in my area and who tragically lost their son and brother. He was just having a good night out at Glenelg after the football season, just going out and celebrating. That person is no longer with us. It is sad, it is tragic and I have seen firsthand what that has done to that family.

When there are allegations that some of these people get absolutely blind drunk, walk through the streets in a group and take out anyone who they choose, I believe we have the responsibility to give the police and the courts the tools they need. This is one tool. It is not the only answer we need.

I support the Sammy D Foundation and the proactivity and commend the parents of Sammy. As we all know, Sammy lost his life in a tragic situation. We need to be able to ensure that we have a state that is above the rest when it comes to safety and opportunities for all people who want to enjoy what Adelaide has to offer. I commend the bill to the council.

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

Parliamentary Committees

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE: REPORT 2013-14

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:34): By leave and at the request of the Hon. T.J. Stephens, as the Presiding Member of the committee, I move:

That the 2013-14 report of the committee be noted.

I thank the Hon. Terry Stephens for putting up the report at the last sitting week while I was absent. This is the 10th annual report of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee and my first as Presiding Member of the committee, having been appointed to the committee after this year's election. In the past year there have been a lot of changes to the committee, and a significant change to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act, with the act being amended to remove the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation as the presiding member. The committee also welcomed new members after the election in March this year.

In the midst of all these changes, the committee still endeavoured to meet with and discuss issues of importance to the Aboriginal people in their communities. In July this year the committee decided to visit the APY lands to give new members like myself the opportunity to speak with and get an understanding of the communities. Having met and spoken to a number of Aboriginal people during this visit to the communities of Pipalyatjara, Kulka, Nyapari, Murpatja, Kanypi, Umuwa and Amata, I am starting to get a better appreciation of the complex social, cultural and economic issues that Aboriginal people face on a daily basis.

I have learnt that members of the committee have great respect for the issues facing Aboriginal people, particularly those living in remote and rural areas, and I applaud all members for taking a bipartisan approach to addressing these issues. During the year the committee also heard evidence from witnesses, from a number of state agencies and Aboriginal support organisations. I thank the people and organisations who provided information to the committee.

The committee also finalised its inquiry into the Stolen Generation Reparations Tribunal Bill 2010 and tabled its report in both houses of parliament in November. I thank the current members of the committee: the Hon. Terry Stevens MLC, the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC, Mr John Gee MP,

Mr Eddie Hughes MP and Dr Duncan McFetridge MP, for their dedication and hard work. Special thanks to the Hon. Terry Stephens MLC, the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC and Dr Duncan McFetridge MP, who have been on the committee for several years, and for providing advice and guidance to the new members of the committee.

I also acknowledge the commitment and dedication of previous committee members. They are: the former presiding member and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, the Hon. Ian Hunter MLC; our President, the Hon. Russell Wortley MLC; and, former members of parliament, Lyn Breuer and Ms Gay Thomson, for their significant contribution to the committee. As always, the state and commonwealth agencies provided considerable information, which greatly assisted the committee with its work, and I thank those agencies for their support and following up on matters that arise at meetings and committee hearings.

Finally, I would like to thank the Aboriginal communities, organisations and representatives that I met with, and which provided advice and input to the committee during the year, especially the communities the committee recently visited for allowing us to visit their land and making us feel very welcome. I appreciate their willingness to discuss their issues and share their stories and knowledge with the committee.

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

Motions

INNER METROPOLITAN AREA DEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.C. Parnell:

That the regulations under the Development Act 1993 concerning Inner Metropolitan Area Development—Relevant Authority—Development Assessment Commission, made on 28 November 2013 and laid on the table of this council on 6 May 2014, be disallowed.

(Continued from 6 August 2014.)

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (17:40): I rise to speak on behalf of the Liberal opposition to the motion by the Hon. M.C. Parnell. Last year, minister Rau tabled these particular variation regulation, and the regulation provided that:

- The Development Assessment Commission (DAC) is now responsible for assessing development applications that involve the construction of a building that exceeds four storeys in height within inner-rim council areas; specifically, in an area defined in council development plans as the Urban Zone Corridor and the District Centre(Norwood) Zone, taking the development assessment role from council development assessment panels.
- The DAC has established a committee, known as the Inner Metropolitan Development Assessment Committee, to act as a delegate of the Development Assessment Commission.
- Membership of the new subcommittee is determined by the minister. It comprises all the members of the DAC and a representative (a specialist external DAP member) from each of the six affected councils: Michael Llewellyn-Smith from Adelaide, Brenton Burman from Unley, Ross Bateup from Burnside, Jenny Newman from Norwood Payneham and St Peters, David Cooke from Prospect, and Wayne Stokes from West Torrens.
- Removal of the City of Adelaide's statutory referral role for advice on projects over \$10 million. CDAP lost the power to approve or reject just projects five years ago; DPTI insists that the DCC still have an informal role.
- And finally, an expanded role for the Government Architect, supported by the Capital City Designer Review Panel, and the expansion of the pre-lodgement case management service to support the changes.

The Hon. Mark Parnell has moved to disallow these regulations, and I indicated earlier in my contribution that the opposition will not be supporting him. I am waiting for him to groan with disgust in his chair, but maybe he missed that.

The Hon. M.C. Parnell interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: The main reason we will not be supporting these regulations—and I will certainly touch on it a little further in my contribution—is that we are on the cusp of some more planing reform with the expert panel, which these regulations were designed to complement. So, it does not make sense from the opposition's point of view to disallow these before we have actually had a look at all of the reforms.

In a letter to the Adelaide City Council (and in a similar letter sent to the inner-rim councils), minister Rau outlined the state government's objectives: primarily, to provide progressive certainty and a streamlined assessment process, as well as removing unnecessary duplication and costly delays within the planning system. The Local Government Association of South Australia and the six inner-rim councils were not happy with the state government's lack of consultation, and the announce and defend attitude to legislation.

We appreciate the councils have a predisposition to resisting these types of changes, and we appreciate the consultation process followed has been lacking. Throughout my time as the shadow planning minister, this lack of transparency and consultation was always one of my chief concerns. However, the LGA is not opposed to the planning reforms, and is willing to compromise with the government on planning initiatives to promote development in the inner-rim zone.

A strategy to promote in-fill development within the inner metropolitan area is vital to guarantee vibrancy in the city and impede urban sprawl. I think all of us in this chamber have been concerned with the continual urban sprawl and, in particular, some of the actions of the government in relation to property and land at Seaford, which had been rezoned for 20 years or more, but it was this government that actually sold it to allow the gateway to the Fleurieu to be subdivided. We have seen issues up in Mount Barker and, of course, there have been some issues out north.

There have always been people opposed to such developments with an infill strategy, but the government does have a responsibility to implement some reform and some sustainable planning agendas. Of course, the development assessment process needs to be transparent so that the South Australian public has confidence in the system and to ensure that corruption does not transpire between government and developers.

During parliamentary estimates in July this year, my colleague Steven Griffiths, the member for Goyder, asked minister Rau why changes were implemented prior to the final report of the expert panel on planning reform being released in December. His explanation was that he wanted to 'manage the system in an ongoing way and you cannot put in into deep-freeze while Brian [Hayes] and his team work on it for 18 months'. He further stated that 'the development community has been very pleased with the notion of being able to deal with DAC and very pleased with the notion of being able to get design review and that sort of case management model operating'.

A streamlined development application process plays a significant role in driving competitiveness, economic development and the delivery of sustainable communities. We need to create uniformity within the system by having one body (DAC) making all of the decisions at a higher level while still enabling council to make planning decisions at a lower level.

My colleague Steven Griffiths, the member for Goyder, on behalf of the Liberal Party sought advice on some key aspects of the regulations. He said that DPTI had advised that council staff are welcome to participate in pre-lodgement discussions with applicants and that DAC staff were to highlight any initial concerns and to report on local considerations so that DAC can factor these issues into the assessment of development applications.

In instances where an applicant chooses to 'cold lodge' a development application without having participated in the pre-lodgement process, the council is given the opportunity to highlight any initial concerns and to report on local considerations in writing. A council representative (the selected specialist external DAP member) is also involved in the assessment process as a member of the Inner Metropolitan Development Assessment Committee. I think that it was John Hanlon who confirmed in writing that 'sitting fees will be paid per meeting' for participation in that subcommittee. In order to clarify council's non-statutory informal role in the pre-lodgement and post-lodgement assessment of development applications, a heads of agreement was developed by DPTI and has been endorsed by council CEOs.

In relation to the question of where are the development application fees paid, I indicate that, as the DAC is now the relevant authority for assessment of buildings over four storeys, all development application fees are paid to DAC. Given that council is not a statutory referral agency, it receives no fees for its informal participation in the assessment process. A number of councils have raised concerns that the participation of council staff in the pre-lodgement process is considerable; that is, each development application involves the attendance of a council representative at several pre-lodgement panel meetings and design review panel meetings. There will be some financial impact on councils, but it is uncertain how significant they may be.

A question was raised by Steven Griffiths, the member for Goyder: how were the urban corridor zone and the district centre (Norwood) zone determined? In December 2010, the six councils were presented with the inner city dwelling yield analysis project report and were asked to work collaboratively with the Minister for Urban Development and Planning to prepare a development plan amendment to progress policy framework to support population and density yield targets, as outlined in the report, in line with the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.

In relation to the inner metropolitan growth project, councils agreed to prepare draft DPAs incorporating the urban corridor zone and the district centre (Norwood) zone to allow for a new urban structure that includes more intensive forms of urban development along main road corridors, an important strategy in reducing urban sprawl. Examples of where the zone may apply include parts of Greenhill Road, Anzac Highway, Port Road, Prospect Road, Unley Road, Kent Town, Hackney, Norwood and specific sites along Norwood Parade.

In October, following the endorsement of each council's inner metropolitan growth DAP by the Minister for Planning, the zoning came into effect. South Australia's design review programs are headed by the government architect. There are currently two programs: the Office for Design and Architecture SA (ODASA) design review program and the Capital City Design Review Panel. The Capital City Design Review Panel, launched on 22 November, is made up of 26 experts in urban design and architecture. The establishment of the Capital City Design Review Panel forms the partnership between the government architect and the planning department to deliver the pre-lodgement process.

The pre-lodgement service is a free voluntary service offered to proponents of development projects in the Adelaide City Council area that have a value of over \$10 million, and an inner metro urban corridor zone that involves buildings exceeding four storeys. The role of the panel is to assist the government architect in providing immediate advice to the Inner Metropolitan Development Assessment Committee on the design merit of individual projects. It also offers independent, impartial expert design advice, from conceptual design through to lodgement.

Projects going through design review as part of the department's pre-lodgement process that are successful in reaching pre-lodgement agreements with all relevant statutory authorities will receive a decision from the Inner Metropolitan Development Assessment Committee within 20 days of lodgement. This result is supposedly a streamlined assessment process that identifies, investigates and resolves land use planning and design issues up front.

The councils have called for a better design process, and currently the applicant is able to lodge a development proposal (pre-lodgement development agreement) with the Capital City Design Review Panel. A copy of the report is then provided to CDAP. A number of councils have provided their support for the mandatory referral process of development applications to the government architect and the design review process.

I also note that it is interesting that the current interim report by the expert panel talked about some reforms that they are doing that are consistent with something that I discovered when I was the shadow minister and I spent some time in Western Australia. Following that, I presented a discussion paper to the community which was centred on many of the principles that are now going to be adopted by the South Australian reform in establishing a planning commission serviced by planning, economic and environmental experts, as well as having regional planning bodies. Of course, Western Australia is currently undergoing a raft of new reforms, and I think we should also look to those reforms.

It is interesting to note that there are 27 proposals in the South Australian reform document, and we look forward to a very robust and public debate on those when they are released later this year. This inner city rim initiative aims to eliminate the discrepancies that were previously occurring at a council level which deterred developers and investment in our state. Minister Rau has stated that one of the big things we have been hearing from business is that you go to different councils and, even though the zoning is exactly the same, you have two completely different interpretations of what that zoning means.

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has previously informed the opposition of figures outlining how many development applications the Inner Metropolitan Development Assessment Committee has assessed in each council. The number was relatively low and there have been none within the West Torrens council since planning changes were implemented.

There is no doubt that the role of local government within the planning system will change if the recommendations for reform are embraced, particularly through key reforms being considered to establish a state planning commission (which includes the roles of the Development Policy Advisory Committee and the Development Assessment Commission and their subcommittees) and the creation of regional planning networks.

You can see there is a raft of changes that are going to come with the planning reforms. I think, as I said earlier, interestingly a number of those reforms have been picked up from what happens in Western Australia. I spoke to a couple of the bureaucrats from Western Australia some four or five years ago. One of them had worked in six jurisdictions for 23 or 24 ministers and they believed the Western Australian system was one of the best, so I am pleased that the South Australian government, although somewhat reluctantly, has come to the table to look at some of the reforms that we proposed in our discussion paper back in August 2011, which is three years ago.

With all of those reforms that are likely to come, I know that those proposals, things like planning commissions etc. will have legislative changes that will be required, so I think it is at that time that we should have a robust debate around the reforms and the changes rather than disallowing these regulations at present. Our member for the seat of Adelaide, Rachel Sanderson, has some concerns at the moment, but even she agrees it is a better thing for us to look at the whole picture of reforms in a package rather than just disallow these regulations. With those, probably a bit longer than a few, words I indicate that we will not be supporting the honourable member's disallowance motion.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (17:54): I rise to outline on behalf of the government the reasons that the government is opposing this motion to disallow. The government regulatory changes have brought about an increased level of confidence and certainty around significant development projects. The changes promote a planning system that is consistent, efficient and repeatable. A key feature of the new system is that it provides for a centralised case management system, run by the government and at no cost to councils, that coordinates the planning, design and other technical considerations as proponents work up their proposal.

There is a whole host of reasons why the regulations should not be disallowed. In particular, there are four key reasons that I wish to raise. First, the affected councils are currently working with revised controls. The one issue that has consistently been raised when the community is asked what concerns them about development is that they do not believe enough effort is put into the design of new buildings. The new process that these regulations establish goes a long way to ensuring that design is at the forefront of not only the assessing body but, more importantly, the developers themselves.

Secondly, the referral to DAC is necessary to ensure the consistency and success of the new design process. A strong feature of the new system is a centralised pre-lodgement and design review service that provides progressive certainty to proponents and provides an integrated decision-making process. This new approach ensures that all significant development proposals undergo a comprehensive design review process.

Thirdly, the previous arrangement of referral to the city council was of limited value. The referral to Adelaide City Council was removed to address duplication and confusion around the

planning assessment process. The process was creating a dual assessment process that caused unnecessary delay and undermined the imperative to achieve progressive certainty. Importantly, all councils are represented on the Inner Metropolitan Development Assessment Committee by a council development assessment panel member.

Fourthly, the disallowance would change a new and consistent investment environment. The development industry is now, for the first time, working with a development assessment system that for significant development proposals is consistent across six councils.

It should be noted there is broad industry support for the changes. The South Australian division of the Property Council of Australia in a press release on 13 February 2014 indicated their strong opposition to any return of these new planning powers to local councils. Their statement said that to do so:

...risks hindering independent [assessment] process, timely planning approvals and good design outcomes.

They went on to say that:

Unpicking the progress made in the past year doesn't make economic sense. It may even act as a disincentive for development at a critical juncture for our Inner Metro Rim.

Most critically, this new system has been able to achieve good design outcomes in a number of major projects. To throw out these regulations just when they are starting to see real benefits and increased confidence in the planning system is both short-sighted and ill-informed.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:59): I will begin by thanking the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars and the Hon. David Ridgway for their contributions and I will say that of course there is no surprise in the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars' contributions. These are government regulations, so of course they are going to defend them. But I have got to say that I am gobsmacked by the Liberal approach, which is at complete odds with what they said before the election.

I remind members that the press release issued by Steven Marshall back on 14 February 2014 was headed 'Liberals will return planning powers to councils'. That is what disallowing these regulations do: they return the planning powers to councils. I read some of the press release when I introduced the bill, but what I did not refer to were some additional comments that were made by the Liberal Party in an interview with InDaily back on 13 February, in an article by Liam Mannix, which says:

Planning powers for multi-storey development would be handed back to inner city councils under a state Liberal policy announced this morning.

You cannot get any clearer than that. The Liberals said before the election that they would do exactly what I have just attempted to do, and that is to hand those powers back. The article goes on:

A string of planning changes by the State Government late last year substantially reduced the role of local government in approving multi-storey developments with the aim of speeding up high-density development in the inner city.

Under regulations released in October—which came as a surprise to many...councils—the State Government became the approval authority for developments of more than four storeys in the city and inner rim.

Shadow planning minister Vickie Chapman this morning told InDaily she'd hand many of those powers back from state to local government.

The quote from Vickie Chapman:

'Local councils should remain in the planning assessment role,' she said. 'We have confidence they can do it. We don't think there's any necessity for there to be a transfer of that responsibility to a state agency.'

'They—

being local councils—

would give the public a right to be consulted before decisions are made, right from the start—and not just have state imposition, which is what we're so angry about. It would reintroduce local knowledge to local decision making.'

There you have it, Mr President. The Liberals have absolutely backflipped on what they said they would do before the election. I know I am focusing on them—I am cross with the government because these are bad regulations, but it is inexcusable of the Liberals. The message to the local community

is: you cannot trust the Liberal Party on planning. They say something before the election and they vote a different way afterwards.

I have to remind members that these regulations are opposed by every single local affected council. Every single local residents' group in the affected areas opposes these regulations, and many dozens of them wrote to you all as members of the Legislative Council urging you to support this disallowance motion, and you have ignored them. You have let them down and, what is worse, you have lied to them in relation to the statements made before the election.

If we think this is the end of it, it is not. We know that the state government started their crusade against local councils by first of all stripping Adelaide City Council of developments worth \$10 million. Next, they decided to strip the inner rim councils of their ability to approve more than four-storey developments. But what we now have—and we will be debating this next Wednesday—is an attempt to remove all developments worth more than \$3 million from local councils back to the Development Assessment Commission, because they are regulations that were tabled in this place yesterday.

People might think, 'Well, no, that won't happen.' I tell you it will happen. Developers who want to develop to a value of more than \$3 million will effectively go to a public servant, say they do not trust the local council and the public servant will say, 'Right, we will send your project to the Development Assessment Commission.' The Hon. David Ridgway mentioned the fact that we have an expert panel on planning reform and that, therefore, that somehow justifies agreeing with all the ad hoc changes to the planning system that the government is introducing before Brian Hayes and his panel have even reported.

I have been going along in good faith to these meetings, meeting with the expert panel, talking to them about changes, and yet the government does not give two hoots about that process. It does not care that citizens in good faith are debating changes to the planning scheme, because it is just going to keep introducing changes outside this process until somebody stops them. Do not look to the Liberals to stop them, because they will not.

Submissions to the expert panel close on 26 September, and people would be thinking, 'What does it matter what we tell them? The government is just going to do what it wants anyway,' as it did with these regulations and the ones that we are going to be debating next Wednesday in parliament—another disallowance motion to make sure that local councils stay in the process.

I am very disappointed in the approach of the Liberal Party, and I can tell you that the community will be as well. I look forward to seeing Vickie Chapman attend a meeting of the Burnside Residents Association, one of the groups that wrote to members of parliament saying, 'Please support this disallowance. Please support local council involvement in planning.'

They are going to be very disappointed, but it is very clear to me that the Liberal Party and the Labor Party are far more scared of the development lobby than they are of communities and citizens and residents' associations. People have a right to feel very let down by this decision, but I can say on behalf of the Greens: we will not be giving up and we will insist in this place on proper planning processes and making sure that laws are changed only for the best reason and following full consultation, not the way this government is approaching it.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes	3
Noes	17
Majority.....	14

AYES

Franks, T.A.	Parnell, M.C. (teller)	Vincent, K.L.
--------------	------------------------	---------------

NOES

Brokenshire, R.L.	Darley, J.A.	Dawkins, J.S.L.
Finnigan, B.V.	Gago, G.E. (teller)	Gazzola, J.M.

NOES

Hood, D.G.E.
Lee, J.S.
Maher, K.J.
Stephens, T.J.

Hunter, I.K.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Ngo, T.T.
Wade, S.G.

Kandelaars, G.A.
Lucas, R.I.
Ridgway, D.W.

Motion thus negatived.

Parliament House Matters

CHAMBER FILMING

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Can I ask for a point of clarification? I am aware that the contributions by some members were being filmed during the process. Is the filming only to be while members are standing in their place or can divisions and all the activities be filmed?

The PRESIDENT: My ruling is that the only thing being filmed is the members on their feet when they are giving a contribution. The actual filming of the division would not be allowed. It is only while the Hon. Mr Parnell is speaking.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am just getting clarification, because the members are still in position.

The PRESIDENT: It is in position. I am sure you will edit it.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Yes.

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

*Answers to Questions***ADELAIDE CASINO**

In reply to the **Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (17 June 2014).

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): I have been advised:

Prior to the new taxation arrangements for the Adelaide Casino, there was no VIP tax rate. The new tax rates for premium gaming areas were set relative to rates payable by the Casino's interstate competitors.

The new VIP rate enables SkyCity to offer an internationally competitive premium gaming product comparable to interstate and overseas competitors. This provides an opportunity to attract international and interstate VIP business that Adelaide could not previously compete for. As a result of this agreement, there is an opportunity for State taxation revenue to grow.