

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Thursday, 2 July 2015**

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

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills (Hon. G.E. Gago)—
Flinders University—Report, 2014
Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—Report to the Board on the Actuarial
Investigation as at 30 June 2015

*Ministerial Statement***DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:19): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement made in the other place today by the Minister for Defence Industries on Australia's naval shipbuilding industry.

*Question Time***TIME ZONES**

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, representing his very good, close and intimate friend, the Minister for Investment and Trade, a question about time zones. Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: As members would be aware, back in early February—I think around 5 February—the old chestnut of a distraction was released, which would be a discussion around—I think the Premier floated it—changes to the eastern time zone. Members would be aware that I lived on the South Australian-Victorian border all of my life before being a farmer, and we lived with a difference of half an hour. We lived right on the border; in fact, my property backed onto the border. Really, they should have actually spoken to the people who live with it on a daily basis before we went down this path.

We are now nearly six months on from that announcement. I was listening the other day with interest, as I often follow what the member for Waite does and listen to what he says, because sometimes it varies on a daily basis. Anyway, I was listening last Monday or Tuesday as I walked to work to a radio interview, where I listened to the discussion on what had been happening. They had a great debate on 9 April and then they did some other consultation, and the minister was saying to Mike Smithson on morning radio:

...we're walking along the trail assembling the 'What We Heard' report following extensive consultation...we've got an early draft of that...it's raised some really interesting issues that required further work. So we've gone to a range of sources to get some answers to some of the issues raised into 'What We Heard' report...also we've commissioned some economic modelling because I think the argument would be supported by some sound economic arguments.

He goes on to say that a whole heap of other issues were raised:

...firstly it's telling us that there's a wide array of views here and that there's no general consensus. It's also raised some interesting issues, some of which haven't come up on previous occasions when this matter's been raised...for example, over on the West Coast there's issues that have been raised about kids getting up half an hour earlier, will it be darker, are there any health issues...

He says that has never been raised before. Where has he been? Then he goes on to say, 'we're seeking advice on that'. He then goes on to say that the report also raised issues about safety, with the more daylight the better. Later in the day the argument is that if you have more daylight there'll be less chance of hitting things on the road and they are getting some advice on that. He goes on:

Issues have been raised about whether or not we can open schools and government offices...later to accommodate a change...we're getting advice on that...

He then went on to say that they have also—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, this is not a brief explanation.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: It is a brief explanation.

The PRESIDENT: No, it's not; it's a long explanation.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I'm just about—

The PRESIDENT: Three minutes for an explanation is getting a bit too long. Just get to the questions.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: The last 15 seconds, Mr President, have been taken up with you asking me to hurry up.

The PRESIDENT: Get to the questions.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: My final point is that he said, 'we've gone to the universities, we're getting some economic modelling done'. My questions are:

1. Who has been commissioned to do the economic modelling?
2. How much is the economic modelling costing?
3. The economic modelling the minister referred to later in his interview on the radio—was that the same economic modelling as before? It mentions that the same people have been engaged.
4. The minister took a number of flights to all parts of the state. Can the minister bring back a response as to how much the flights have cost and how much the whole study into the change to time zone is costing South Australians, when it was really just a joke and a distraction?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for his question and his very touching personal story and reminiscence about his former life on the land. I will seek an answer from the minister responsible, who is a very good minister. He is a good egg and a great advocate for this state, the minister responsible, and I will bring back a reply. He's a good egg.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary question.

TIME ZONES

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Did the minister call his colleague 'a good egg' or 'a rotten egg'?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:24): He's a good egg.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wade.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Wade has the call.

HEALTH BUDGET

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Acting Minister for Health a question related to Country Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In the run-up to the last state election the Labor Party promised to, and I quote, 'create more country jobs in regional communities', noting that 'people are best placed to make local decisions when they are part of the local community'.

According to last week's budget papers, over the next 12 months SA Health is intending to cut the number of staff employed across the Country Health SA Local Health Network by 124 full-time equivalent positions in the 2015-16 financial year. As I asked yesterday, and the minister undertook to provide an answer:

1. Does the government stand by its promise to create more Country Health jobs in regional communities?
2. Will the 124 positions removed from Country Health by June 2015 be consistent with the government's commitment to create more Country Health jobs in regional communities?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for the same question again, and I know that we will continue to work towards our election commitments. But it takes a lot of front, of which the Hon. Stephen Wade has a lot, to talk about health like this. It is hugely hypocritical that he has asked this question, given everyone knows that Labor will always invest more in health and education than the Liberals—we will always do that.

Just look at the \$5.5 billion worth of cuts that the Hon. Stephen Wade's federal mates have made to the hospital and school funding in South Australia over the next 10 years and not a word from him, not a single word when his federal mates, when Christopher Pyne, the member for Sturt, his factional boss, makes these huge cuts—the self-appointed head of politics in South Australia makes these huge cuts—and not a word from the shadow health minister, not a single word; \$80 billion in health and education cut across Australia.

Labor will always invest more in health and education. Contrast that with the last time the Liberals were here. I can't remember who it was, but the education minister at the time shut 45 schools—45 schools down to the last Liberal education minister. Labor will always invest more in health and education.

HEALTH BUDGET

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:27): Supplementary: how does the Acting Minister for Health justify his statement that Labor will invest more in health when this financial year they are budgeting to spend less than they spent last financial year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:27): We will always invest more than they will.

HEALTH BUDGET

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (14:27): Supplementary question: can the minister explain why in the forward estimates of the health budget in real terms there is a significant cut, and will the minister confirm that they have a goal to cut \$500 million per annum out of their budget and slash beds and get rid of doctors and nurses?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:27): The Hon. Robert Brokenshere talked about 'scientific evidence' yesterday. All the evidence that you need is to look at what the Liberals do when in government. Look at what the federal Liberals have done: \$80 billion worth of cuts in health and education across Australia. The evidence is there.

STEM AUSTRALIA WEBSITE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:28): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Science and Information Economy a question about STEM Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: STEM Australia website was launched in January 2014 and was promoted as a 'one-stop information hub' for science, technology, engineering and maths training and careers. Information obtained under freedom of information confirmed that the state government has wasted hundreds of thousands of dollars by dumping a website promoting science and technology careers only one year after setting up the site.

The FOI stated that at least \$226,000 was spent on the STEM Australia site, and despite the department having a fully qualified web developer and designer the government still decided to start a contract with web developer StudioHum. Subsequently, another advertising company Showpony was also involved. The site was shut down in April this year, with much of its content transferred to a page within the Skills SA site. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister advise why the website was pulled down from its original site in April this year after just 14 months of operation?
2. Can the minister advise why, even up to now, links on the site lead to disconnected phone numbers and dead ends?
3. Can the minister advise how much departmental staff time was spent on the project?
4. Why did the government outsource this contract, especially when the department employs a fully qualified web developer and designer?
5. Can the minister advise if the advertising agency Showpony work for the STEM website was billed as part of the Skills for All contract and not billed as a direct cost of producing the STEM portal website?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:29): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions. Indeed, from April 2015 the content from the STEM Australia website was made available through the more popular Skills for All website; it will continue to be available on the new WorkReady website posted the day before yesterday. This transition allows people to more easily connect with STEM career information with the training and skill options available under Skills for All and now WorkReady.

The Skills for All website receives much higher visitor traffic and gives the STEM content much higher exposure, with an average of over 26,000 visitors per month. The website is also actively promoted as part of the Department of State Development's training and career information services, including the use of social media channels. The South Australian government remains committed to lifting participation in STEM education and training. STEM skills are critical to increasing productivity and research capabilities, commercialisation and response to technological change.

The government is working closely with Australia's science hub, RiAus, based here in Adelaide to implement direct STEM initiatives such as the development of STEM resources, incorporating lesson plans and video content and a range of other things.

The government recently launched the Inspiring South Australia program, a \$1.52 million initiative supported by the federal and state government, the state's three local universities and also the SA Museum. The state government is also contributing \$360,000 over four years towards a program to increase the community's understanding and appreciation of the role that science plays in our lives and our future prosperity, and the state's support will include a number of activities.

STEM Sista is another initiative industry-led pilot program to encourage more girls into STEM. Concept2Creation is an industry-led program to provide industry-centric curriculum resources and mentors for schools worth \$700,000 over three years. The Defence and STEM Scholarships and Internships program enhances university students' learning and employment outcomes, and

VentureDorm for Teachers is a pilot program in conjunction with the New Venture Institute at Flinders University and the Australian Science and Maths School. So, we have a very extensive STEM program.

The STEM Australia website contained general STEM career information on jobs and training as well as blogs and articles from people working in STEM industries, particularly women. That site was targeted at school and tertiary students, parents and teachers. The site was developed by the former DFEEST and went live in July 2013. Audience testing of the original concept and consultation with STEM stakeholders showed support for the website.

However, despite extensive cross-government efforts to promote the STEM Australia portal to schools, students and employers, it didn't achieve the level of user interest as anticipated. The number of page views averaged 1,500, but the number of registered members submitting content was estimated at less than 10. There was also a number of competing national and international websites with similar content, such as myfuture, and there are a number of others.

Given that we monitor these things and are always looking to make best use of public money and given the low level of stakeholder engagement and ongoing maintenance costs associated in terms of staff resources and the website licence fee, the department decided to transition the STEM content to a more recognised website with higher visitor traffic.

The content development on the STEM Australia website remains accessible to the public. Since the transition in April 2015, there have been over 1,800 page views on the STEM page on the Skills for All website, so clearly this was the right thing to do, and it is a very positive indication that the STEM content is receiving a much higher exposure, given its new location.

Ministerial Statement

ENERGY PRICES

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:35): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to electricity prices made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis.

Question Time

STEM AUSTRALIA WEBSITE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:35): I have a supplementary question. Arising out of the answers by the minister, she said that her staff are monitoring the website. Can she explain how much departmental time was spent on the project monitoring, and can she explain why, even up to now, the links on the site lead to disconnected phone numbers and dead ends? Can her department investigate this matter?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary questions. I will follow up with the links and rectify anything that does need to be rectified. In terms of monitoring, this is the general vigilance that our public servants issue in relation to services, so it really is part of their everyday activities.

I think you did ask about the total cost of developing the STEM website, comprising information, architecture, development, project management, web development, web text editing, as well as the creative design and marketing strategy, and I am advised that it was approximately \$220,000. That is the answer to that question.

BPW ADELAIDE SUFFRAGETTE DINNER

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (14:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about South Australian suffragettes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA: South Australia led the world in political rights in 1894 when all women, including Aboriginal women, won the right to vote and to sit in state parliament. Can the minister update the chamber on the recent BPW Adelaide Women's Suffragette Dinner?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. It gave me great pleasure last night to co-host the BPW Adelaide Suffragette Dinner, along with the Hon. Michelle Lensink and Ms Frances Bedford MP.

The event was attended by many women from a range of different communities across the state, including a number of members of parliament, and I thank them for their support. It was wonderful to be in such good company and to be able to celebrate the 120-year anniversary of women's suffrage in South Australia.

BPW is a community of women who strive to improve conditions for working women. Its objective is to help women achieve personal and professional goals through networking, friendship, development programs and workshops, as well as attending national and international conferences.

Organisations such as BPW and events such as this suffragist dinner are incredibly important, because they remind us that we must not become complacent when it comes to achieving women's equality. It has been 120 years since South Australian suffragists made remarkable gains for women's rights in this state, and we acknowledged the work of many women yesterday evening, including Muriel Matters, who was born in the Adelaide inner city suburb of Bowden in the late 19th century and who campaigned tirelessly with the Women's Freedom League to further the cause of women.

Yet, we are still faced with entrenched inequality throughout much of our society. For example, as at 1 June 2015, women comprised 25 per cent of South Australian parliamentarians and 29 per cent of all parliamentarians in Australia. These figures are obviously well below the proportion of women in the Australian population, which is just above the 50 per cent mark.

The gender gap in politics and wider society has serious implications for our society. We know that women have much to contribute to society and that when they are supported they can do great things, which is why it is even more important that we address the cultural reasons why women continue to be under-represented not only in politics but also as leaders of business and other leadership roles in society.

Obviously I am very proud to be part of a government that is determined to continue to enable women to reach their potential as leaders in any field they might choose, and we are not just talking the talk of equality but are working very hard to establish targets and initiatives. For instance, in 2004 we set ourselves gender balance targets in South Australia's Strategic Plan—the first jurisdiction in Australia to do so—and, more recently, we have provided scholarships for 50 women to attend a governance course through the Australian Institute of Company Directors.

The Premier's Council for Women (PCW) works very hard to improve the opportunities, wellbeing of and services for South Australian women. Established in 2002, the Premier's Council for Women provides leadership and advice to ensure that the interests of women are at the forefront of government policies and strategies. PCW's work plan for 2014-18 focuses on four priority areas, one of which is women and leadership.

In partnership with the Office for Women and with local industry, PCW has developed a guide to best practice for attracting, retaining and promoting women in executive levels of industry. 'Words into Action: a practical guide to achieve gender equity in your work place and improve your company's performance' was developed in response to organisations seeking help to assist them turn their commitment for gender equity into real, practical action.

Events such as the BPW Adelaide Suffragette Dinner remind us that although South Australia has a proud history of women's rights, we must remain vigilant and tireless, and continue to act with courage to ensure equality for women throughout society.

BPW ADELAIDE SUFFRAGETTE DINNER

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:42): A supplementary. Given that the minister noted the numbers of women in this place, is she disappointed that the government benches actually have one less woman than they did in 2010, when I entered this place, and will she undertake to ensure that the government's next appointment for a casual vacancy for the Legislative Council is a woman?

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): Obviously I will be very happy when we finally reach the day when we have at least equal numbers of women not only in parliament but also right throughout all leadership areas and executive positions in our society. I continue to focus my attentions on and will work hard to achieve that.

PALLIATIVE CARE SERVICES

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:42): I seek leave to ask the minister representing the Acting Minister for Health questions about palliative care services cuts in the South-East of South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Further to my questions some two weeks ago in this place regarding dramatic cuts in staffing levels in the South-East regional palliative care service that came into effect yesterday, it has come to my attention that there have also been cuts to the South Coast or Fleurieu Peninsula palliative care program. I understand a specialist palliative care nurse full-time equivalent person has been transitioned to the community team and will be part of the generalist round. Palliative care episodes will only begin three months prior to death or if the patient is deemed to be in a terminal phase. I also understand that people under 65 years old with a terminal illness will have no service coverage at all under this change.

As I said in this place last month, for most, tending to patients who are dying is not an everyday occurrence and, in line with many other conditions, requires active support from those with a distinct body of specialist knowledge. It is essential that specialist care is available at this difficult time. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why is the minister, in addition to cutting South-East palliative care services, also cutting palliative care services to the South Coast?
2. I ask again: does the minister understand that not all medical and allied health care staff are trained in end-of-life care, and very often do not have the skill or aptitude to provide standards-based palliative care at home, in hospital or in residential aged care settings?
3. What services will be available to people under 65 years of age who are experiencing a terminal illness in this region of South Australia?
4. With these reduced services, will South Australia now be known for its arguably Third World palliative care services?
5. With no after-hours on-call for dying patients who want to stay at home, who will address these issues? How will they manage additional stress for relatives who are already distressed by their dying relative?
6. Will there be any expectation that GPs newly contracted to work in hospitals who do not have training or expertise in caring for people facing death and bereavement be expected to do so anyway, and what alternatives will be available for people in these regions with cuts in this area?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:46): I thank the honourable member for her important questions and very genuine concern and interest in these matters. I do not have the answers to the questions on palliative care in front of me now, but I will undertake to bring back a reply to her questions as soon as I possibly can.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Acting Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse a question regarding the state's Suicide Prevention Strategy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Last year, the government committed to add an additional one full-time equivalent to assist the rollout of the state's Suicide Prevention Strategy. On 18 July 2014 in estimates, the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse assured the opposition during questioning on the Suicide Prevention Strategy—and I quote from a line of questioning by the member for Morphett (Dr McFetridge) in another place:

In the suicide prevention programs. In the community grants area, I understand there is only [one] staff member who is organising the rollout of these programs. Is there any intent to increase that?

The Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, the Hon. J.J. Snelling said:

That one FTE is actually an additional position on top of what we have currently got.

I was very pleased to hear that, particularly regarding the need to assist in the establishment of further suicide prevention networks across the South Australian community. However, I was frustrated to find towards the end of last year that no appointment had been made. I subsequently followed up that concern with letters to minister Snelling early this year. Having had no response again, in early April the honourable member for Taylor in another place said, 'The minister's parliamentary secretary wrote to me on 15 April admitting that there had been a delay and advising me that the position should be filled by July 2015.' However, at this point I am yet to hear of any concrete appointment to that position. My question is: when will the additional full-time equivalent position to assist with the rollout of the Suicide Prevention Strategy, as advised by the minister in his answers during estimates last year, actually be filled?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for his question. I do not have the answer to his question with me now, but I will take it on notice and make sure a reply is brought back as soon as possible. I do note his continuing and very genuine interest in this matter, both in this chamber and advocating for the community on suicide prevention. I think the work he has done in this field is a great credit to him, so I will make sure a reply is brought back as soon as possible.

WORKREADY

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:49): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills questions regarding the government's WorkReady program.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Further to my previous questions regarding private training, redundancies and unemployment under the new WorkReady program, I have had representations from key stakeholders in the industry, and the issues that they have raised with me have been quite concerning. I would like to ask some questions of the minister:

1. How many training accounts does TAFE SA currently have for superseded qualifications and what is the policy behind this?

2. How many notices to close training accounts have been issued by the Department for State Development and/or Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology to TAFE SA in the last 24 months? How many notices were complied with? I understand the minister will probably have to take that one on notice.

3. Did the minister or her department or TAFE SA approve an increase in advertising for TAFE SA in the two months leading up to the release of the minister's policy?

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) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. Indeed, we are very pleased, this being the second day that WorkReady has been operational. As we know, it was a reform to our VET training system that focused our efforts much more tightly on employment outcomes and a much closer connection with industry. It also has a much higher focus on completion rates and it is a system that we were very pleased to roll out. I have spoken in this place before about a number of unfortunate issues that have occurred in terms of the 2015-16 financial year and some of the challenges that we face throughout that particular year, particularly the high levels of pipeline or current enrolments and the impact that that is having on the system generally.

In relation to the first two questions, I will need to take those on notice and bring back a response. I do not have that level of detailed information with me. In terms of advertising, that is a matter for TAFE. I am not aware that they need any approval or to seek approval in terms of their rate of advertising. I know that their material comes through my office because it comes through the central communication, but how much they individually spend on it and the rate that advertising is conducted at any one time is really a matter for TAFE. It is a question of whether I knew what level TAFE undertook—

The Hon. D.G.E. Hood: Well, it was both.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: As I said, I am not aware of any approval that was sought of me and, as I said in terms of the rate of advertising, he would need to ask those questions directly of TAFE.

MICRO FINANCE FUND

The PRESIDENT: The honourable and gallant and debonair Mr McLachlan.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (14:53): Thank you. I am glad that your eyes are working on this side of the chamber, Mr President. My question is directed to the Minister for Automotive Transformation: can the minister advise the chamber who are the members of the pool of independent experts that the assessment panel of the South Australian Micro Finance Fund are able to access to assess the applications to the fund?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for his important question. The pool is many and varied.

MICRO FINANCE FUND

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (14:53): A supplementary, Mr President: is the minister either able to provide today or take on notice the actual list of the independent experts and advise how they will be remunerated?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:54): I absolutely will take it on notice. Again, it is a very tricky question that has found me wanting. He is a very good member and I suspect it is his lawyery experience that finds me wanting for this. I will take that on notice and bring back a response. I suspect, though, it is a very large pool of people that can be called upon for informal advice and there would not be remuneration, but I will check that is the case.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: He'll be found wanting on this one too, I suspect.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: I suspect not. Minister, are there any Liberals standing up for manufacturing in South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for his very, very important question. Yes, I have an answer to that question. Although there are many Liberals in South Australia, there is very clearly only one correct answer to this question. The only Liberal in South Australia supporting manufacturing is the Independent Liberal, the member for Waite, minister Hamilton-Smith—the Independent Liberal. The Independent Liberal, the member for Waite, has achieved much during his time as Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries and Minister for Veterans Affairs.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Tell me what he's done.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Hon. David Ridgway says, 'Tell me what he's done'. I will tell him what he's done: he's done a lot.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister has the floor. He wants to answer that very important question. Minister, go for it.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am more than happy to tell the temporary Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council what he has done.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Twelve months ago industry was saying that the manufacture of Australia's next fleet of submarines, Australia's largest ever defence procurement, would be done in Japan, and that was a done deal. Without a strong public campaign from the Premier of this state and the Minister for Defence Industries, it is very likely the commonwealth government would already have sent this multi-billion dollar project offshore. There are options. There are some very good, sensible options for building these submarines in Australia. As minister Hamilton-Smith said earlier this year in another place of German shipbuilder TKMS, and the French industrial group TCNS:

Both shipbuilders express their willingness to embrace the Australian defence industry and to build in Australia. Both companies have proposed plans for an in-country build of Australia's future submarines as our international design partners. During our meetings we conveyed the South Australian government's clear commitment and support to the Australian defence industry, and we offered our assistance in securing an Australian built submarine solution by either of those companies.

Minister Hamilton-Smith goes on to say:

Compared to the international shipyards of Europe, there's a vastly different level of confidence in Australia's shipbuilding capacity than there is in the shadowy corridors of Canberra.

The shadowy corridors of Canberra! He continues:

The Liberal federal government does not appreciate that the investment of large global defence companies plays a vital role in our current shipbuilding strategy, the jobs they provide to Australian workers and the flow-on business it provides to our SME community.

Minister Hamilton-Smith went on to say:

I can assure the house, however, that while our federal government appears to have little confidence in the Australian defence industry to build our future for ships and submarines, the century-old icons of European shipbuilding have admired us from afar. They express their great desire to expand their interests here, but could not commit until the federal government gave industry a clear commitment to the future of Naval shipbuilding.

Minister Hamilton-Smith has also developed close relationships with global engineering defence companies, like Kellogg, Brown and Root, Singapore Technologies Marine, Rheinmetall Defence, and Boeing, to name just a few.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will continue to answer the Hon. David Ridgway's question about 'What has he done?' But wait, there's more—there is more that he has done! He has developed and is renewing trade strategies for South-East Asia and India. He does a lot on trade missions—some of his best work is done on trade missions.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Stephens!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Some of his best work is done on trade missions.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Stephens must try to contain himself, please. Our poor old friends up there from Save the Rehab will be horrified at your behaviour—horrified!

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Can we ask them what they think about the member for Waite?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Looks like 10 per cent to me. Minister, please continue with your answer.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you, Mr President. I might have had my hemp pants on yesterday, but the Hon. Terry Stephens has his angry pants on today. Under the stewardship—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens, the sooner you sit back and let him finish his answer, the sooner he will have finished with his answer and we can get on to the next question.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens, I have given a ruling to sit back and let him speak in silence. I think you've been around long enough and you are above that. Let him speak.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you, Mr President. I appreciate my very good friend, the Hon. Terry Stephens.

The PRESIDENT: Don't stir up the Hon. Mr Stephens; just get on and do your answer.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We both love Golden North ice creams, Mr President. I had a drink with him on Saturday night, in fact, and was at a dinner with him in Whyalla a couple of months ago. We're very good mates. I hope that doesn't ruin your chances of progressing straight in front of you to deputy leader here. However, it is a great audition as well, and you are blossoming like a beautiful flower as well in your role, in your auditioning, like a rainbow in the morning.

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

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: What's that?

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: He doesn't look like me at all. That's what you said about me yesterday.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: But wait, there's even more that the minister has done. There's even more in answer to the questions the Hon. David Ridgway has asked; there's even more.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, you want to know what he's done and I am telling you. So listen; I'll tell you what he's done. Under the stewardship of the very good minister, minister Hamilton-Smith, we saw the largest ever South Australian trade mission—256 delegates to China. Minister Hamilton-Smith also led a South Australian trade delegation to Shandong, a province with a \$1 trillion economy and a growth rate in excess of 8 per cent.

As a result of the economic opportunities minister Hamilton-Smith has helped to explore, we've seen things such as Seppeltsfield signing a deal for 1.5 million litres of premium wine per annum, Bellco signing a \$12 million trade and investment deal to sell primary produce, and Cleanseas signing their first ever bluefin tuna deal to China worth \$1 million. These are some of the things the minister has helped to do.

And there's even more. Next month, minister Hamilton-Smith will take more than 45 business delegates to India and South-East Asia. Led by minister Hamilton-Smith, the Export Partnership Program has been reformed and endorsed by Business SA, leading to a massive cash injection for businesses looking to expand their export market activity.

Largely as a result of minister Hamilton-Smith's work, there has been a 44 per cent growth in business migrants, with 187 state nominations, up from 130 in the past year, including 46 significant investors and 67 business talent visa applications. The Department of State Development estimates the outcome made by the business migration stream will be a \$167 million investment and will lead to the creation of 369 jobs in the economy.

Minister Hamilton-Smith has also established a new investment agency, with a \$15 million bid fund over the next two years. While minister Hamilton-Smith has been doing great work advocating for the manufacturing and defence capacities in South Australia, the Liberal Party continues to knock the industry. The Liberal Party continues to knock the local industry—like the member for Unley's baffling, misguided tweet against our automotive sector and having a go at Greg Combet, a person who is trying to help our automotive sector, last week.

I don't know if it's a cyber security issue and someone has got his password and has taken over his Twitter account. Except for a keen understanding of irony, that is the only explanation for some of the tweets we've seen from the member for Unley. Quite frankly, South Australia—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Point of order, the Hon. Mr Dawkins.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: The minister has been on his feet for more than nine minutes in answering this question, sir, and I ask you to bring him to a conclusion.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable minister, can you get to the crux of your answer, so we can get on with the next question?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will, but I do note that more than half of that time has been waiting for the interjections to subside, and I am fully answering some of the questions that the Hon. David Ridgway wanted me to answer: 'What has he done?' We are fortunate to have Greg Combet chairing the Automotive Transformation Taskforce. He has done some great work and has a great deal of experience in this area.

Whilst talking about Greg Combet, earlier this week, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire asked for scientific evidence that under a federal Labor government Holden would have continued to manufacture cars in the future in South Australia. I am no 'science-tician' but I know evidence can be found in books like Greg Combet's book *The Fights of my Life* first published in 2014—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: What's a 'science-tician'?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: What's that?

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: You said 'science-tician'.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, scientist. Greg Combet's book *The Fights of my Life*, first published in 2014, and I can quote briefly from the—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I won't quote from the book. I am happy to table the book if I quote from it. I won't table the quote, but Greg Combet makes it very, very clear that if Labor had been returned to government, our policies would have seen Holden stay manufacturing in South Australia. I know it is just the person who was in charge of the industry from the federal government; I know that is all that is: the one person who would know about it, and I know that's not a proper randomised

controlled, repeatable, double-blind, peer-reviewed, scientific study, but that's pretty good evidence. So it is a fact, it may well be—

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Point of order, Hon. Mr Dawkins.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: We are now past 11 minutes in the answer to this question, and I ask you to bring the minister to a conclusion.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I think you have had enough time. Would you please get to the conclusion of your answer?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Mr President, I will finish by saying: minister Hamilton-Smith is a good egg. He's done a lot for South Australia, and he is the only Liberal fighting for jobs in this state.

BATTERY STORAGE INITIATIVE

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, either in his own capacity or if he feels the need to refer to the energy minister, a question on the subject of battery storage in government buildings.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Last week the government announced that it was commencing a tender process worth \$1.1 million for the installation of battery storage in several key government buildings that currently have solar panels installed. These buildings include Parliament House, the Art Gallery, the SA Museum, the State Library, the Adelaide Railway Station and a number of schools. This is quite an exciting development, but minister Koutsantonis in announcing this tender was reported in the media, and I quote from the Renew Economy newsletter:

Energy Minister Tom Koutsantonis says the battery storage initiative is linked with plans to make Adelaide the world's 'first' carbon-neutral city, in an initiative that will include a 'Green Zone' where electric and hybrid vehicles, along with driverless cars, will be the preferred form of transport and petrol cars restricted.

I have been through the tender documents and I'm struggling to find any connection between the battery storage initiative and these transport plans of the government. So my question of the minister is: what is the link between this project and transport initiatives? In particular, I ask whether the government will consider using the proposed new battery storage in Parliament House for the charging of electric vehicles. I ask further: when will the government be procuring electric vehicles for the state fleet?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his important question and his continued interest in these matters as we transition to a much lower carbon future. I think the link is that all of these initiatives go towards supporting the government's goal to make Adelaide the world's first carbon-neutral city. He is right in much of what he said.

On 25 June, the government released a \$1.1 million expression of interest for the installation of battery storage demonstration systems in government buildings in the Adelaide City Council area. The expression of interest lists a number of high profile government buildings with existing solar photovoltaic systems installed for respondents to consider, such as the museum, the State Library and the Art Gallery. Respondents can also consider other government owned sites within the Adelaide City Council area.

As the honourable member points out, this initiative will support the government's goal to make Adelaide the world's first carbon-neutral city. Through this project, the government hopes to demonstrate how integrating battery storage with solar PV can deliver the multiple benefits of greenhouse gas reduction, energy load management and energy cost reductions. Indeed, the battery storage solutions are becoming increasingly important as the technology rapidly develops in this area.

I know in South Australia we have some of the world's leading innovation and research into battery storage. South Australia is very well positioned to be a strong early market leader for battery storage systems, as we have a very high uptake of renewables in the state, including an estimated, or a bit over, 170,000 rooftop systems currently connected to the grid. In terms of powerful electric vehicles and possible uses as state fleet cars, I am certain that, as the technology develops, the government will look to see what role it can play in the mix of government procurement.

REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:11): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills regarding regional jobs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: South Australian regions are facing an unprecedented jobs crisis with continuing job losses across the state, including Arrium in Whyalla to lose 580 jobs, to 450 at Alinta Energy, IMX Resources laying off 200 people, Penrice finishing up with 95 jobs, and up to 1,000 jobs across the state, including a number of regional areas in the VET sector.

I note that last month another minister announced a \$1 million package to assist communities in Leigh Creek and Port Augusta. My question is: what support is there for other regions in South Australia that are suffering under this Labor government?

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) (15:12): I thank the honourable member for her questions and, indeed, it is extremely challenging. We are facing significant challenges in terms of our employment numbers, and this government continues to work with industry to seize every opportunity we can to increase employment.

It is worthwhile noting that there are more than 21,000 additional people in jobs in regional South Australia than when this government came to power, including more than 15,000 full-time jobs. So, in terms of Greater Adelaide and regional South Australia, we have seen an increase in employment compared with the previous year although, as I said, we have very significant challenges. This government continues to work with business, industry and local communities to attract investment and create regional jobs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: That's from 2002-15. Our skills and jobs policy sets out a strong strategy for further job creation. This includes direct support for job creation and new initiatives to enable us to work more closely with industry and identify emerging job opportunities in local communities.

The recent state budget will deliver a \$985 million stimulus package including major tax reforms and also target investment in growth industries to boost the economy and to help generate job growth. That includes a tax reform package that provides almost \$670 million in tax reductions over four years by restructuring business taxes to help businesses invest, grow and create jobs, and it injects a further \$315 million over four years into growth industries and targeted infrastructure projects to stimulate the economy and create jobs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Clearly, the outline of the wonderful work of our minister Hamilton-Smith has made the opposition very tetchy, very angry and cross.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: They are obviously very sensitive to the good work that minister Hamilton-Smith has done. There are a number of positive signs in terms of our economy.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The minister has the floor.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: We also have detailed plans for jobs supported through this and a raft of other measures to grow business, including payroll tax concessions and reforming WorkCover, and an estimated \$180 million in savings to businesses. We know that, as part of our recent budget, there were significant additional funds set aside for roads and this—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Maher, don't agitate. Your Leader is trying to answer a question.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: We have also established the role of the Co-ordinator General to help assist lodged projects valued at over \$3 million to clear bureaucratic hurdles, and we have also provided funding for regional projects such as the \$15 million Regional Development Fund and the \$10 million Regional Jobs Accelerator Fund.

The first round of grants from the Regional Development Fund has so far resulted in 41 projects across the state, generating investment of more than \$337 million, leading to the creation of a projected 665 jobs in the regions. The Jobs Accelerator Fund will be used to:

- accelerate the impact of the Regional Development Fund by adding a further \$2.6 million in the upcoming RDF round;
- establish a new \$4 million loan scheme that supplements the assistance available through the Regional Development Fund;
- facilitate the indigenous economic development in the north-west pastoral region initiative with \$1.4 million over two years; and
- to respond to emerging opportunities with \$2 million for strategic regional initiatives.

These are just a few of the focused initiatives that we have in our regions to help support investment and business growth and development in our regions and, of course, to create jobs.

REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:17): I have a supplementary question. The minister might want to take this on notice: will she cite the resources that she uses to claim that there are 21,000 more jobs in regional South Australia since the government came to office?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:18): I am advised that there are more than 21,000 additional people in jobs in regional South Australia than when this government came to power, and that is from March 2002 to May 2015, and that would be ABS data.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway has a supplementary.

REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (15:18): Can the minister advise as to which ABS document those figures come from? She says they are from the ABS, but which ABS document did you get those figures from, minister?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:18): The ABS documents that are reported.

AUTOMOTIVE WORKERS IN TRANSITION PROGRAM

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. Can the minister provide an update on how the Warradale Career and Workforce Development Centre is assisting automotive supply chain workers?

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Oh, did Marty do this too?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for his very important question and his interest in this matter. In answer to the Hon. David Ridgway, no, I am not sure that Mr Hamilton-Smith directly was responsible for this, but I am sure that he is very supportive of manufacturing in this state, as we clearly established earlier today.

The South Australian government is serious about assisting workers currently employed in the automotive supply chain companies who will lose their jobs when automotive manufacturing exits Australia in 2017. Automotive workers in southern Adelaide are now able to access the same level of support that their fellow workers have access to in northern Adelaide.

As many members are aware, the state government has established a Career and Workforce Development Centre at Warradale to deliver elements of the Automotive Workers in Transition Program to automotive workers living and working in southern Adelaide, and I was pleased to officially open the centre in March this year. The address and other details of the centre, as well as the Holden Transition Centre, were recently added to the DSD website, and can be found at www.statedevelopment.sa.gov.au.

The Warradale centre is going very well, and I know that the Hon. David Ridgway is aware of how well it is going and where it is; I seem to recall him bragging earlier this year about skulking around in the late hours of the night with his camera, taking candid pictures of that centre. I am advised that the staff working at the centre are existing Automotive Transformation Task Force staff and that there are two staff there at any given time.

As of 9 April 2015 the establishment cost for the centre, including the rent and fit-out, was \$144,941. This consisted of establishment and signage of \$108,308 and rent of \$36,633. The ongoing rental is \$135,450 per annum. The annual budget for the centre is approximately \$200,000 a year, with staffing costs met from within the existing Automotive Transformation Task Force budget. The term of the lease for the Career and Workforce Development Centre at Warradale is two years from 12 January 2015 to 11 January 2017, with an option to extend for another two years. I am advised that the task force has sourced as much furniture and IT equipment as possible from within the Department of State Development.

The centre complements the Holden Transition Centre at Elizabeth which, like Warradale, is also available to GM Holden employees and car component manufacturing workers, including eligible labour hire personnel. I am informed that 64 individuals are receiving career and transition services through the Warradale centre, resulting in 148 appointments to date.

I am very pleased that South Australian workers, whether they work in the south or the north of Adelaide, now have access to a centre to assist in their transition from the automotive sector to alternative employment. I am advised that Automotive Transformation Task Force research has identified that more than 90 companies located in Adelaide's southern suburbs, with up to 2,000 employees in the region, may be affected by the closure of the automotive sector.

Southern Adelaide has a proud history of automotive manufacturing and is currently home to some of the largest automotive component manufacturers in this state, including companies like SMR and Tenneco. The state government centre at Warradale, like the GM Holden centre, provides a range of services including information sessions, professional career advice and transition services, skills recognition, computer and ICT training, and forums and workshops that provide opportunities for automotive workers.

The Automotive Transformation Task Force is coordinating, with GM Holden, information workforce sessions for presentations both to the Warradale centre and the Holden Transition Centre at Elizabeth. I am informed there have been four information sessions held at the Warradale centre so far, and am advised that there will be more information sessions and expos expanded over the next two years. I am encouraged that the Automotive Transformation Task Force is providing services in both the north and south of Adelaide to workers who will be transitioning to other industries.

*Ministerial Statement***MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

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) (15:23): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to a response to a matter of privilege made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Emergency Services.

*Bills***CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) BILL***Final Stages*

Consideration in committee of the House of Assembly's message.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

That the House of Assembly's consequential amendment be agreed to.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: This bill passed the Legislative Council on 18 June with amendments moved by the government after negotiations with the opposition, and we are happy to support it. It has had its name changed from '(Extended Supervision Orders)' to '(High Risk Offenders)' as a result of the inclusion of a new type of order in the new process for dealing with breaches of an ESO.

The Attorney-General has negotiated with the member for Morialta, working cooperatively, and there are further amendments resulting from drafting errors, I believe. Clause 5(d) includes in the meaning of 'a high risk offender', 'a person in prison for an offence breaching a supervision order.' That offence, which was in clause 17 of the bill before it was deleted by the amendments, does not exist as a result of the amendments, hence clause 5(d) should have been deleted as part of the amendments. I just convey to the chamber that the Liberal Party will be supporting the government in the tidy up of this legislation, on which we have worked quite cooperatively with the government.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will not repeat what my very good friend, the Hon. Terry Stephens, has already said about why clause 5(d), included in the meaning of 'a high risk offender', has been changed. I would be saying exactly the same thing he has said, so I am glad he has put that on the record.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (VULNERABLE WITNESSES) BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 June 2015.)

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:29): It makes me immensely proud to speak to this bill today and to know that in some small way Dignity for Disability has contributed to improving the justice system in this state for all people with disabilities through consistent and fierce lobbying for what we now know as the Disability Justice Plan.

Not long after I was elected to this place in 2010, I was made aware of horrific cases of alleged abuse perpetrated against seven children under the age of 10 years who also had intellectual and communication related disabilities. These abuses were allegedly perpetrated by their school bus driver. The case involving these children and this abuse never proceeded to trial. This is because our police, courts and justice system more generally do not cater for people with different communication needs and does not recognise specialist methods of evidence collection and interview types nor the need for cases to proceed to trial quickly where witnesses have a disability.

The fact that these abuses occurred is heartbreaking to me, and should be to us all, but of course most of all to the victims and their families. As all of you have probably heard me explain before, children with disability are estimated to be between four and seven times more likely to

experience abuse—physical and sexual—in their lifetime than their non-disabled peers. The fact that this horrendous statistic exists at all is upsetting, but the fact that most cases of abuse involving children and adults with disabilities never proceed to trial is plainly wrong, alarming and a complete miscarriage of justice which must be rectified.

How does one move on with one's life as a victim, a survivor or the family member of a victim knowing that the perpetrator is still wandering around the community, never to be brought to justice. How is that in any way fair or just? I would go as far as to guess that one of the reasons that people with disabilities are more likely to experience abuse is probably because the court and other systems that would otherwise provide us with an avenue to tell people what has happened to us present a barrier to us, so this situation must be rectified.

As members would be aware, this bill seeks to change some of the failings in our current justice system and improve the experience of people with disabilities within it as witnesses, as suspects or as defendants and very importantly for victims. This bill is about improving the position of potentially vulnerable or disadvantaged parties in the justice system—people with disabilities but also children generally—whether they have a disability or not.

Changes that will be enshrined in legislation following the passage of this bill include a child, whether or not disability is present, will now be defined as a person aged zero to 14 years (the current definition is zero to 12 years old); provision of communication assistants or communication partners, as they are sometimes known, for people who need it such as someone with a disability that affects the way they communicate. This could be somebody who uses augmentative and alternative communication methods such as speech boards, picture boards and so on. It could also be someone with an intellectual disability or cognitive impairment or, for example, a child with autism who uses some sign language.

These will now be admissible as evidence in court. The measures are spelt out in the bill very clearly, we believe. The communication partner must be objective in the same way that we would expect an interpreter for a witness whose first language is not English to be objective, and the communication partner is clearly not an advocate for the person they are helping to communicate, nor are they a lawyer.

There can now be 'ground rules' hearings. This will set out how a case will be conducted: for example, what is admissible evidence; what type of questions can be asked of potentially disadvantaged defendants; are witnesses victims and suspects? This measure has been very successful in the United Kingdom, I am told from the consultation I have undertaken, in making suggestions to government. For instance, this would potentially prevent the use of questioning that is deliberately verbose, repetitive or delivered in another style that might confuse or frustrate a witness with particular communication or literacy-related needs.

The bill also provides for the use of audio visual evidence of interviews as the evidence of victims or witnesses who are children under the age of 14 years, or who have a disability that affects their capacity to give evidence involving violence, including sexual violence, and outlines how those interviews can be conducted.

The bill also admits the use of hearsay evidence in some restricted cases: for example, a teacher, a parent or other caregiver reporting what a child has disclosed to them. It will extend the priority listing of trials to include people with a disability whose disability affects memory, so that the trial must proceed within three months of arraignment.

An example of this type of disability might be someone with an acquired brain injury (ABI) or cognitive impairment. At the moment only trials involving children get that priority listing. Given that it may well be that a person with a disability is able to give detailed and substantial evidence that would otherwise be admissible and it is just that they need to do it within a specified time, this is a very important amendment.

The bill also makes amendments to section 21 of the Evidence Act. This allows for an exemption for the need to give evidence in a court. It is hoped that some witnesses will not need to appear in a trial, which could be particularly important for people who are traumatised by what they are giving evidence about.

Finally, the bill also amends section 25 of the Evidence Act to clarify and strengthen the ability to prevent complex and confusing cross-examination, as I mentioned earlier. These amendments proposed are supported in the strongest possible terms by Dignity for Disability as they are simply technical amendments to capture changes that have already been passed by this parliament at the end of 2014, introducing new sexual offences to protect people with cognitive impairment or intellectual disability.

I strongly commend this bill to the chamber and also remind everyone that this is just one small part of the disability justice plan, which was launched in 2014. More cultural, policy and legislative changes are yet to occur to empower people with disabilities to not only speak out about what we experience but to prevent us from experiencing those negative things in the first place. Increased cultural awareness of disability rights, as well as education for people with disabilities about what are those rights in a broad range of life experiences, is definitely needed.

These changes will require us all to work together conscientiously and constructively in this space for many years to come. We certainly welcome the passage of this bill. We thank the government for its cooperation on this very important project. Perhaps even more so, we thank those people who have allowed us to use their stories as cases for the need for these changes. Of course, we wish that we had never had to use them and that they had never happened in the first place, but it is my hope that in using these stories we can create a situation where we will not have to hear these stories again in future. With those few words, I am very proud, on behalf of Dignity for Disability, to support the passage of this bill today.

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

INTERVENTION ORDERS (PREVENTION OF ABUSE) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 June 2015.)

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) (15:42): I do not believe that there are any further second reading speeches, so I wish to thank the opposition for its support. I look forward to dealing with the committee stage expeditiously.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

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) (15:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 June 2015.)

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:46): I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Serious and Organised Crime) Bill 2015. I will set out the Liberal Party position on this bill. Let me say at the outset that we in the Liberal Party support the key policing powers in this bill. We have listened to the briefings from the police and have formed the view, after much consultation, that the

exercise of these powers in the circumstances may have some merit in addressing criminality in certain motorcycle clubs. We especially acknowledge the extremely strong opposition to this bill from the legal community and especially the Law Society of South Australia and the Bar Association.

The Liberal Party has filed amendments to this bill. We believe that these amendments go some way to ameliorating those parts of the bill which have been strongly criticised by the legal profession and have also caused concern with the public in general. We believe that our amendments will provide safeguards and prevent unintended consequences inherent in the broadly drafted definitions. The bill seeks to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935.

The bill sets out a number of offences for being a participant in a criminal organisation. The bill declares 27 organisations to be criminal organisations under the Criminal Law Consolidation (Criminal Organisations) Regulations 2015 and the Liquor Licensing (Declared Criminal Organisations) Regulations 2015. Further declarations will be able to be made in the future by regulation on recommendation from the minister.

Like Labor we do not want organisations such as criminal motorcycle clubs to flourish in our community. We want our people to be safe. We want our police to have the training, resources and techniques to prevent criminal organisations from operating in South Australia. What we do not accept is that the Attorney-General should alone, in a process which lacks transparency and which is unable to be reviewed by a judge, decide that certain organisations should be declared illegal and then seek parliament's agreement to his decision by passing this legislation, without the benefit of the same information.

We are being asked to suspend our skills and experience as legislators and ban organisations based on the untested assertions contained in a secret police file and reviewed by one member of this parliament. This is unacceptable. This should be unacceptable to every member of this chamber who takes seriously their oath of office. The process that is set out in this bill offends long-standing principles of law that protect the rights of the individual against arbitrary acts of the government.

Not surprisingly, this system has been very strongly opposed by the Law Society and the Bar Association. At no time has a clear and present threat to our society been identified or articulated that justifies the undermining of the legal principle of the separations of power and the rule of law. These are principles that define our democracy and underpin the liberty our community enjoys.

The doctrine of the separation of powers is a key pillar of our democracy. Its formulation is generally attributed to the French jurist Montesquieu. Legislative power is the power to make laws. Executive power is the entitlement and responsibility to conduct the business of government according to the law, and for the public good. Judicial power is the power to give binding and authoritative decisions according to the law to settle disputes. A significant feature of judicial power is that it does not depend upon agreement of the parties to the dispute. Judicial power comes from the law itself. The aim of the doctrine is liberty as a matter of enduring relevance, or should I say, to all of us except the Labor Party.

In living memory, we sent our youth to fight and destroy regimes with Draconian laws such as the ones being proposed. Now we insult their sacrifice by enacting laws of a similar nature. The bill sets out a declaration process that is not independent or appealable. Parliament is not hearing evidence, nor is its decision appealable. Parliament does not have to give reasons for its decision.

The bill seeks to prevent judicial appeal of the decision to declare certain organisations as criminal. In this way, it dramatically subverts the doctrine of the separation of powers, a doctrine that is critically important to the proper functioning of our democracy. At the same time, there are significant penalties for breaching this legislation. Participation in a criminal organisation must receive a period of imprisonment, even if they are not a member of the club or even engaged in any criminal activity. A participant does not even need to intend to commit a crime.

When reading these provisions of the bill, I am reminded of Justice Kitto's famous quote in the Australian Communist Party case. He said during argument:

You cannot have punishment that is preventative. You can't remove his tongue to stop him speaking against you. That is wide open to a totalitarian state.

There are also associated amendments to the Liquor Licensing Act. A person will be guilty of an offence if they enter or remain in licensed premises wearing items of clothing or jewellery bearing the insignia of a declared criminal organisation.

It is our belief that the intent of introducing this legislation was not motivated, as has been claimed by the government, as a serious attempt to prevent organised crime. Rather, it was introduced simply to provoke a political error by we Liberals or, alternatively, as a feeble attempt to provoke an internal split within our ranks. This is an example of how debased politics has become in this state. More and more Draconian legislation keeps being brought to the parliament with the intent to generate political advantage for Labor. The ultimate losers in all this are the people of South Australia.

Let me assure the people of South Australia that the Liberal Party will always put the people's interests first ahead of its own political advantage. We will always seek to protect them from the criminal elements in our society. We will always examine legislation carefully to ensure that their rights and liberties are protected, and in all these things we will not be harried into making quick decisions on a false pretext that passing a bill is urgent.

The government has had months in which to bring the amendments contained in this bill to the parliament. The people have elected us to apply our skills and learning gained throughout our lives, to make decisions in their interest; not, as is the Labor mantra, in the interests of their own party. Our party is united in the fact that this legislation, having regard to its significance, must be comprehensively debated.

Our party is united in the view that the interests and security of the people of South Australia come first. Our party is united in the view that this bill requires amendment. We are united because we have debated the merits of this bill within our own ranks. We are united because we have not adopted the practices of Labor where each member is factionally bound to the views of their respective commissar. We are a free and united party that seeks to ensure the liberty and security of the citizens it represents. We resist Labor's attempt to denigrate the rights and liberties of South Australians for crude political gain.

We know that by proposing amendments in a constructive manner the only response we will receive from those opposite is the condemnation by Labor that we are somehow soft on crime. It has started already. I emphatically reject that assertion on behalf of my party. The Liberal Party has worked with the Labor government on these issues in a constructive manner at all times. We have always been prepared to work with the government in a bipartisan manner.

Of course, this offer would not be accepted by Labor because true bipartisanship would deprive them of the ability to devise legislation that is more and more oppressive and arbitrary in the hope that we will eventually say no, and then they can criticise us. I make this offer again to Labor: we are prepared to work constructively on ensuring the safety of our citizens. All the Labor Party has to do, like us, is to place the interests of all South Australians first.

When contemplating this bill my mind turned to my university days at Law School. If I could be certain of two things back then they would be: that I would not be sent to a war in Afghanistan and that in a democracy such as ours there would be no attempt to breach the rules against the separation of powers.

Both these things were unthinkable in that gentler time. But time moves on and we are now commemorating 800 years of the signing of the Magna Carta. I have been sent to Afghanistan and, courtesy of the Labor government, I am speaking on a bill that seeks to subvert the opportunity for judicial review of executive action, disregards the principle of the separation of powers and asks the parliament to declare organisations illegal based on secret evidence that it cannot even access itself.

The development of administrative law was in its infancy when I was being tutored in the law. In my role in defence I have seen how it has grown. At first it was adopted to protect the rights of individuals in the bureaucracy; now it is manipulated by the state to shape processes of administrative decision-making in an attempt to provide for decisions that can avoid judicial scrutiny. The law should not be abused in this way.

It is the Liberal Party's position that, no matter how hideous the government considers a particular group in our society, any government decision that affects these groups should be available for judicial review to ensure that no mistakes are made or powers abused. It is not acceptable in a democracy to say, as this Labor government is doing, that we cannot get a court to approve this so we are going to cut them out of the process. This in itself should serve as a warning beacon to every member of this parliament: if there is insufficient material to satisfy a court, how can the Attorney-General or this parliament come to a satisfactory decision?

This bill demeans the parliament as it is an attempt to lure us into committing an arrogant and authoritarian act. The Attorney-General should not aspire to be Robespierre and make this chamber his committee for public safety. Arbitrariness is the key to oppression. If there are no rules, justifications or reasons, everyone is at risk. This bill takes the first step into the world of capricious acts of the executive. The Liberal Party must and, indeed, is duty bound to the people of South Australia, to resist this grasp for power by the government. It is our duty as concerned citizens in a democracy.

Similar dilemmas have been debated in the federal arena recently. While there is much to distinguish the proposed commonwealth citizenship laws from the provisions of this bill, there are also very similar questions being raised about the exercise of the powers of the state and the opportunity for judicial review. The proposed commonwealth laws provide for a process of judicial review.

I ask the chamber: why does a terrorist have an opportunity to have a decision made by the executive reviewed by a judicial officer and yet a bikie in South Australia who does not conspire to bring down the state is not afforded the same rights under this bill? The question cannot be answered.

What may be of assistance to my colleagues on the government benches are some responses to questions by the federal shadow attorney-general, the member for Isaacs, in a recent media interview. When being interviewed on Sky News, Mark Dreyfus, in response to a question about how much involvement there should be with the courts before someone loses their citizenship, said:

...it is disturbing that in the week that we have celebrated the 800th anniversary of Magna Carta, one of the chief points of significance about that 800th anniversary is to remind us all of the need to guard against executive overreach, against the executive seeking to exercise power without restraint, the executive seeking to exercise power on a whim. I have described it this week as a ministerial whim...

He goes on in the interview to say:

It concerns me to hear this government—

and he is referring to the federal government—

talking about any power that is to be exercised without involving the courts.

If you do not believe me please refer to your own federal shadow attorney-general, whose views on this matter are pertinent to our considerations on this bill.

The bill before us, in its construction, is flawed by the vaulting ambitions of this government to subvert the role of the judiciary. The Attorney-General in this place has, in response to our reservations about the operation of the bill, been reported to have questioned our courage as Liberals on the matter. My response to the Attorney-General is that he himself is seeking to declare certain clubs in the body of this legislation. In essence, he is seeking from parliament an endorsement of his decision, despite parliament not having all the requisite information to do this.

If the Attorney-General truly believes that the information the police have provided him is so overwhelmingly sufficient to declare each and every bikie club referred to in the schedule to the bill as a criminal organisation, he should support our amendments. He can then bring to parliament a regulation that declares each and every club a criminal organisation. Only by this action can the Attorney's decision be considered a clear and unambiguous statement to the chamber, and the community, that the information provided by the police is sound and of sufficient weight to warrant a declaration; in other words, that the government has confidence in its own decision-making in respect of each club, and this decision will survive scrutiny by a court should it be challenged. I do not see

why this chamber, by passing this bill, should seek to alleviate the Attorney-General or the government of the burden of these difficult decisions.

There is also an issue of bias that has been built into the declaration process. It cannot be ignored that senior members of this government have strongly condemned certain motorcycle clubs both in and outside of the parliament. In a judicial setting, making such statements before undertaking a decision-making process would usually disqualify the maker of the statements from hearing the case. This is why it is the usual practice of democracies to leave decisions regarding the conduct of individuals to an independent judiciary.

A related concern is the impact this will have on the enforcement of declarations and the reputation of our police force. We have a fine police force in this state, which is dedicated to the protection of its peoples. As the parliament is, in the first instance, acting on the advice of the Attorney-General to declare some organisations criminal and, subsequently, in response to considering further regulations naming other clubs, it necessarily follows that the manner by which the advice is formulated is critical.

In other words, in addition to potential bias the Attorney-General's recommendation will inevitably always be considered an essentially political one. I submit to the chamber that this, in essence, corrupts the whole process. We are, in turn, demeaning our police force by asking them to enforce laws which are essentially political in nature and lacking in moral force. My fear is that the corrupted nature of the process, and the failure to respect the principles of the separation of powers, will have a long-term and lasting negative impact on the reputation of the South Australian police force and its senior officers. Again, this is why—and unlike this extraordinary situation being proposed to us in this bill—we, as a parliament, ordinarily leave such judgements to an independent judiciary.

We need only look over the border to Queensland and the case of Sally Kuether to see what is wrong with these laws, and the unforeseen impacts that these types of capricious laws can generate. Sally is a library assistant and a mother of three, who was charged under the Queensland laws with participating in a criminal organisation. She was not a member of a club but she risked a minimum of six months in prison for wearing the wrong clothes and being in the presence of two people who were associated with a declared motorcycle club; one was her partner, and they did not meet to engage in criminal activity. The charges were eventually dropped, largely as a consequence of the resulting community outrage.

There are also the embarrassing revelations closer to home regarding the motorcycle club called Phoenix, a legitimate club of motorcycle enthusiasts but named in the schedule. It is impossible for any member of parliament to be absolutely certain that the club listed in the schedule is one that is criminal. How can we have comfort when the schedule is already being amended in respect of places?

I note that the Attorney in a letter to members of parliament dated 30 June 2015 advises that South Australia Police will determine whether materials which he himself relied on should be made available to a particular member of parliament. I do not think this initiative takes us much further. Even if all the material is released, including criminal intelligence, to make a determination will require some legal skill and advice. Not all members of parliament possess the qualifications, skills and experience, nor do we have access to legal counsel to assess the material. This dilemma is in itself another reason why such matters should be left to the judiciary.

One of the key materials presented to the Attorney-General which informed his decision on these clubs, and will do so in the future, is police criminal intelligence. In my working life before being elected to this place, I gained experience with intelligence files, in particular military intelligence. I know well the difficulties in assessing the veracity of such material. This difficulty was beautifully put by former Labor leader and Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Ben Chifley, when he argued in the federal parliament against the Communist Party Dissolution Act:

This bill strikes at the very heart of justice. It opens the door for the liar, the perjurer and the pimp and to do so in secret without having either to substantiate or prove any charges they might make.

Of equal concern is that there are no longer legislative annual reviews of the Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act by a retired judge. The last review was tabled on 24 November 2011.

The government should give consideration to having a greater compliance structure around the collection and assessment of criminal intelligence, especially given the use of criminal intelligence, in coming to a decision for the purposes of this bill.

Issues relating to criminal intelligence are not new. We only need to look back to the 1970s and the Salisbury affair as a reminder of what can go wrong. I am very concerned that there is no-one holding the watchers to account. Bureaucracies and the police are no exception and can, when not properly supervised, develop the impulse to perpetuate and justify their existence. When tangible threats do not exist, less tangible threats may be perceived or even invented. Bureaucracies will find work to occupy their energies, even when none naturally exist. I am not suggesting that this is the case in this instance, but no-one is watching the watchers.

I am especially concerned having regard to the serious penalties imposed on someone found to have breached the provisions of the bill. My concerns also stem from the same reason criminal intelligence is generally not used in court proceedings: it cannot be tested for accuracy. The government's decision to place certain Queensland clubs in the schedule to the bill was based on intelligence from Queensland police. It is our understanding that this information has not been tested by South Australia Police. So, we are relying on the competency, integrity and covert sources from a foreign police force. We have no way of assessing its veracity.

The whole process of assessment envisaged in this bill reminds me of the children's party game of whispers. Children are organised in a row and one child at the end is given a secret. They in turn whisper the secret to the next child and so on and so forth. The last child has to announce the secret. It often bears no resemblance to what was said to the first child.

Criminal intelligence is not necessarily evidence. It consists of hearsay and unsubstantiated allegations. I remind members that we are being asked to declare organisations as criminal based on the assertions which may be of varying quality, and held in files we cannot access. The response of the government to this dilemma was to try to make sure it did not have to justify its case before a judge. This is why we in this chamber are being asked to consider declaring organisations as criminal in the bill itself.

In this chamber we do not need evidence to make this decision. We can be as authoritarian as we wish, but just because the chamber may have the power, it is not an excuse to use it unwisely. I have no doubt this is why the government has played so much on the public disquiet about certain motorcycle clubs and its pursuit of penal populism. It is an attempt to distract the community from the slow and insidious retreat from the rule of law and the rise of executive authority.

The government mantra is that a great threat requires a tough response, but these laws have broader application than just motorcycle clubs and have the potential to impact other members of the community and their rights. We must question the necessity of these laws in the light of a wide range of other law enforcement and investigative powers that are available to the police. We must remember that these laws focus on association and seek to target categories of people. This approach contrasts to the traditional criminal offences based on conduct. The approach in this bill undermines the principle of equality before the law—a principle that is central to the Australian legal system.

The Liberal Party has filed amendments to this bill. We have done so despite our grave misgivings about the provisions of this bill. We have drafted these amendments in an attempt to keep the intent of the bill and more particularly the powers the police have requested. In putting these amendments forward, we have sought to act reasonably and responsibly. We acknowledge that the amendments will not repair the breach of the doctrine of separation of powers.

The bill remains extraordinary in its grant of power to the executive. The amendments remove the process of declaration of entities set out in schedules 1 and 2 of the bill by statute. The amendments also seek to strengthen the regulation process for an entity to be declared a criminal organisation by making the police information available to the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee for their consideration. This is contingent upon making a regulation to enhance the role of this committee and providing a report to parliament. The purpose of this amendment is to provide the parliament with some comfort that more than one of its members have reviewed and assessed the materials provided by the police that justify the declaration.

Our amendments ensure that there is an opportunity for parties to secure a judicial review while at the same time protecting the criminal intelligence. Our amendments also require a separate regulation for each organisation. This is to ensure each declaration for a particular organisation or place is assessed on its merits. The government process requires the declaration of a number of organisations at once. It is our view that the grouping of organisations diminishes the probity of the process and creates the perception that each organisation has not been individually assessed. In other words, we seek to repair the government's approach to restore it to one more that is in line with the principle of equality before the law.

Other amendments seek to refine the offences relating to the concept of participating in a declared organisation. We are endeavouring to tighten the definition of 'participant' and remove the change of name and reforming of entities provision. The definition of 'participant' includes a person who seeks to be a member or associated with an organisation. It also includes a person who attends more than one meeting or gathering of people who participate in the affairs of the organisation in any way.

We consider that this definition is too broad and that it will result in unintended consequences. We also believe that they will be very difficult to prove in most instances. It is our view that individuals seeking to be associated with a club is not a class that should attract the extreme penalties contained in this bill. We note that there are no time limits between meetings. On its face, this means that you could be introduced as a young person and then attend another meeting 20 years later and still be caught by this provision. We consider the remaining provisions of the definition to be adequate.

We are also seeking to delete the provisions relating to the change of name or membership provisions as well as the reforming provisions. We believe these are too broad and not practicable or workable. The police will have close surveillance on these clubs. They will be able to accommodate changes in their internal dynamics. If the current clauses stand, then the effect of a declaration may never end even if a club ceases all forms of criminal activity.

In considering the definition amendments, our primary concern is that innocent people will be caught by these laws, and in this context we are particularly mindful of the large penalties imposed for breaches. All of our amendments have been mindful of the submission of the Law Society and the Bar Association.

By way of final comment, this proposed legislation, in all its imperfections, would already have been passed into law by now if we did not enjoy the benefits of a Legislative Council in this state. The introduction of this bill, and the attempts by the government to manufacture a sense of artificial urgency, once again presents the most compelling argument for the existence of an upper house in this state. It is ironic that the very party that has in recent memory had a policy for its extinguishment has, by the introduction of this bill, at the same time provided the greatest justification for this chamber's role in the democratic life of this state. We are truly the last line of defence for ensuring the liberty of South Australians.

I would also like to add a personal observation. It is my view that, if we are serious about fighting organised crime in this state, we should convene a round table or task force, as the Labor government has done in Queensland, and seek to address the problem of organised crime in an holistic fashion. Any such gathering would have representatives from the police, as well as the academic and legal communities. Perhaps we could even have a royal commission, since this mechanism seems to be in vogue with this government.

If I take the missives of the government at their highest, it is a far more pressing problem for South Australians than dumping radioactive waste into our pristine environment. Alternatively, we could allow the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee to do its work. This parliamentary committee was not even given the courtesy of examining the bill.

Of course, all this would deprive the government of its ability to use draconian legislation against motorcycle clubs as a political tool. I suspect it will not find favour with the government benches, but it would go a long way to facilitating what the police need, while at the same time ensuring that the liberty of our citizens is protected. Perhaps I am one of the last true believers in the rule of law, but if the problem of motorcycle clubs is serious enough then a government truly

committed to solving the problem should endeavour to bring along all South Australians, rather than ensure their political survival by manufacturing fear in the electors of marginal seats.

I challenge the government to rise above its more base instincts and make a genuine effort to address the operations of criminal motorcycle clubs. In 2008 we were told by the Labor government that their initiatives would solve the problem of criminal motorcycle clubs, yet here we are today considering even more draconian laws. The failure to use the police powers enacted in 2008 does not necessarily justify the return to this chamber to enact more legislation. Those 2008 powers were supposed to work and should at least have been tested.

Despite the protestations of the Attorney-General, the government has not made a convincing case for the introduction of this legislation or its impact on criminal motorcycle clubs. If history is to be any guide, this bill will only have a limited impact if enacted, but at the cost of irreparable damage to the democratic fabric of our community. I look forward to continuing to debate this bill at the committee stage.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (16:18): At the outset can I say that the general principles of what the government is endeavouring to do here Family First supports. This is not new. This has been on the agenda and the government has been trying to improve the laws when it comes to addressing what is significant growth in serious and organised crime. This is not just about bikie gangs, but about organised crime other than, and over and above, bikie gangs. For anyone who has had any dealings in their lifetime with the issues around bikies, I can assure you that they are organised and there is a lot of criminal activity within the bikie gangs.

We have just tabled an amendment, which I will speak to briefly in a little while and will spend more time on it when we get to the committee stage. I am hoping that the amendment we have tabled covers some of the concerns the opposition have just raised, without actually going to the point where, as with some of the amendments the opposition has tabled, it would basically destroy the intent of the bill. We could not support the judicial review proposal as one amendment, for example.

I am not the keeper of the Attorney-General, clearly, sir, you know that, but at times I think you need to actually defend some of the comments put in the chamber against the minister. The Attorney-General has not just dreamt this up, and the Attorney-General is not driving this per se. SAPOL has done its work and SAPOL is very actively involved in this. SAPOL wants to get this bill through the parliament because it wants to have another tool in what will be an ongoing comprehensive pack of tools that SAPOL and other agencies will need to combat significant growth in serious and organised crime.

Just as we hear almost on a daily basis the Prime Minister, the Rt Hon. Tony Abbott, talking about the importance of draconian legislation when it comes to the protection of our nation from terrorism, so from a state aspect in our parliament we are now debating a bill to better protect the people of South Australia, from a safety aspect as well as from a criminal and organised crime aspect that is growing in this state.

I personally was refreshed in a couple of points that are in this bill. The first is that for the start of a new piece of legislation, the parliament, a democratically elected parliament on behalf of the people of this state, has the opportunity to actually have a look at those first 27 declarations that will occur, has the opportunity to debate that in both houses, has the opportunity to actually put others forward if they happen to have been briefed and have evidence. That probably would not happen, but the members have the opportunity to delete some and argue that debate as well.

Most of the time what happens in this place is that we get legislation come through, we get a framework put before the parliament, we are told that certain things will be structured in regulations as a result of that framework, and then we discover when the regulations come through that it is vastly different to what we believed was going to be the structure of the regulations from the statute that we passed—and then what can we do? We can move a disallowance motion, but the reality is that once you move that disallowance motion, the minute we get up the government can put that regulation back in. We have seen that on many occasions and so it just is a yo-yo.

Here, to give credit to the Attorney, after detailed advice from SAPOL and other sectors of the justice department, the Attorney has actually put the 27 declarations into the house, so we know

exactly what we are talking about; we know exactly what we are debating. I have never defended, and I never will defend, organised crime or outlawed motorcycle gangs.

The other point I want to put forward when it comes to what the Attorney has actually done here is that he has sent us a letter, he has spoken to many of us, and he has offered us to have one-on-one briefings with the delegate of the Commissioner of Police, an assistant commissioner, and he has gone further than probably any minister, police minister or attorney-general has done in the past, to actually let every member of parliament—all 69 members of parliament—go in there with the assistant commissioner and have detailed briefings on all 27 declarations.

I put on the record that when I was police minister I did not ever offer that. We were involved in things like Panzer references at the time. You have to be very careful about how you go about this work, but there is that opportunity there; there is that offer there. Tomorrow, some of us will be getting some of those briefings. This bill is not going to be voted on today, so there is still time for members to do as much detailed work as they want with respect to the 27 organisations that have been put into this bill for the declaration side of it.

This goes back to 2008. We know the history and the problems and, yes, it is fair to say that back in 2008 probably that bill was put through the parliament a little bit too quickly, but the reality is that whatever legislation is put through any parliament can still be challenged. You often see challenges in the High Court and then you often see a situation where there has to be further amendments brought in.

But the courts do not make the laws: the parliament makes the laws. The courts are there then to make judgement on a case-by-case basis on the laws and the intent that the parliament has put into law. We are the lawmakers and they are the judiciary, and I think that it would be an error to have a situation where you were having the judicial reviews.

We know what we are dealing with and debating here right now, but we do not know what other declarations may come in the future. That is where I agree with the opposition when they say that they do not believe that it should be police commissioner to Attorney-General and then the Attorney-General going through executive council and putting a regulation forward. Then the only option left for MPs is to move a disallowance which, unless we change the structure of regulations and disallowance motions so that you cannot reintroduce that regulation for the rest of that term, (and at this point in time that is not the case) then, as I say, they can simply put it back in.

I propose in the amendment that we have put up—because I hear what the opposition is saying there—that, in future when the parliament wants to consider what is proposed by police, in the first instance the commissioner should be going through the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee. Then the committee would carefully consider in-confidence and in-camera what proposal SAPOL has put forward, and then, without declaring any of the detail, coming into both parliaments and actually tabling whether or not that committee recommends the Attorney-General sign off on the request or recommends the Attorney-General does not sign off on the request. So that would give an opportunity for Liberal, Labor and crossbench members to deliberate on future declarations.

The current provisions do not allow for the prevention of association in public, and although OMCs or outlaw motorcycle gangs have a general disregard for the law, evidence of the effectiveness of such provisions is apparent. In 2012, when the Finks Motorcycle Club was declared a serious criminal organisation, we need to remember that the Finks Motorcycle Club closed clubhouses and had a reduction in membership and shifted interstate.

As far as I am concerned, that was a very good thing for South Australia; a very good thing. We have members of this house and the other house who want to decriminalise prostitution and yet they do not want to put pressure on outlaw motorcycle gangs. Well, where do you think most of the prostitution is structured and managed and organised from?

The Hon. T.A. Franks: Decriminalisation gets the motorcycle gangs out of sex work: that's the point.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Well, we will debate that when we get to another bill. The fact of the matter is that we have some members who want to decriminalise prostitution but they are not actually opposing the very structures that are in place in this state that are organising most of

that prostitution. Of the approximately 1,000 prostitutes in this state, the majority of them, one way or another, have an association with outlaw motorcycle gangs. Have a look at illicit drugs and you will see the same thing.

So, from my point of view, if we get rid of a lot of the motorcycle gangs out of this state, hopefully we can see a reduction in drug trafficking and prostitution, not the growth that we are seeing through those organisations. We will debate that later, and I look forward to that. It will be a good debate; it will be a healthy debate.

I want to put on the record the way we interpret the bill. The bill is aimed at disrupting and distressing serious and organised crime and its members and aspirant members from conspiring and carrying out serious crimes. The bill also aims to reduce the presence of criminal organisations in public spaces and the intimidation generated by these organisations when they gather in numbers in public.

The bill also aims to prevent South Australia from becoming an OMCG haven through laws that are in line with other states, namely, New South Wales and Queensland. It enacts new offences mirroring sections in the Queensland Criminal Code and Liquor Act recently declared valid by the High Court where it is an offence for a participant in a criminal organisation to be in a public place with two or more other participants. It is also an offence for a participant in a criminal organisation to enter a prescribed place or attend a prescribed event, and bans them from entering licensed premises wearing club colours or logos and precludes them from meeting at the listed locations. It is also an offence for the participant to recruit others.

In his second reading speech, the Attorney spelt out clearly what the intent of the bill is, and as the honourable Mr McLachlan says, they oppose the government's declaring entities and attempts to have organisations set out in regulation therefore being subject to judicial review and parliamentary scrutiny. I say again that if you have a look at the amendment that we have tabled today, it does address the issue of parliamentary and, therefore, public scrutiny.

Clearly, there are some people who do not like aspects of this legislation, and often when you come in with tough legislation like this you get the legal fraternity opposed to it. I get lots of letters from the Law Society about these sorts of bills. At the end of the day, we need to ensure that we are listening to what the people of South Australia want; we need to ensure that we are giving the police the tools they need to keep this state safe and do everything we can to prevent organised crime and criminal activity, and that is the intent of this bill.

I do not see this as a political bill: I see it as another extension of a lot of work done by the former Liberal government in these areas, and the current government, and I would suggest that, when it comes to keeping communities safe and doing everything you can to combat organised crime and outlawed motorcycle gangs and everything that goes with them, the government is getting on with the job that is just work in progress. If you look back historically, it has been work in progress for decades of successive governments.

The one thing I do know is why there has to be continuing work in progress and why the Attorney has introduced this. Let us remember that the police officers who work in this area are highly trained and highly experienced, and I would argue that they would have more expertise and valuable input into this than the judiciary because of the nature of their work, their training and what they see. They are asking this parliament to give them another tool.

Therefore, with the amendment we have put forward we will debate and discuss that further, but we will be supporting the government to give the South Australian police force another tool to combat what is escalating criminal and organised activity in this state. There will be plenty more increasing criminal and organised activity in this state if we go soft on a bill that is designed to help stamp out criminal and organised activity.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.T. Ngo.

NATURAL GAS AUTHORITY (NOTICE OF WORKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 June 2015.)

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (16:34): I rise on behalf of the opposition to speak to the Natural Gas Authority (Notice of Works) Amendment Bill 2015 and indicate that the opposition will be supporting this bill. It is a necessary piece of legislation which essentially deals with the integrity of vital infrastructure and, more importantly, public safety.

The relevant act, the Natural Gas Authority Act, deals with the Moomba gas pipeline and the Katnook gas pipeline, and obviously the smaller lines which spur from them. In the mid-90s those pipelines were sold to Epic Energy and the associated act was amended accordingly. Under the previous act, there had been registered easements and those easements were then enshrined in legislation. However, and I am unsure as to the reason why, those amendments did not put a requirement on the landowners of the easements to give notice or to gain the consent of Epic Energy to carry out works within the easements.

South Australian communities have a huge reliance on the integrity of these pipelines. Indeed, we saw in April, when the supply was cut to some 8,500 customers in Port Pirie and Whyalla, just how much of an impact it can have on families and small businesses when the line sustains damage such as it did and, in fact, some businesses I suspect are still suffering some economic penalty or pain from the time of that outage.

Mr Clive D'Cruz, the general manager of operations at Epic Energy said that the pipeline operations is essentially a business of managing hazards and that one of the biggest challenges is mitigating the risk associated with their assets. It is the state's role to do whatever is reasonable and practicable to assist them in those functions.

I have taken guidance from my colleague in another place, the shadow minister for mineral resources and energy, Dan van Holst Pellekaan, the member for Stuart, and concur with him that the legislation has been proposed in a sensible way, where the pipeline owner cannot be obstructionist unless there is some justification. Under the bill, if a landowner proposes certain works, which are prescribed, Epic has the opportunity to object, but only if there is the opinion that it would interfere with the safety or operation of the pipeline or the associated equipment. Those works could include:

- excavation, drilling, installing or digging a pit, erecting something that requires a foundation, digging a well, some pavement or some other structure;
- disturbing alteration grades and contours of the land;
- planting trees or shrubs;
- storing plant machinery, equipment or material; and
- using explosives.

The bill actually specifies that easements are between 15 to 25 metres in width from the pipeline and three to 15 metres from the spur pipelines. Just to rehash the notification requirements, the landowner has to give 21 days' notice of proposed works and, within 14 days of receiving that written notice, the authority has to lodge an objection or approval. That period can be extended by mutual agreement or negotiation. The works could actually proceed sooner than the 21 days were permission given by the pipeline owner, which would sometimes be the case for certain works.

If there is an objection, the minister gets notified and can choose to mediate or not. The minister would have 21 days to advise the parties that they have chosen to mediate; otherwise it will be taken that the minister will remain uninvolved. The matter can proceed to the Wardens Court if the ministerial mediation is unsuccessful.

My colleague, the shadow minister, did question the minister on how this legislation would operate in the case where emergency works needed to be done—for example, if there was a train derailment and it happened to fall on the easement. The minister took that on notice and I am advised that he has come back and said that appropriate permission would be given immediately in an emergency situation. That is all that can really be expected without any further details of a specific potential incident, so the opposition is satisfied with the minister's response.

As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, this is a sensible and necessary piece of legislation to ensure the continued and reliable supply of natural gas to South Australians, the safety of the public and landowners, and business security for the pipeline owner. On behalf of the opposition I commend the bill to the chamber.

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) (16:39): I thank the opposition for its second reading contribution and its support for this fairly straightforward bill and look forward to it being dealt with expeditiously through the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

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) (16:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (VULNERABLE WITNESSES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:41): I rise on behalf of the Greens to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Vulnerable Witnesses) Bill 2015, an important piece of legislation. The Greens support this bill and will certainly not be seeking to amend it in any way. We welcome its passage and, indeed, hope it is a speedy debate.

The bill before us was introduced in response to a very disturbing case in which charges of sexual abuse against a bus driver were dropped. The alleged victims, who were the seven children, were seen as unreliable witnesses because they were intellectually disabled. These children were denied justice. That is something this bill will not fix for those children, but let us hope that in the future we will see justice implemented for future victims. This is something that we, as a parliament or as a society, cannot accept, that such children were failed by our judicial system.

This bill builds on the Disability Justice Plan 2014-17 and seeks to make a number of important reforms. In particular, the bill aims to make South Australia's criminal justice system more accessible and more responsive to the needs and interests of children and people with a disability—be they victims, witnesses, suspects or defendants—and we welcome that.

The definition of vulnerable witness is clarified under the Evidence Act 1929 to include cognitive impairment, and extends the age of a young child from a child of or under the age of 12 years to a child of or under the age of 14 years. The bill also amends the Declaration of Principles in section 6 of the Victims of Crime Act to include specific reference to both physical and intellectual disability.

We thank and commend the Hon. Kelly Vincent MLC, and Dignity for Disability, for her and her officers work on this important reform. We also commend the Attorney-General's office for their commitment to this legislative reform we see before us. With those few words, the Greens look forward to the successful passage of this bill.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (16:44): I thank honourable members for their contribution. The Statutes Amendment (Vulnerable Witnesses) Bill is an important measure. The bill builds on earlier reforms and makes major changes to the Evidence Act 1929 and various other acts to help make the criminal justice system more accessible and

responsive to the needs of both children and people with a disability, whether as witnesses, victims, suspects or defendants.

I thank the opposition for their constructive approach on this bill. I would also like to highlight the valuable contribution earlier today from the Hon. Kelly Vincent MLC, who is a constant advocate and very constructive in this place on disability matters, and also the Hon. Tammy Franks, whose contribution we have just heard.

The bill is closely linked to the government's Disability Justice Plan. The plan was developed in close consultation with people with lived experience of disability. The Disability Justice Plan includes two particular projects to support the operation of the bill. First, there will be specialist training to be delivered to investigative interviewers working with vulnerable witnesses in South Australia Police, Child Protection Services (SA Health), Families SA (Department for Education and Child Development, DECD), the Care and Concern Investigations Unit in DECD and the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion. The training will assist in implementing the proposed amendments to the Evidence Act 1929 to allow for the administration of an audiovisual record of an investigative interview at trial as a substitute for that witness's examination in chief.

Secondly, the bill provides for the important role of a communication assistant to facilitate communication between victims, witnesses, suspects and defendants with complex communication needs and members of the criminal justice system. A specialist scheme will be established as part of the Disability Justice Plan to provide what are known in the bill as communication partners. As stated in the Disability Justice Plan, the service will be established in the non-government sector. The communication assistant model and market approach is currently being finalised in consultation with criminal justice agencies.

The Hon. Mr McLachlan has raised in the debate three concerns expressed about the bill by the Law Society. First, the Law Society is concerned about proposed section 21(7) of the Evidence Act that prohibits an appeal based on a determination of whether a witness is compellable to testify in criminal proceedings. This clause draws on the advice of the Solicitor-General. Why should an accused, otherwise lawfully convicted of an offence, be permitted to take advantage of a failure to afford a close relative the protection contained in section 21 of the Evidence Act? There seems to be no reason why a conviction obtained in a purported breach of section 21 should ever be able to supply grounds to consider that a miscarriage of justice has occurred.

Section 21 does not afford an accused any right. The section gives a right to a prospective witness to make an application to the court to be exempted from giving evidence. This section is concerned purely with the court and the entitlement of a prospective witness not to testify. Any appeal grounded in a breach of section 21 is unlikely to succeed, if for no other reason than that the proviso would be routinely invoked. However, that does not assist a complainant who must anxiously await the outcome of any appeal.

It is prudent to make this point clear. Any purported breach of section 21 should not be able to form the basis of a successful appeal by a convicted defendant. This section does not prevent an appeal based on the content of the evidence given by a witness who was not afforded an exemption under this section. It merely prevents an appeal being instituted based solely on the discretion of the court to compel a witness to give evidence.

Secondly, the Law Society supports the policy behind the new section 34LA, but it argues that the clause goes too far in allowing the admissibility of hearsay evidence. The government does not accept this view. New section 34LA has been carefully drafted with the advice of the Solicitor-General and it is a strictly limited exception to the hearsay rule. It will only arise where the out-of-court statement of the vulnerable party has both probative value and reliability. There are various similar common law and statutory exemptions to the hearsay rule.

The Law Society has expressed the view that there should be an amendment to section 34LA so that an out-of-court statement can only be admitted if it has sufficient probative value to justify its admission, but that is the test that is already explicitly stated in section 34LA(2)(d).

The proposed new section avoids the problems that have plagued the old section 34CA. The new section 34LA is only designed to operate where the vulnerable party is unavailable to testify and

be cross-examined. To that end, the section provides that the court must warn a jury to treat the evidence with particular care because it is not being tested by examination or cross-examination of the maker of the statement.

Thirdly, the Law Society queries the proposed new section 67H to extend the protection given to sensitive material to include the audiovisual record of an investigative interview with a vulnerable witness and the transcript of such an interview. It is hard to understand this concern. The proposed new provision is not new but rather draws on the existing powers already provided to the Director of Public Prosecutions to protect sensitive material under the present sections 67G, 67H and 67I of the Evidence Act. The prosecuting authorities under the present legislation have the power to restrict access to anything that contains or displays an image of a victim or an alleged victim of a sexual offence.

The amendments simply make plain that the section applies to the audiovisual record of an investigative interview with a vulnerable witness and the transcript of such an interview. An audiovisual record of an investigative interview with a vulnerable witness and the accompanying transcript will often contain sexually explicit, confronting and sensitive material. Access to such material by an accused should be carefully controlled and regulated.

An accused is not denied access to such an item as it is feared by the Law Society but access can and should be carefully regulated. An accused should not have unrestricted access to such a sensitive item or be able to retain it. Such an item could all too easily be misused or disseminated by an accused. It is right to extend the DPP's already existing powers to be able to safeguard access and retention to such sensitive material.

I can advise that the government, as has been foreshadowed, will be moving at the committee stage several minor changes of a purely technical nature to deal with a drafting issue recently identified. I commend the bill to the house and look forward to its swift passage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: I would like to put on the public record that at my second reading I raised a number of issues which the Law Society had raised and those queries have been satisfactorily addressed to the satisfaction of the Liberal Party by the minister in his recent address to this chamber. We will be supporting the progress of the bill and the government amendments.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 1 [ManInn-1]—

Page 3, after line 20—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) Section 50B(2), definition of *sexual offence*—after paragraph (e) insert:
 - (ea) an offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment under section 51 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*; or

This amendment and the ones that follow clarify that the offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment pursuant to section 51 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 is included in the class of sexual offences to which the bill relates.

This is a new offence that came into operation on 30 March 2015 and is not specifically listed as a sexual offence for the purpose of the bill. This offence is aimed at protecting vulnerable adults from sexual exploitation. The bill improves the position of this class of witness in the criminal justice system, and this amendment and the ones that follow are necessary to ensure that the various

reforms that the bill makes to different acts to assist vulnerable witnesses apply to victims of an alleged offence under section 51 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

This specific amendment inserts section 51 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, the sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment, into the definition of 'sexual offence' as contained in section 50B of the District Court Act 1991, providing that trials of an alleged offence under section 51 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act are included as trials of sexual offences that are given priority if the alleged victim has a disability that adversely affects a person's capacity to give a coherent account of the person's experiences, or to respond rationally to questions.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Just for the record, on behalf of Dignity for Disability, these are purely technical amendments that bring this bill into line with legislation already passed by this parliament previously to do with aiming to protect people with cognitive disability, which affected their capacity to consent to sexual acts, to make it clear that the abuse of power, for example, where a disability support worker might use their position to gain sexual favour from a client who could not consent, is illegal. These are technical amendments to bring it into line with previous legislation passed that was supported by Dignity for Disability. Accordingly, we will also support these amendments.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 2 [ManInn-1]—

Page 4, after line 15—After subclause (2) insert:

- (2a) Section 4, definition of *sexual offence*—after paragraph (da) insert:
- (db) an offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment under section 51 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*; or

This amendment is consequential on amendment No. 1 and clarifies that the new offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment, pursuant to section 51 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, is included into the definition of 'sexual offence' as contained in section 4 of the Evidence Act.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 20 passed.

Clause 21.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 3 [ManInn-1]—

Page 17, after line 6—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) Section 48B(2), definition of *sexual offence*—after paragraph (e) insert:
- (ea) an offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment under section 51 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*; or

This amendment is consequential.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 22 to 25 passed.

Clause 26.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 4 [ManInn-1]—

Page 19, after line 28 [clause 26, inserted section 74EA(2), definition of sexual offence]—Insert:

- (fa) an offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment under section 51 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*; or

The amendment is consequential to amendment No. 1.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 27 to 31 passed.

Clause 32.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 5 [ManInn-1]—

Page 23, after line 3—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) Section 126A(2), definition of *sexual offence*—after paragraph (e) insert:
 - (ea) an offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment under section 51 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*; or

This amendment is consequential to amendment No. 1.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 33 passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (17:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS (SURROGACY) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:04 the council adjourned until Wednesday 29 July 2015 at 14:15.