LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 15 October 2015

The PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley) took the chair at 14:16 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)—

Construction Industry Training Board—Report, 2014-15

By the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Reports, 2014-15—
- Dog and Cat Management Board
- Flinders Ranges National Park Co-management Board
- Ngaut Ngaut Conservation Park Co-management Board
- Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park Co-management Board

Regulations under Acts—
- Health Practitioner National Regulations under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010—Midwife Insurance Exemption

By the Minister for Water and the River Murray (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Technical Regulator Water—Report, 2014-15

By the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Defence SA—Report, 2014-15

Question Time

WATER ALLOCATION PLANS

The PRESIDENT: Ms Lensink, this is your last question before you depart from us. Very good luck with the wonderful birth of your child.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:19): Thank you, Mr President. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation a question about the carryover of water.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: This is the first water year in which a number of water allocation plans have converted water to volumetric allocations, and I understand that there are issues in relation to carryover for the Eastern Mount Lofty/Western Mount Lofty and South-East Water Allocation Plans. Having been a particularly dry spring, a number of irrigators have already been required to use some of their entitlements. My questions for the minister are:

1. Is there any capacity for himself or the NRM boards to provide carryover for this year's water season?

2. Has he been approached?

3. Does he have an attitude on this particular matter?

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: Before you begin, minister, I would like to acknowledge the former premier, Mr Lynn Arnold. Welcome.

Question Time

WATER ALLOCATION PLANS

The PRESIDENT: Minister.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. I can say, at this point in time, that I don't think I've been approached—not that I can recall, anyway—about carryover in those three water areas. It is a matter, essentially, for the NRM board to advise me should there be a combined approach in that regard and, if they do approach me, I will consider it.

At the end of the day, these issues are dealt with in terms of the entire water catchment, and the allocation of waters is broken down, essentially, based on the sustainability of the water resource and what level of extraction there currently is, or has historically been, and whether the water resource is under stress, or whether it has been sustained in recent times over the last couple of years. So, all of those things are taken into account when allocations are made. In terms of private carryover for those water users, that would be part of their normal approach to the NRM boards, and I will act on the advice that I receive from my agency in that regard.

WATER ALLOCATION PLANS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:21): Supplementary question arising from the minister's answer: do I take it then that in areas where the resource is not under particular stress, his attitude is more likely to be favourable, or am I interpreting that for myself?

The Hon. S.G. Wade: No, you're ascribing rationality.

The PRESIDENT: Minister.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary, and I will ignore the verballing I am getting from the former lawyers surrounding her. That is a practice that, of course, they would have been paid very highly for in private employment, but is not quite so useful in this chamber, Mr President, because we can all hear how they carry on. They really do besmirch the character of most honest lawyers who are out there earning a crust.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: In terms of any decision I might make, I reiterate I will do that on the advice of my agency.

LOWER LIMESTONE COAST WATER ALLOCATION PLAN

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Water a question about the Lower Limestone Coast Water Allocation Plan.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I have a copy of a letter from the minister to Mr Mick Deland of Naracoorte, dated 12 October, in which you attempt to explain the principles on the application of the volumetric conversion of water licences. I think the letter does answer some of the questions but, sadly, there are still some other questions unanswered. I am also told that the members of the Mid South East Irrigators Association were made aware of the requirement to apply for the delivery

component, despite the expectation from previous workshop attendance that this was an integral part of an efficient operation and, therefore, would be automatically included as part of the volumetric allocation. However, they were not told about the charges that may well be allocated to those delivery components.

I read from some other information that was provided to me by Mr Deland after he had spoken to the secretary of the Mid South East Irrigators Association. He said they indicated that the delivery component is added onto the base component which significantly increases the cost above what could be expected with an inflation addition to past years. So, it is hardly a no disadvantage policy that the government is implementing. He also went on to say—and I think this is the most concerning thing—that, because of the uncertainty about these delivery components, he is informed by a neighbour that if the neighbour used the same amount of water this year, as they did last year, his fines or charges would amount to an increase of some $70,000.

I think the irrigators have some justifiable concerns that the volumetric conversion process is potentially being used to camouflage the significant increases in levies to cover the increased operations of the NRM. As we know, there are significant issues to do with that right across the South-East. The question is, if it is resolved this year that the delivery component is to be granted, but not until the end of the irrigation season, will irrigators be fined for using water that then eventually will be allocated to them?

I think the minister needs to provide some clarity, given the horrendous season that is happening in the state, especially down there with two consecutive years of decile 1 rainfall. So the irrigation is very, very important. Could the minister provide some clarity around whether irrigators will be required to pay these fees if they get their delivery component even later in the season?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and his ongoing interest in this area. It has been very helpful for me to receive the advice of the Hon. Mr Ridgway in these regards. It assists me in framing questions which I then pass on to my agency for further advice. On 30 April, I think I have advised previously, the South-East NRM board wrote to me asking if the Lower Limestone Coast water allocation plan could be amended to allow a period for irrigators to apply for delivery supplements or specialised production requirement. Who missed the application period.

My understanding is that I will be receiving advice from the department on the suggested amendments to the Lower Limestone Coast water allocation plan very soon and on the ramifications that will have for local irrigators. When I have that information at hand, I will then be able to make an assessment as to the questions that the Hon. Mr Ridgway has asked. I will take the question on notice and bring back a response when I am informed.

LOWER LIMESTONE COAST WATER ALLOCATION PLAN

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Will the minister make that a high priority, given that the irrigators need to irrigate? The need has already started; it is an extremely dry season. They need some clarity.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:26): I thank the member for his supplementary question. These are issues that I have reminded my agency about, the need for some urgency, and that is why my expectation is that I will be advised from the agency in the very near future.

AUTOMOTIVE TRANSFORMATION

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Automotive Transformation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The opposition has been contacted by constituents who will be directly affected by the closure of the Holden plant at Elizabeth. These constituents are concerned

that the adjustment support provided has focused on recognising existing skills, not equipping workers with new ones. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is any of the funding available for automotive transformation being spent primarily on formally recognising the existing skills of Holden workers?

2. If so, could the minister explain how recognising a worker's existing skills better equips him or her to find a new job in a transformed economy?

3. Is it the case that Holden workers who complete the automotive transformation program will be eligible for a larger redundancy payment from Holden's?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for his question. In terms of workers in the automotive industry, workers who work directly for Holden are given a suite of services and help, including skills recognition, career advice and some help with training directly by Holden, as they should, and Holden is doing a very good job with that. For the supply chain workers, the government is providing a similar level of support through our automotive workers in transition program, and that support varies from worker to worker depending on their needs. It includes things such as skills recognition, career advice and also training.

The components of what makes up those elements of the services that are provided to a worker are tailored to that individual worker. Some workers do and will have readily transferable skills that the skills recognition process can help with, and other things like help with resume writing and job applications. But for other workers, through doing some of that skills recognition, it is recognised that there is further training that needs to be developed, and the government does provide some support for that further training as well.

JOB CREATION

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:29): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question about employment projects.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: We know that it is critical that South Australian workers are equipped with the skills needed to enable our economy to transform. Can the minister inform the house about what the government is doing to support South Australia's economic transformation?

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 his most important question. As I have mentioned to this house on many occasions before, job creation is critical to South Australia, particularly in the current climate where there has been a slowdown in the economy, a downturn in commodity prices and a withdrawal of the federal government's support for our auto manufacturing and navy shipbuilding industries.

As a government, we know that taking advantage of new industries emerging and making the most of existing opportunities, such as increasing overseas trade, are critical to ensuring that every South Australian is provided with a job opportunity. We need to build a strong and vibrant economy that is flexible and dynamic for the 21st century, and as a government we are committed to ensuring that this happens.

This is why it was with great pleasure that I recently announced, on 1 October, a pilot employment program that will take place at Sundrop Farms near Port Augusta. As part of the WorkReady Jobs First employment initiative, a $50,000 grant will be given to fund a pilot skills development program at Sundrop Farms. Sundrop Farms was founded in 2009 and has been growing high-quality produce since 2010. Sundrop Farms is a leader in sustainable horticulture for arid areas, growing high-value greenhouse crops, and has developed technologies to responsibly and profitably grow crops in some of the world's driest regions using renewable resources, sea water and sunlight.

Sundrop's expansion, which was announced at the end of 2014, is a world first. The expansion integrates leading technologies across solar thermal energy, solar sea water desal and fresh water neutrality across 20 hectares of energy-efficient greenhouses on a commercial scale. To put that into simple terms, Sundrop estimates that they will produce over 15,000 tonnes of vegetables annually in energy-efficient greenhouses, removing fossil fuels out of the process where possible.

The employment pilot will provide training to 32 jobseekers, with the first intake of 25 people expected to gain a job at Sundrop Farms in the coming months. Training provided will include units from accredited training courses and also non-accredited training to assist participants to transition into a workplace. Accredited training units will be from the Certificate II in Horticulture and Certificate III in Agriculture.

This is a good news story for the Far North and it is an exciting opportunity. Jobseekers in Port Augusta in the Far North region will be provided with skills to help them gain available jobs at one of the state's most innovative food producers. It is a vote of confidence in the region that a global company like Sundrop Farms is supporting local jobseekers, contributing to the local economy and being part of a viable and sustainable region.

The employment pilot will help jobseekers to gain the skills to work with innovative technology being used by Sundrop Farms, and it will help them to equip themselves for the 21st century. This is exactly the type of project the government is looking to support through WorkReady. This is also a great example of how our skills, employment and training initiative responds to emerging local industry needs, and it can do that in a timely way.

Through WorkReady's Jobs First employment initiative, we can assess and align training to real employment outcomes, particularly in the region, to real industry needs, and we can quickly act in special circumstances to fund projects outside of the application rounds. I look forward to seeing the fruits of this pilot program—excuse the pun—and I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in this area.

LEIGH CREEK

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:34): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation a question regarding Leigh Creek employment levels.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: The face of Leigh Creek is set to change dramatically after Alinta Energy confirmed that mining operations will cease on 17 November this year, forfeiting along with it another 253 valuable jobs. The decline in this market has been linked to the increased push towards renewable energy by some.

Initially, a suggestion was made that workers could return to the Public Service as a result of a pre-privatisation deal; however, of the 253 soon-to-be-redundant workers from Leigh Creek, only 69 actually qualify for this, leaving a concerning 184 people likely unemployed. These figures of course only account for the mine workers, not those workers employed at the Northern and Playford B power plants in Port Augusta who will be made redundant by 31 March next year. My questions to the minister are:

1. What, if any, pre-emptive strategies were implemented to ensure that workers were retrained, or at least given the opportunity to retrain, prior to the announcement of the closure, and what is the current status?

2. Has the government committed yet to how the approximately $250,000 of the million-dollar support package for Leigh Creek will be used to support the ongoing viability of Leigh Creek?

3. What proportion of the million-dollar support package has the government assigned to those workers who are not yet covered by the pre-privatisation arrangement?

4. How does the government anticipate this will help them, and when can the workers access that assistance?

5. What, if any, of this support package has been assigned to innovative employment opportunities or other potential manufacturing opportunities in the region?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for his questions about Leigh Creek, and particularly the future of the workers. As the honourable member points out, there are between 200 and 300 Alinta workers in Leigh Creek. Of those, a bit over a quarter have a right to return to the public sector. So, when the mine stops operating on 17 November and as people are made redundant towards and after that date, about 70 of those workers have a right to return to the public sector under the terms of the legislation that set out the privatisation of our electricity assets in the late 1990s.

There are a number of things that the government and other groups have been working on with workers in Leigh Creek. I know that there are a range of views and desires from workers in Leigh Creek about what they want to do. I have been up there a number of times, and I will be in Leigh Creek again over this weekend. There are some people who have worked in Leigh Creek who are planning to use the opportunity to use their skills elsewhere in South Australia and Australia in similar industries. There are some who want to stay in the area and look for other opportunities.

I know that, as has been outlined to the Hon. Stephen Wade with Holden, Alinta are doing a lot of work with their own workforce in terms of skills recognition and providing packages for training. That has commenced and is ongoing in earnest. The state government, much like with Holden, is providing a similar package for the Alinta supply chain.

On the railway, in Port Augusta and Leigh Creek, there are those that are employed by other companies that provide services and are involved in the supply chain to Alinta, for which the state government is providing some of that skills recognition, career advice and support for training. That is estimated to be about 50 to 100 people. In terms of the Alinta staff, Alinta themselves have started the process and are providing training for their workers, and the state government is doing that for the supply chain.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Automotive Transformation. Will the government grant of $450,000 provided to the Edinburgh Park-based business ZF Lemforder to assist it in phase 1 of its diversification plan be a final payment, or has there been any further discussions with or indications from the company regarding the need for further grants?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:39): I can provide some general information and, if needed, some further specific information. The company in question was provided with a grant of almost half a million dollars to diversify out of the heavy reliance they have had on the automotive sector. I was out at their factory site on Friday of last week, looking at the project that they are diversifying into, which has do to with the side tipping of trucks, particularly in the agricultural and mining sectors.

The company is, of course, able to apply for further grants. The grants are assessed quite stringently. Greg Combet, who is the head of our Automotive Transformation Task Force, is heavily involved in making recommendations about which companies get grants. He has been quite stringent on making sure that only those companies which have genuine proposals, which will continue to provide employment and which will look like surviving after the end of automotive manufacturing ceases with Holden at the end of 2017, receive grants. They have received this grant, and certainly they are at liberty to apply for further grants. We are keen to back companies that have the ability and motivation to diversify into other areas, so they are at liberty to apply for further grants if they wish to.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Can the minister advise the chamber of South Australia's progress in meeting landfill reduction and recycling targets?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:40): I thank the

honourable member for his most important question. Sir, under this government, as you know, South Australia has established quite a reputation as the nation's leader in waste management reform and resource recovery, and Zero Waste, which has now transitioned to Green Industries SA, has played a vital role in this.

Current landfill data, I am advised, which has been obtained from the EPA, shows that South Australia reduced waste to landfill by 27 per cent from 2002-03 to February 2015. South Australia has surpassed its 2014 landfill reduction target and, based on current trends, we are well on track to achieving the 35 per cent reduction target by 2020.

Overall, the state's total landfill disposal in 2013-14 represents a per capita waste to landfill rate of about 540-odd kilograms per person. This is the lowest recorded landfill disposal rate per capita in Australia, I am advised. Such results can be attributed to a concerted effort at all levels, including education and community involvement programs, as well as industry partners, including local government, to ensure that everyone takes responsibility for waste and uses it to its highest level.

South Australia's ban on lightweight plastic bags and our container deposit legislation are notable examples that we often hear about at a national level and, indeed, even internationally. There is also a number of agreements at a national level to encourage a voluntary commitment to reduce waste to landfill and to increase recycling rates which we are a party to. It was pleasing that at the recent meeting of environment ministers, states and territories endorsed a new five year strategic plan for the newsprint producer/publisher group. That plan aims to maintain our world-leading rate of recycling in newsprint. All of these measures have contributed to South Australia's outstanding results in recycling activity in recent times.

The 2013-14 recycling activity survey, commissioned by Green Industries SA, shows that 3.59 million tonnes of materials were diverted from landfill and into recycling in 2013-14. This means that our recycling rate has almost doubled since 2003-04. The survey also shows a diversion rate in South Australia of 79.7 per cent, the highest reported rate in the country.

South Australia has also achieved the highest per capita recycling rate in Australia, at 2,134 kilograms per capita. According to the survey report, South Australia's recycling efforts have prevented the equivalent of 1.12 million tonnes of carbon dioxide entering the atmosphere. That is the equivalent of taking about 250,000-odd passenger cars off the road. This increased recycling activity, beneficial in many ways,also has clear economic benefits for the state. The report estimates that the total 'direct' market value of resource recovered materials for South Australia in 2013-14 was $270 million, or an average of about $75 per tonne of resources recovered.

I take this opportunity to congratulate all South Australians, particular in industry and local government, for their partnership with government and for playing their part in these exceptional results right across the board in our recycling rates.

STOLEN GENERATIONS COMPENSATION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. One year after the Liberal bill for a stolen generations compensation scheme passed this place, two years after the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee report supported such a scheme and, indeed, five years after my private member's bill for a stolen generations reparations tribunal was introduced into this place, on the day that the Liberal Party has reintroduced that bill that passed the Legislative Council, will the Weatherill government announce their plan for a stolen generations compensation scheme? If they do not have a plan, will they simply get out of the way and follow the leadership of those other people of this parliament to ensure that we have a stolen generations compensation scheme by 2016?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for her question on this again, and I will repeat what I said when she asked this a couple of sitting weeks ago and a couple of sitting weeks before that. This is a very important issue and we are looking at it. I will just make the comment that the Premier talked about, and the Deputy Premier has echoed in recent weeks, in relation to a stolen generations compensation

scheme. We're really down to the point where we're discussing what the fine grain of that solution will look like. I'm pleased to be part of a government that is looking to do something in this area, but to do it in a more comprehensive way and get it right.

WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:45): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women questions about the lack of opportunities for young women.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: In a report in the *Sunday Mail* on the weekend, it was noted that women in their early 20s are continuing an exodus from South Australia at far greater rates than their male counterparts. Data from the past decade reveals that an average of 807 women aged between 20 years old to 29 years old left SA each year, compared to an average of 571 men. Reports have identified that career and lifestyle opportunities were the main factors in the decision of a young person to move interstate.

Furthermore, in the state government's Achieving Women's Equity report it was revealed that women are more likely to be in part-time employment, with one in five wanting to work more hours. Women comprise 47 per cent of the South Australian workforce, and only half of these women are in full-time employment. Criticism has been aimed at the state government for not doing enough to create opportunities for young South Australians. In the Office for Women's policy document the Labor government outlined its responsibility for improving women's economic status. My questions of the minister are:

1. Does the minister agree that South Australia has a gender issue, as reported in the media?

2. What retention strategies will the government introduce to keep young women in South Australia?

3. How will the government be meeting its objectives outlined in its report for improving women's economic status, and what outcomes have been achieved so far?

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) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. Indeed, increasing the participation of women in employment and leadership roles and ensuring their safety continues to be a priority for the Weatherill government. We are also committed to ensuring that women can access information through our Women's Information Service, and we continue to receive specialist advice about women's issues through the Premier's Council for Women.

In terms of achieving women's equity, and I have spoken on these issues many times before in this place, but it is worth repeating: some of the barriers to women accessing employment and continuing to remain in employment include being able to have access to workplace flexibility arrangements. Achieving women's equity includes a number of short and long-term initiatives to help ensure that women can achieve economic independence, and do so across their life span. Some of the things mentioned are: encouraging and promoting the use of flexible workplace options, particularly showcasing flexible work success stories.

We know that women continue to be the primary carers, and not just in terms of young children but also ageing parents. So, it is critical that women are able to achieve a degree of flexibility in their workplace that allows them to be able to balance those caring needs and their work needs. It is important that workplaces continue to implement policy that caters for flexible workplace arrangements, but it is more than that. It is about encouraging women and men to take advantage of those provisions and to showcase what a success that can be.

Others include establishing scholarship support for women in STEM; establishing online networks; encouraging women to access training and pathways for employment in high demand, non-traditional female industries such as IT, in particular, and there are a number of programs that we have in place around STEM encouraging women in that space; developing a women's economic

independence strategy that includes a focus on economic empowerment and, again, non-traditional employment because we know that in those areas of employment that are dominated by men those areas of employment tend to be higher paid than those that are highly represented by women, thus there is a gender pay equity gap and ensuring that women move into some of those non-traditional work areas will help overcome that.

Other initiatives involve undertaking research into the specific causes of the gender pay gap in South Australia and encouraging businesses to undertake gender pay audits and implement strategies to reduce the gender pay gap. A lot of organisations say, 'No, there is no pay gap here in our organisation,' yet when they do an audit, a stocktake, they find that there are in fact some big differences between the genders.

In terms of women in science and STEM, the Department for Education and Child Development, the Department of State Development and the Office for Women have developed a promotional campaign to encourage women to access training in high-demand non-traditional industries such as mining, defence and construction. Building on previous support to pre-employment and leadership development programs, this strategy now includes the development of an online resource and other supports.

In terms of the workplace flexibility that I referred to, as a Labor government we have said that we will make the public sector chief executives personally responsible and accountable for ensuring that flexible work options are available to staff and that chief executives need to be able to report on their achievements in this area. It will be a new imperative for them to increase the numbers of women in executive positions within the public sector. We are also looking at the ongoing recognition of women's contribution to society and their representation at all levels, including their professional life and the promotion of women in non-traditional areas of employment.

The Premier's Women's Council has put forward a wonderful tool to help organisations understand their gender equity of staffing better and to assist them to ensure that there is better representation of women within their organisations. So, they are a few things that we are doing to address that issue. It is something that is entrenched right throughout our society, right throughout our culture. Whilst our society continues to have attitudes that devalue women and reflect a lack of respect for women, it will be extremely difficult to overcome some of these barriers. Nevertheless, it is important that we never stop trying to ensure that we do achieve gender equity in this state and in this nation.

WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:54): Supplementary question: how is the government working to address gaps in superannuation for women given that recent reports seem to suggest that even women in their early 20s who have not yet had time out of the workforce to have children are still disadvantaged in superannuation in comparison to men?

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) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. Superannuation is just one more area of disparity between women and men. Of course, the pay gender gap that I referred to clearly results in significant discrepancies in superannuation outcomes at the end of one's career. That discrepancy begins right at the outset of employment. We know that there is a gender pay gap even at the first-year graduate stage, although it increases as careers go on.

In terms of superannuation at present, there is a Senate inquiry into women's economic status. The Australian Senate has referred the issue of economic security for all women in retirement for inquiry and a report by the Senate Economic Reference Committee, and I was very pleased to see that inquiry called. Submissions will close on 30 October, if any honourable members are interested in making a contribution. The committee, I understand, held a public hearing in Adelaide. The key focus of the inquiry is to consider:

- the impact that inadequate superannuation savings has on retirement outcomes for women;

- the extent and causes of the gender retirement income gap;
- if there are any structural impediments in the superannuation system;
- the adequacy of main sources of retirement income for women; and
- what measures could provide women with access to adequate and secure retirement outcomes.

The Office for Women has sent out information on how to make submissions and is encouraging submissions to the Premier's Council for Women. Clearly, women's financial security is a key issue for them.

We have been in contact with the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, Women in Adult and Vocational Education, Women in Super and the Working Women's Centre. These organisations clearly have the knowledge and expertise to make submissions to address those key industry issues. Obviously, we will watch with great interest to see the outcome and the findings from that inquiry, and we look forward to that. I hope that through that process we can address some of those significant structural inequities that exist that produce very poor super outcomes for many women.

NORTHERN ECONOMIC PLAN

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Automotive Transformation. Can the minister advise on the success of the tele town hall event on Tuesday night and how the information from the event will help inform the Northern Economic Plan?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in the automotive industry and in cars in general. On Tuesday night, as the member said, the government conducted a tele town hall meeting. This had all the benefits of a traditional town hall style meeting, allowing members of the public to speak directly to both the Premier and myself and allowing the government to get a better understanding of people's priorities, but with the added convenience of people who wanted to be involved not having to leave their own home.

It was about reaching out to people who might not usually have a voice in government decision-making to seek opinions and answers to questions directly, with the feedback received to inform the development of the final Northern Economic Plan. As a government, we think it is important to source opinions and views from right across all parts of the community, and we have undertaken consultation with industry and with businesses large and small, as well as a lot of discussion with local government, in the development of the Northern Economic Plan.

We have given residents from Adelaide's north a range of ways to take part in this important decision-making process. The comprehensive engagement approach includes formal events, shopping centre stalls, industry forums and workplace conversations, as well as this tele town hall event. We are committing to give all South Australians a say in the development of government policy such as this, and are prepared to give people their say in new and innovative ways, such as this tele town hall.

Close to 7,000 residents listened to the discussion, and the Premier and I were able to speak directly to dozens of residents during what was supposed to be an hour-long conversation, but it was pushed out to closer to an hour and a half. Questions ranged from Stephan asking about support for auto workers; Joe asking about new possible industries such as Tesla; Katie asked about matching education and training to available jobs; Craig asked a couple of questions about a potential nuclear industry; Jamie asked about small business; Wade asked about component suppliers diversifying into ship building work; Vicky asked the Premier about opportunities for young people; Jarrod had questions about health jobs; Andre had his own start-up company and took the opportunity to ask questions about government support; and Daniel suggested bringing trams back to Semaphore.

There were a range of answers to the dozens of questions asked. These were just some of the questions and suggestions put forward to the Premier and myself, and many were, as Tony Jones would say, comments rather than questions, with some very interesting views put forward.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Did any of them have the same style and approach as the Treasurer to conversations?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Don't get distracted, Kyam.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will try not to be distracted. People reacted very well and, contrary to some of the commentary, such as the article from earlier in the week that quoted I think the member for Unley's mum (David Pisoni's mum), this was much more than a call from a 'JayBot'—this was actually a conversation where people had opportunity to speak directly to the Premier and to hear from the Premier.

The local community plays an important role in defining the vision for northern Adelaide's future. I was extremely pleased that so many local residents from northern Adelaide took part in this fruitful discussion. If we held these tele town hall meetings in actual town halls, we would have to schedule dozens and dozens of halls to fit everyone in. Many thousands of people took part.

The state government is committed to having manufacturing in South Australia, and some of the input provided ideas that we will go away and work on. Some of the ideas people had included health industries and jobs in the disability and aged care sectors, ideas about food and food manufacturing, as well as other manufacturing industries, and we will continue to work with people and with the community, particularly with local councils and industries, to develop plans for new jobs and new industries as we head towards the end of 2017, when the automotive manufacturing sector will close.

NORTHERN ECONOMIC PLAN

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:03): By way of supplementary question, were the participants invited into the tele town hall only from the three city councils within the northern Adelaide zone, or did it go farther afield than that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:03): That is a very good question, and I thank the honourable member. This particular tele town hall was from the three council areas with which we are working at the moment: Playford, Salisbury and Port Adelaide Enfield. Other councils, such as Tea Tree Gully and Gawler, certainly we have been speaking to. I have spoken to people from Gawler this week about some of our plans for the northern Adelaide area, but I am happy to discuss with the honourable member rolling out this tele town hall, possibly into the Gawler area into the future.

INTENSIVE HOME BASED SUPPORT SERVICE

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the minister, representing the Minister for Mental Health, questions surrounding the defunding of the Intensive Home Based Support Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: People who have experienced or are experiencing mental illness and their families or other community supports often do not know who to turn to in the case of a crisis or acute mental illness, and often the supports we do turn to are highly medicalised and do not support us socially. This is where the Intensive Home Based Support Service (IHBSS) has been invaluable. The Intensive Home Based Support Service has a proven ability to help people avoid hospital and has been a highly effective support service for people with acute mental illness.

Intensive Home Based Support Service includes clinical and nonclinical support, case management and coordination for people experiencing mental illness with the aim of avoiding crisis situations and mental instability. IHBSS in South Australia has shown a reduction in the number of hospital admissions and hospital bed stays by 10.3 days per individual per mental health crisis.

The same evaluation by IHBSS estimates that the saving in reduced hospital service costs was greater than the cost of the service. IHBSS has now been defunded by the commonwealth government, which claims that it is the responsibility of the state government to prioritise the mental

health funding they are allocated. That is, the state government could choose to continue funding IHBSS if it chose to. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given that the minister is seeking to find cost savings in the health system, does he see the value in funding primary healthcare programs in the community that actually prevent people from needing to go into hospital and/or shorten their hospital stays?

2. Has the minister read the favourable figures from the evaluation of IHBSS and its ability to prevent hospital admission and reduce hospital stays?

3. Will the minister commit to funding IHBSS because of these cost savings and work together on the federal government in doing so?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for her most important question about the Intensive Home Based Support Service and, of course, the implied reference to the commonwealth's shocking abrogation of their responsibilities to health and mental health in the states and territories of this country. This just goes further on the back of the billions of dollars ripped out of the health budgets of states and territories right around the country. Right around the country, billions of dollars—Labor states and Liberal states.

Labor states and Liberal states have had the guts ripped out of their health budgets because of the commonwealth unilaterally walking away from its responsibilities to the health of Australians—our citizens. They seem to have absolutely no shame. They think they can make these cuts to public health service provision and not wear any of the blame for it. They think they can make these cuts at a commonwealth level which hurts the most vulnerable in our society, in our community, and walk away with none of the blame sheeted home to them, and they try to shift that blame back to the states.

I say to the honourable member, with her very important question, let's not fall into the trap that the commonwealth is setting for people by saying, 'We're going to cut the funding to the states' and territories' health budgets. We, the commonwealth, will slice into those by billions and billions of dollars over forward estimates. Oh, and by the way, the states—you can now pick that service up if you wish to.' That is the outrageous proposition we hear from the commonwealth government, and they have been attempting to get away with it in areas of Aboriginal policy as well. They ripped half a billion dollars out of Aboriginal support services right around the country. How can the government, at a federal level, hold its head up when it talks to the South Australian or the Australian public and say, 'We're there for you,' when they're ripping the guts out of health and education budgets right around this country? I think the honourable member's question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I think the honourable—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down for a moment. Can I just remind the opposition that when you ask the questions, the Hon. Ms Vincent and others sit and listen intently so you can hear the answer. I think it's important that you show the same respect for everyone else, and I think it's important that you allow the minister to answer in silence.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President, for your protection. I need it—a lot. It is an absolutely vicious situation we find ourselves in with the commonwealth government ripping the funding away from the most vulnerable in our communities, right around the country, gutting the territory and states' health and education budgets right around the country—billions and billions of dollars—and I think the honourable member's question is incredibly important.

As I say to her, it is vitally important that none of us fall into the trap which the federal government would like to set for us and say, 'Well, we're walking away from our responsibilities, but you states, if you think that service is still important well then you can find out how you can fund it in other ways yourselves.' It's scandalous, it's shocking, it's morally bankrupt. I thank the honourable member for her question which I will undertake to take to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse in the other place, and seek a response on her behalf.

INTENSIVE HOME BASED SUPPORT SERVICE

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:09): I have a supplementary question. Given the cuts, has the state government actually made direct representation to the federal government encouraging them to continue funding this important program?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:09): I can't speak for the minister in the other place about what approaches he has made in particular, but I can assure the honourable member that at every opportunity South Australian government ministers are standing up to the commonwealth government as they viciously attack, through funding cuts, the most vulnerable in our communities and will continue to do so.

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:10): Two-thirds of the health cuts are state ones. My question is to the Leader of the Government. Does the minister accept that the ministerial code of conduct requires all ministers to treat their public servants with dignity and respect?

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) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. We do have a code of conduct that refers to the standard of behaviour that is expected by members, particularly in relation to their parliamentary responsibilities, and all members are expected to stand by that code.

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:11): I have a supplementary question arising from the answer. Does the minister accept that that code of conduct to which she refers requires her as a minister to treat her public servants with dignity and respect?

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) (15:11): That certainly goes to the intent of the code. The code more specifically refers to parliamentary behaviour, but in terms of the intent of the code, that would definitely underpin those sentiments.

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:11): I have a supplementary question. Given the minister's answer, and given the findings of ICAC commissioner, Mr Landy, yesterday, does the minister believe that Treasurer Koutsantonis has treated his public servants with dignity and respect?

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) (15:11): This matter has been dealt with appropriately by both the Premier and the minister involved. It is obvious that the Liberal opposition is desperate for a fresh question for question time today. The matter was dealt with by the Premier. The Premier clearly identified that the behaviour of minister Koutsantonis was completely unacceptable. He was counselled by the Premier. He was warned by the Premier. The minister, Tom Koutsantonis, made a public apology yesterday. He admitted that his behaviour was below acceptable standards and apologised for that.

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:13): I have a supplementary question arising from the minister's answer. On the basis of that answer, does the minister accept that minister Koutsantonis has breached the ministerial code of conduct?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:13): I have answered that question. In terms of the intent of the code of conduct, his behaviour falls well outside of the intent of the code.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question about international education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: International education is an important contributor to the state's economy. Can the minister inform the chamber about a recent international student delegation to South Australia?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his important question. I am pleased to advise the chamber that, as part of the Brazilian government's global science program, Science without Borders, the University of South Australia will welcome 120 Brazilian students to Adelaide, providing them with an invaluable opportunity to increase their science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM) skills.

The Brazilian government's Science without Borders program, established in 2011, provides up to 100,000 scholarships to undergraduate students from Brazil to support one year of study at colleges and universities throughout the world. Students will complete their degrees in Brazil.

As part of that program, the Brazilian government is funding 75,000 scholarships, while 26,000 are funded by the Brazilian private sector. The scholarships cover the international airfare, a monthly stipend, housing and living costs, and health insurance. I understand that the Brazilian students have either undertaken or will undertake English language studies at TAFE SA before selecting a STEM program from UniSA from their undergraduate degree.

This excellent program not only supports the government's commitment to growing our international educational programs and that particular sector but also our STEM commitments, which are major priority areas for this government. The state government, via its STEM strategy, is a key driver in the promotion of vital science, technology, engineering and mathematics outcomes for South Australians, and the government's Destination Adelaide plan is also aimed at increasing international student numbers in STEM fields of education.

Our Destination Adelaide plan seeks to strengthen, support and grow our international education sector. In welcoming 120 international Brazilian students and possibly their families to Adelaide, this project will bolster international student numbers as well as showcase South Australia to Brazil, a market that has enjoyed promising growth in recent years. In 2014, Brazil was South Australia's seventh-largest market for international students, with enrolments growing by—would you believe—67.5 per cent, from 607 to 1,017. The majority of this increase is attributed to the ELICOS English language courses and non-award sectors, growing by 56 per cent and 306 per cent respectively.

While the state government's Destination Adelaide plan is focused on China, Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, Singapore and Vietnam, its objectives are adaptable to any region and, with modest yet healthy growth in student numbers, Brazil may prove a significant market in the future. With worldwide demand for education continuing to increase and the number of mobile students expected to reach 7 million by 2025, South Australia is well positioned to capitalise on this growth, and we will continue to welcome delegations such as these to South Australia.

CYCLING STRATEGY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:17): My question is for the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation representing the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, and it is about cycling. My question is: if cycling is to be allowed on footpaths, what strategy does the government have to ensure that the existing road network will be made as safe as possible for cyclists so that the need for adults to ride on the footpath is kept to an absolute minimum? Secondly, as I have asked on many occasions, when will a new cycling strategy for South Australia be released?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will pass those questions on to the minister in another place and bring back a reply. I do note, though, that in my experience Adelaide is very cycling friendly. We could always do better, but compared to a lot of other places, cycling is easier in Adelaide than most places. I presume the honourable member was involved in Ride to Work Day again this year and I apologise it for not making it as I have in previous years. I rode in on Monday and Tuesday and, quite frankly, I was too tired to ride in on Wednesday with him.

COBBLER CREEK

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation questions regarding the erosion of Cobbler Creek within and around the recreation park of the same name.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: The cities of Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully recently commissioned a study into the erosion of Cobbler Creek caused by excessive stormwater run-off from surrounding homes and businesses. As many people would be aware, there has been an increasing number of both residential and business developments in that area in recent decades.

The draft report has been completed and suggests it could cost up to $4.75 million to stop erosion of creek beds and cliff faces along the creek. The report also highlighted the threat of erosion to the 10-metre high cliffs downstream from the Cobbler Creek Dam. Amongst the 40 recommendations to fix the problem of erosion is the suggestion of increasing the minimum size of rainwater tanks from the current 1,000 litres on new builds, and also the development of an incentive program to encourage retrofitting of existing properties to increase their rainwater capacity.

I understand that the councils are scheduled to meet next month to discuss the draft report and consider actions on the recommendations early next year. My questions, sir:

1. Has the minister or his department discussed the issues relating to erosion along Cobbler Creek with the two councils?

2. Does the government have any plans at present to mitigate the erosion issues in Cobbler Creek?

3. Will the minister consider partnering with the councils in developing an incentive program to increase the rainwater catchment capacity of existing properties along Cobbler Creek to assist with reducing erosion?

The PRESIDENT: I ask all members to allow Mr Dawkins to hear the answer in silence. Minister.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:20): Thank you, Mr President; I am just wondering what you know that I don't know about how people are going to respond to my response to the Hon. Mr Dawkins' question.

I thank the honourable member for his most important question in regard to Cobbler Creek and the soil erosion problems around the creek line. It is not an isolated event; it is something that we are dealing with right across the state, in terms of urban water management erosion policies, particularly where runoff is occurring close to suburbia and encroaching into our parks on the peri-urban perimeter. It is also an issue for our rural and regional areas of the state as well.

By way of answering, I can say that we have released an issues paper in terms of water management policy. Some of the aspects of the Hon. Mr Dawkins' question relate to that. We are looking for feedback from local government and the community in particular about how we can better mobilise the community in terms of our water management issues, and highlighting some of those issues to which the Hon. Mr Dawkins referred.

In terms of Cobbler Creek, I have not yet made a determination about how we are proceeding. We are waiting for the council to address the issues, and I am awaiting advice from my department about how they will deal with the local government in that respect.

Members

MEMBER'S LEAVE

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:22): I move:

That maternity leave of absence be granted to the Hon. J.M.A. Lensink until the first day of resumption of the Legislative Council in 2016.

Very briefly, I know that every member of this chamber joins me in wishing the Hon. Michelle Lensink every best wish for the imminent birth and the arrival of—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Young Ian.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Well, I heard a rumour that he is going to be called Neville, but I am not sure if that is true. I think everyone in this chamber will join me on this momentous occasion, because it is the first time, I understand, that maternity leave has been needed to be granted in the Legislative Council. We do sincerely wish you every best wish and, as was said earlier, we will probably miss you more than you will miss us.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: May our best wishes go with you.

Bills

WHYALLA STEEL WORKS (ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 October 2015.)

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (15:24): I rise to be one of a number of speakers, I think, by looking at the *Notice Paper*, to speak on this bill. On behalf of the opposition, I indicate that we will be supporting the bill, but I know two of my colleagues have some other contributions to make. Essentially, this bill is about maintaining Arrium's confidence in the state's regulatory regime as it faces many challenges to its Whyalla operations in the coming years.

Arrium (or OneSteel, as it was known) is essential for the future of Whyalla, and it is undertaking a root-and-branch review to maintain and enhance their operations in Whyalla. We are all aware that the current economic climate internationally and nationally, especially in South Australia, is particularly tough for businesses, and Arrium is going through a fairly significant review of its operations.

The company's decision to half its mining operations in South Australia will have a significant impact on our economy and jobs. With extremely low commodity prices, coupled with our ailing manufacturing sector, it is imperative that we give existing operators confidence through any means that are practicable and reasonable.

The key component of this bill is that it seeks to extend for another 10 years the requirement for Arrium to be accountable to the Department of State Development for all environmental regulations at the steelworks, rather than to the EPA. I remember that we had a bill go through this parliament nearly 10 years ago. I think this one expires on 4 November, so it is a little short of the 10 years. I think that the long-term plan, even back then, would have been for the EPA to be the regulatory authority.

While the bill is sensible and necessary, the government has been typical in its rushed timing, taking it for granted that parliament can rush a bill through at any time before the 10-year expiry. I think that is symptomatic in that often we see in this place this panic that suddenly there is an issue and we have to resolve it and that it has to be passed today, which we are happy to do, but we could

easily have had much more time. We have known for 10 years that it was going to expire on 4 November, yet there is a rush.

The department did not facilitate the opportunity for this bill to be thoroughly considered by the opposition as it had not been provided with the bill when it was first listed for debate in the other place. We are told that Arrium approached the government seeking the extension of the environmental authorisation.

Understandably, the government being sensitive about our economic position and the financial difficulty being experienced by Arrium, they were prepared to make a negotiation. I might add that they are also in a difficult political position because they have failed to cultivate the business environment where the current economic threats can be mitigated. Arguably, many businesses which have folded would have survived if the government had been more nurturing, more sympathetic and more understanding of how tough it is to do business in this great state. So, the government is under even more pressure to save our existing industries in any way possible.

As I said earlier, it was in 2005 that the South Australian Parliament enacted amendments to the Whyalla Steel Works Act 1958, including the addition of section 15, where Arrium was granted environmental authorisation under the Environment Protection Act 1993. It gave the company the regulatory certainty it needed to enable it to diversify into the resources sector, through Project Magnet, which would convert the Whyalla steelworks to magnetite iron ore feed, creating a new revenue stream for the company by making available hematite iron ore for export sales.

The successful implementation of Project Magnet essentially provided a new lease of life for the Whyalla steelworks and significant environmental improvement with respect to the red dust problem. As we would all recall, there has been a constant stream of questions in this place and the other place about the red dust issues in Whyalla. Arrium's confidence in the regime also resulted in further investment in the port and mining operations.

With the environmental authorisation about to expire, the section is to be varied such that the expiry will occur on the 20th anniversary, rather than the 10th anniversary, of the section being enacted, taking it to 4 November 2025.

Arrium is currently undertaking a broad strategic review of its business as a result of the low global iron ore prices now prevailing. It has already curtailed significant mining in South Australia, writing down some $1.3 billion in costs. Obviously, this has led to reduced exports for the financial year 2014-15. It was predicted in January that exports would fall from about 12.5 million tonnes of 60 per cent iron to about nine million tonnes of about 69 per cent iron.

The government is working with the company to assist it to minimise its costs and maintain financial viability. They had aimed to cut total production costs by about 20 per cent to around $57 a tonne by 2016. In these circumstances, the proposed extension of the environmental authorisation provides continued regulatory certainty for Arrium and directly contributes to the prospects for its business sustainability in Whyalla and Upper Spencer Gulf. Arrium has agreed in writing to work with the EPA over the 10 years to transition to a 'normal' EPA-issued long-term licence.

Apparently, the department has seen a letter from OneSteel's general manager at the Whyalla Steelworks to the EPA outlining that commitment. I think that is the key to this. We have a situation in place. They need a 10-year extension. Times are particularly tough. If we were to have a new regime it would provide some uncertainty but also, I suspect, quite a lot of cost on this particular company. We have been happy, as a state, to have it operate in that fashion for the last decade. It will go on for another decade but I think that any of us who are still here in another 10 years time will need to make sure, at that point in time, that they do transition to a normal EPA-issued long-term licence.

The second part of the bill is the insertion of a section which has provisions for schedule 3 of the act (environmental authorisations under the EPA) to be updated to reflect the variations in the environmental authorisation at the request of the minister. We are pleased to see that the EPA maintains a good relationship with Arrium, which is so important in terms of Arrium's willingness to continue business in South Australia. Again, I reiterate that the opposition supports the bill and sincerely hopes the government will endeavour, when making amendments which could have such

serious implications for the state's economy, to facilitate a more thorough consideration by providing information to us, as the opposition, in a timely manner.

I should also add, to be on the ball and alert when this sort of legislation is about to expire, that we have some lengthy period of time to examine it. I know it was examined briefly by a select committee in the House of Assembly. There was some criticism of that relatively small time frame and it was not particularly widely advertised. If the government had been on the ball and realised this was happening some six months ago we could have done it quite thoroughly. We would probably have had the same outcome but could certainly have answered some of the questions that may not have been answered. Given the tough economic times the opposition is happy to support the bill.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:31): I rise to support the bill, as I did 10 years ago. Given that I have what can only be described as a reasonably consistent and solid background, having been born and bred in Whyalla and spent 40 years there, I think I am reasonably well placed to give a bit of a commentary and talk about the feelings of most of the community that I came into contact with. I have managed to find an email which was a submission to the select committee on the Whyalla Steel Works (Environmental Authorisation) Amendment Bill. This email was from one Ted Kittel.

The Hon. M.C. Parnell interjecting:

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: The Hon. Mr Parnell interjects and says, 'My old mate.' No, he is not. Can I just put this on the record; I will read it to you:

Dear Sean,

I refer to recent articles and responses in the *Whyalla News* and *The Advertiser,* and on Southern Cross TV regarding the renewal of the 10 year Indenture.

My position is as follows

It is true that the 2005 Indenture caused the WRDAG Inc. litigation to be null and void because the Indenture changed the law.

However, on behalf of WRDAG I continue to negotiate with OneSteel with the express desire to find a middle ground.

The negotiations over a period of time resulted in a win/win position for both Parties and launched the beginning of a new partnership between WRDAG and OneSteel/Arrium.

This partnership has flourished and is now strong and progressive.

I have observed throughout the 2005-2015 Indenture period that OneSteel/Arrium has conducted its operations in Whyalla in a most environmentally responsible way.

OneSteel/Arrium has shown good faith by engaging with community representatives (myself included) on all issues which relate to environmental impacts, and I have no doubt this will continue for the duration of the 2015-2025 Indenture.

I will continue to further expand the good relationship I have with the Company by recognising and promoting the good environmental outcomes already enjoyed by the affected community as a result of the goodwill, and the good work we have done together.

I therefore distance myself from any negative media statements about this issue because I am confident that the Company will continue its responsible environmental practices during the life of the new Indenture.

Please forward this email to the relevant CEO/Managers.

Yours sincerely

Ted Kittel

Former Chair WRDAG Inc.

The reason I am quite keen to put those remarks on the record is that I want to indulge the council and inform it of probably the most offensive email I have had in my time as a member of parliament. Sir, as you may be aware, I was a strong supporter of the last indenture—quite proudly so—knowing that the vast majority of the community in Whyalla wanted certainty and they wanted that industry to continue to flourish and provide employment and opportunities for the people of Whyalla.

Mr Kittel, and I did not keep the email, basically went along these lines: you've sold out your city, you should be ashamed of yourself and that my father, who had recently passed, would turn in his grave with regard to my behaviour. I do not think I ever responded to that email because I could never trust myself to provide a response that was remotely calm or reasonable. But here we are and I am about to make my speech, but I just wanted to put that on the record that one Ted Kittel, who thought I was the worst thing since sliced bread, dared to say that my father, who was never a fan of Ted Kittel, would be ashamed of me and now is talking about how everything has actually worked out pretty well. You would be surprised, Mr President, that I have not had an email from one Ted Kittel apologising at any particular point, nor do I want one at any stage.

I speak in strong support of this bill. This bill is an extension to the special exemptions from certain environmental standards which, when applied to the steelworks, were unreasonable and had the potential to affect efficiency and productivity at the works. Of course, as many in this place would remember, these exemptions were first applied 10 years ago, and I made a contribution on the amendment bill back then.

Similarly to my view in 2005, I believe these exemptions should remain in place. The steelworks are the economic lifeblood of the Whyalla community and everything within the government's power should be done to ensure that it remains viable. Contrary to the argument of the Hon. Mark Parnell, OneSteel and Arrium have proven to be decent corporate citizens by working with the community to ensure that the red dust problem has been well and truly alleviated, and I am very proud of that outcome.

As mentioned during the 2005 debate, Project Magnet was proposed by OneSteel as a way to significantly reduce, if not resolve, the problem of red dust by shifting to magnetite ore, crushing it at the mine site and transporting it to the process plant in a slurry form via pipeline. Fast forward to 2015, we can confidently say that Project Magnet has been a success. This was despite the protests of those on the WRDAG group and others who were against the exemptions and were distrustful of the intentions of OneSteel/Arrium.

Given the time of the day, I am not going to continue at great length with this but I am extremely keen to support this particular bill. I put on the record a little bit of my distasteful history with regard to a certain person but I feel that I have been vindicated and, at a time when Whyalla desperately needs certainty, the people of Whyalla want OneSteel/Arrium to continue. I think that this parliament and this government, along with strong opposition support, wish them every possible success.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:38): I will make a few brief remarks in relation to this bill which is an extension of the 10-year conditions which were granted in 2005 to provide the company operating the Whyalla steelworks with some regulatory certainty. Many comments have already been made, particularly in the House of Assembly by our lead speaker, the member for Stuart Mr Dan van Holst Pellekaan. I would like to endorse those remarks and the remarks of my Liberal colleagues here in the Legislative Council.

This is not dissimilar to the issue that we faced with BHP Billiton in that there are occasions when companies need to manage risk, and I do see that these conditions relate to risk minimisation which is very much a function of the commodity markets and investment circumstances of companies, rather than necessarily a reflection on environmental standards. My understanding of these operations is that they have been good corporate citizens and have implemented effective environmental programs.

The advice of our Liberal colleagues in the House of Assembly in relation to the select committee is that the Environment Protection Authority's preference is not to have an indenture, but it does not oppose the extension of the indenture; it considers Arrium/OneSteel to be environmentally responsible; it does not believe that the indenture compromises the EPA's ability; and that it may effectively adjust its licence conditions as necessary. I think that should give comfort to anybody who has particular concerns about environmental matters in relation to this indenture.

It might be just a philosophical point, but I think it is possibly not ideal that we do require these indentures, whether it is a reflection on the way the EPA operates or the way that capital markets and the flow of funds respond to those agencies that require separate conditions for certain

circumstances, but I do not believe that that is a reflection on these operations. I endorse the bill to the council.

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) (15:41): I thank honourable members for their second reading contributions. As honourable members have identified, the amendment bill simply extends for a further 10 years the environmental authorisation provided to Arrium for operating its Whyalla steelworks by simply changing the expiry date in the existing act. The reasons for the need to do this have been outlined. I thank honourable members for their second reading contributions, most of which were supportive of this bill, and look forward to dealing with this bill expeditiously through the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: In my quite lengthy second reading contribution I made some observations about parliamentary process. In particular, I referred to the fact that this bill had, in another place, been deemed a hybrid bill and therefore had to follow the standing orders of the House of Assembly, which are similar to the standing orders of the Legislative Council. That meant that just after the second reading it had to go to a select committee.

I make the point in my contribution that that having occurred in the House of Assembly and a select committee having been formed, there was no requirement on the House of Assembly to notify the Legislative Council that the committee had been formed and that public submissions were being called for.

In my second reading contribution, to a somewhat mirthful response, I referred to the advertisement in the Adelaide *Advertiser* on page 81 and its companion advertisements for various lonely hearts, a kennel club and a lost cockatiel. But really, the point I was making was that our parliamentary processes, in my view, are quite defective in that there is no mechanism whatsoever for this chamber—which was going to have to consider this bill—to be told that a select committee has been established in the other place and, as a courtesy, to let us know that this is happening and perhaps invite us to contribute to that select committee.

So, my first question of the minister is: is she prepared to consider a review or change of parliamentary processes that might enable communications between the two houses to be more effective and more adequate so that we are not tempted in this chamber to try to set up our own select committee, which we could try to do, because we were not told that they had set up theirs?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I thank the honourable member for his question. I can understand the sense of frustration. I was not aware of that issue in relation to the process, and I be would happy to take that up with possibly the President and the Speaker of the House of Assembly and also the Leader of the Government in that house as well, and see whether we cannot come up with a better process to inform and enable a greater level of participation and communication between the houses.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: I thank the minister for that response because I really agree with her that it is not satisfactory and we could improve it. I know that the minister was not part of that select committee process, and I am not sure whether she is able to take advice on how that process went, but another aspect I raised in my second reading contribution was that only one submission was made to the select committee, yet as I have read through the transcript of the select committee I can find no reason why, given that it had only one submission, it did not want to hear from the person who made that submission. Does the minister have any intelligence as to why the sole submitter was not heard by the select committee?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am unaware of the process, and I am unaware of the submission as well, so I will have to take that question on notice.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: I accept the minister's answer. As I said in my second reading contribution, it was a Mr Warren Godson, who I think lives down on the South Coast somewhere, from memory; he is affectionately regarded as a 'frequent flier' in that he is a regular correspondent to a number of members of parliament on matters related to pollution issues, and it is a shame what the public record will show about an advertisement in the back of the newspaper—I should acknowledge as well that it was in the Whyalla newspaper (I do not know what page)—but certainly it was on page 81 of *The Advertiser*.

It strikes me that the record will show that a committee was established very quickly, gave less than a week for submissions to be made, and that the only person who made a submission was not heard. I will accept the minister's undertaking previously that these are discussions we need to have perhaps between the chambers to try to resolve a better process.

I am not intending to delay the committee for a long time today, but I want to ask what I think is the most fundamental question in relation to this bill, and that is what we would call the evil to be overcome, the need for this legislation and the purpose of the legislation. I have read the various statements made by minister, I have read the various statements made by the company, and the only thing that they can really point to is the fact that this bill gives them certainty; it removes any possibility of something coming out of left field in the next 10 years. Mind you, the only certainty it delivers is that the company will not be bound to complying with different environmental standards.

The key question, which goes to the heart for the need for this bill, is: what possible change to environmental standards is anticipated that might affect the company and thereby justify the need for 10 further years of exemption? Is there any particular environmental standard that the company is not currently complying with or that is on the horizon and there is a fear the company will not be able to comply with? What environmental justification is there for giving this special exemption for another 10 years?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am advised that the reason for providing the 10-year extension is that the environmental authorisation in the Whyalla Steel Works Act has allowed over $1 billion investment in South Australia. Arrium continues to undertake a strategic view of all aspects of its business. They have indicated that decisions are to be made within the next six to 24 months, and the Arrium board requires continued stability and regulatory certainty at this particular point in time. I read from an excerpt from their submission where they say:

> What is going to be really important in the next 24 months is being fluid enough and flexible enough to deal with what's happening in the world. And investment criteria is the crucial thing. We want at least the board to have the confidence in knowing that this is what we operated under the last 10 years and that this is what we have at least got going for a period of time subject to our further discussions with the EPA.

So, it is basically providing the board with the assurance of a known in terms of the environment that they were required to perform in and the conditions of that and that it was simply extending the same, so it provides a certain level of reassurance.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: I thank the minister for her answer, and that exactly is my understanding. The words that the minister read out included confidence, certainty, assurance, and a known investment environment—I accept all that. But the special deal that has been done here is protection from change to environmental standards. My question is: what environmental standard was about to change—or did the company fear might change—that would somehow create an uncertain investment environment?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: None, is the short answer. For businesses, and particularly in this environment—the industry environment they are in is very challenging—the question is the potential for change; to extend the same provisions for a further 10 years is simply providing the assurance that there is no change, and so it is about risk management. It is less risky then that they have to manage in terms of their business plan because the conditions remain identical to the previous 10 years.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: I again thank the minister for her answer, and I am not going to pursue this because I think it is the best answer that she can give. There is not really anything on the horizon, environmentally, that is known. It is more like an unknown unknown—to coin a former

American secretary of state—that something might happen, we do not know what it is, but it might happen in the future and it might affect future investment.

In the first part of her answer, the minister talked about how this indenture allowed the $1 billion of investment, and for the record I point out that that investment was going to happen anyway. The company might have said that having a special environmental protection was an essential precondition, but the reality was they were always going to move from a hematite production process to a magnetite production process and, as I have said before, I think it was a happy result that the red dust problem was largely resolved as a result of that shift.

The minister also referred to the horizon that the company is looking at over the next six to 24 months in terms of making decisions, so my next question is: has the company given any commitment, or have they provided any analysis, that this indenture will create any new jobs or, in fact, that it will save any jobs that are currently there in Whyalla?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I have been advised no, none at all, that it is about their ability to manage risk.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 4) and title passed.

Bill reported 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) (15:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSTITUTION (GOVERNOR'S SALARY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 October 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) (15:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I understand that all honourable members wishing to make a second reading contribution have done so. I want to thank those for their contribution and the support indicated in that contribution and look forward to this 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) (15:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TERRORISM) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 September 2015.)

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:59): I rise to speak to this bill and set out the Liberal Party position in relation to the same. It is appropriate today to be doing a second reading in relation to this bill, as our federal counterparts are meeting in Canberra, led by the Prime Minister, the Hon. Malcolm Turnbull, to discuss matters relating to counterterrorism and the fight against extremism.

This bill seeks to amend the Terrorism (Police Powers) Act 2005 and the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005. Both acts were part of a package in 2005 in response to the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001 and were also subsequent to an agreement by all Australian jurisdictions to adopt a national approach to legislation that would assist in responding to terrorist acts.

Back in 2005, the commonwealth assumed primary responsibility for dealing with terrorism. Nevertheless, it was necessary for the states and territories to have complementary legislation. The reason for this is that there may well have been a case that the initial reaction to an imminent terrorist incident or a completed terrorist act would lie with the state authorities and that extraordinary and special state police powers would have been needed in such an eventuality. We have been fortunate in South Australia that we have not needed to use the provisions under both the acts that I have referred to. Both acts contain particular safeguards as they provided the executive with considerable powers in the event of an act of terrorism.

The bill amends the Terrorism (Police Powers) Act by extending the sunset clause for a further 10 years. Can I advise the chamber that the Liberal Party will be supporting this section of the bill, but we will also be introducing amendments at the committee stage seeking a review mechanism in the ninth year of the second 10-year term, as we believe that it should be reviewed in the event that the powers under this bill are exercised. The Liberal Party has formed its view because the risk of a terrorist incident has not declined since the enactment of the original act and it can be argued that the risk to our citizens has increased.

As I said, back in 2005, the Liberal Party formed the view on the provisions of the 2005 act that terrorism represented a very real danger in this country and to the citizens of this state and that it was appropriate that we clothe our police with the necessary powers. At the time, the South Australian Police did not have the power to stop and search, detain persons or cordon off areas, and so it was considered appropriate to provide for these powers, but only in the event of special authorisation or a special area declaration which could be made by the police commissioner but subsequently reviewed by a judge of the Supreme or District Court.

The circumstances in which the special powers can be exercised are very limited. The Liberal Party was persuaded to support the government in enacting these provisions because they contained particular safeguards. As I have mentioned, one was particular judicial oversight. The other limitations in the powers were in relation to the duration of which they could be exercised, but one of the important ones was the recording and reporting regime, and also the sunset clause. This is why the original act provided that the provisions of the act be reviewed on the second and fifth anniversaries.

Because the sections of the act have not been exercised, there has been obviously a nominal review, and this occasion before the chamber can be seen as an ineffective review. At the time, the Liberal Party did not believe that the original provisions were either excessive or unwarranted, so the Liberal Party has not changed its view. Because the powers have not been exercised, there is very little to debate in relation to the bills, but we do see the merit in an amendment that says that in the ninth year of the second term, as I said, there is a review in the event that the powers have been exercised and whether the powers remain as necessary.

I know that there are other views in the chamber which will be debated at the committee stage about the regularity of the reviews, and I look forward to debating those matters at the committee stage.

Other states are extending their time, because this is part of a national scheme. I do know that Queensland are taking a different view and are considering a four-year review and then they would wait a further six years for a subsequent review on the end of the further sunset provision.

The second act to be amended, the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005, is a simple amendment which extends the sunset clause for a further 10 years. The Liberal Party has not sought to bring in an earlier review because the originating bill (or act, as it is now) has provisions for annual reviews. At this juncture of the sunset clause, the powers have not been used and, therefore, I suppose the review is nominal, because there is very little to review.

At the time when the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Amendment Bill was debated in this chamber and then subsequently enacted, this chamber, and particularly the government of the time, placed great weight on the safeguards, which were not only a judicial review but also a sunset clause and, at the time, a reversal of the commonwealth position which became known as a shoot-to-kill power. It is encouraging that the premiers at the time placed great weight on the civil liberties of their citizens, and I encourage the government to take a similar approach in other contexts in relation to the legislation it is enacting.

Perhaps I will just finish off with a comment in relation to these bills. They provide extraordinary powers to the police, but they have countervailing review mechanisms and protections for citizens. It is interesting that the commonwealth does not perceive that it has its own power under this constitution other than to provide detention for 48 hours. We should reflect in the chamber that we obviously have greater room to move under our own constitutional arrangements.

We have perceived greater protections as citizens under the federal constitution than we do under South Australian law, because the commonwealth sought from each state the ability to detain up to 14 days when it felt restrained with only 48 hours, given the legal advice it received on the basis that, if it detained people for longer, the High Court was likely to see it as a punitive measure rather than a preventive measure.

As I said, the chamber should reflect that perhaps we may need in the future to consider the insertion of certain rights in our constitution, or maybe a bill of rights, or follow the Victorian model. I am not necessarily advocating that at the moment, but it is a reflection that constitutional protections are increasingly necessary as we balance the need to protect our citizens against terrorism versus the right of the citizen to a live an untouched life free from the heavy hand of the state. On that note, I indicate the Liberal Party's support for the second reading of this bill.

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

LIQUOR LICENSING (ENTERTAINMENT ON LICENSED PREMISES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Second 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) (16:10): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The *Liquor Licensing Act 1997* ('the Act') regulates the sale, supply and consumption of liquor. Section 105(1) of the Act requires a licensee to apply to the licensing authority for consent to provide entertainment on the licensed premises or any area adjacent to the licensed premises ('entertainment consent'). The licensing authority has the power to grant its consent subject to the conditions it considers necessary or desirable under section 105(3) of the Act. Conditions may also be imposed under section 43 of the Act which is the general power of the licensing authority to impose conditions.

The Government is aware of industry concerns regarding the entertainment consent process and has decided to introduce this Bill to remove unnecessary regulation. Many of the concerns relate to the nature of the conditions imposed on entertainment. While this proposal does not seek to remove the entertainment consent process entirely, the Government considers that this Bill does strike a balance in reducing red tape but still maintaining adequate regulation for entertainment.

The main change proposed in the Bill is that a licensee will not be required to apply to obtain the consent of the licensing authority for entertainment provided on licensed premises (as defined in the Bill) between the hours of 11am and midnight. However a licensee will be required to obtain the consent of the licensing authority outside of those hours or if the entertainment is prescribed entertainment, as defined in the Bill.

The Bill provides for transitional provisions which are outlined in Schedule 1 of the Bill. These transitional provisions are aimed to ensure a smooth implementation of the reform. Existing entertainment consents will continue in force and be subject to existing conditions. However, existing entertainment conditions (as defined in the Bill) will have no effect during the hours of 11am and midnight. Conditions imposed on the premises under other laws, such as approvals under the *Development Act 1993*, will not be affected by the Bill (which is expressly stated in Schedule 1 clause 1(2) of the Bill).

The process under section 106 of the Act relating to noise complaints will remain unchanged. Section 106 of the Act currently allows for a complaint to be made to the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner ('the Commissioner') regarding noise from licensed premises. A complaint may be lodged under section 106 if an activity on, or noise emanating from, licensed premises or the behaviour of persons making their way to or from licensed premises, is unduly offensive, annoying, disturbing or inconvenient to a person who resides, works or worships in the vicinity of the licensed premises. A complaint may be lodged by persons that satisfy the requirements of section 106 of the Act.

In most instances the Commissioner attempts to resolve the issues by conciliation. If the matter of the complaint is not to be conciliated or is not resolved by conciliation, the matter is determined by either the Commissioner or the Licensing Court of South Australia. The parties may nominate the forum in which the matter is heard/resolved.

The Commissioner or the Licensing Court may make an order that adds to or varies the condition of the licence. Schedule 1 clause 1(2) of the Bill makes it clear that nothing affects a condition added to a licence, or varied, by an order made under section 106 after the commencement of the Bill. Therefore any condition added to a licence, or varied under section 106 of the Act, after commencement of the Bill, will apply.

Schedule 1 clause 3 of the Bill is a transitional provision in respect to those licensed premises that currently provide prescribed entertainment. That transitional provision has been drafted such as to enable the continuation of business with minimal interruption. The provision provides the Commissioner with flexibility for the purpose of granting consent to those licensed premises that have been lawfully providing prescribed entertainment as required by the Bill.

Another important transitional provision is Schedule 1 clause 5 of the Bill which provides the Commissioner with power to add, substitute, vary or revoke a condition of a licence or consent if necessary or desirable to do so as a result of the reforms in the Bill. This power will enable the Commissioner to vary or revoke existing conditions that may be superfluous in light of the reforms in the Bill.

The Bill also includes other consequential changes that are necessary to ensure the full effectiveness of the proposed reforms, these include changes to section 57 (requirements for premises) of the Act and section 77 (general right of objection) of the Act.

The purpose of the Bill is to cut red tape, reduce cost to businesses as well as encouraging the live music industry.

The changes will mean, for example, restaurants can have a violinist or acoustic guitar playing in the background during the hours of 11am and midnight, without having to seek the consent of the licensing authority. The Bill will also make entertainment consent for all venues more consistent with that of small venues. Licensees that have a small venue licence are currently not required to apply for entertainment consent for entertainment provided between 11am and midnight.

This Bill strikes an appropriate balance between reducing red tape and maintaining regulation of entertainment during the hours in which noise from licensed premises is most likely to impact upon residents (after midnight and through the early hours of the morning).

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*

4—Amendment of section 52—Certain applications to be advertised

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

5—Amendment of section 57—Requirements for premises

This clause inserts new subsection (1a) into section 57 of the principal Act to require the licensing authority to disregard entertainment that may be provided without the consent of the licensing authority under section 105 when considering an application for a licence.

6—Amendment of section 77—General right of objection

This clause inserts new subsection (6) into section 77 of the principal Act, removing entertainment that may be provided on licensed premises or proposed premises without the consent of the licensing authority under section 105 from the scope of objections under that section.

7—Substitution of section 105

This clause substitutes new section 105 into the principal Act. The new section requires consent of the licensing authority to provide entertainment on licensed premises between midnight and 11 am, or prescribed entertainment at any time. The current section requires consent at all times.

The new section also makes procedural provision in relation to consents.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

This Schedule makes transitional provisions relating to the amendments to the principal Act enacted by this Act.

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

LIQUOR LICENSING (PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN LIQUOR) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Second 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) (16:10): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The *Liquor Licensing Act 1997* (the Act), regulates the sale, supply and consumption of liquor in South Australia.

Under section 131AA of the Act, the Minister has the power to prohibit the manufacture, sale or supply of certain liquor, if satisfied that, because of its name, design or packaging or for any other reason, the liquor is likely to have a special appeal to minors or be confused with confectionery or non-alcoholic beverage.

There is currently no explicit power under the Act for me to prohibit the manufacture, sale or supply of certain liquor on general public interest or community welfare grounds.

Other jurisdictions including New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia, already have the ability to prohibit the sale of undesirable liquor products on public interest grounds.

Earlier this year, the Victorian Minister for Consumer Affairs, Gaming and Liquor Regulation, wrote to her interstate counterparts, regarding the introduction of a powdered alcohol product called 'Palcohol' into Australia.

Palcohol has recently been approved for sale in the United States of America, with the manufacturer of the product apparently seeking to distribute it here in Australia in the near future

The Victorian Government has expressed concerns about the potential impact that the introduction of a product such as this could have on the community.

Likewise, the South Australian Government has concerns about the manner in which powdered alcohol can be easily concealed compared to other types of alcohol, therefore reducing the ability for authorities to identify a person in possession of liquor (for example, in declared dry areas or at large concert and sporting events).

Palcohol being liquor in a powdered form also increases the risk for misuse of the product. For example, consuming the product without dissolving it in liquid or inhaling the powdery substance (similar to illicit drugs such as cocaine and heroin), potentially increasing the rate at which a person can become intoxicated.

On 1 July 2015, the Victorian Minister for Consumer Affairs exercised her power under the *Liquor Control Reform Act 1998*, to prohibit Palcohol on community interest grounds.

The New South Wales Government has now also prohibited the sale and supply of powdered alcohol on public interest grounds under the *Liquor Act 2007*.

South Australia (SA) has indicated that it will support a nationally consistent approach to prohibit the sale of powdered alcohol, however, it is apparent that my ability to prohibit certain types of liquor is somewhat limited compared to existing powers in other jurisdictions.

On a question of legal construction alone, section 131AA as it currently stands, should enable the Minister to prohibit the manufacture, sale or supply of powdered alcohol, provided that it is properly included within the scope of the Act by virtue of the Regulations.

A reasonable argument could no doubt be formed that powdered alcohol is likely to have a special appeal to minors, however, it is unclear at this stage how Palcohol will be packaged and sold, should the manufacturer attempt to introduce the product into Australia.

The Bill amends section 131AA of the Act, in line with other jurisdictions, to provide a clear ability to exercise the power under this section in the interests of the general public.

This will enable the Minister to prohibit undesirable liquor products such as powdered alcohol, in the interests of public safety and wellbeing.

It should be noted that before the Minister can exercise his or her power under the Act to prohibit a certain type of liquor, he or she is required to give known manufacturers, importers and distributors of the liquor at least seven days within which to comment on the proposed prohibition.

Appropriate consultation with the relevant Government agencies would also be undertaken, prior to exercising the power under this section.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*

4—Amendment of section 131AA—Prohibition of manufacture, sale or supply of certain liquor

This clause amends section 131AA of the principal Act to add the public interest to the list of grounds in relation to which a declaration under subsection (2) can be made.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FIREARMS OFFENCES) BILL

Second Reading

Second 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) (16:11): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

This Bill implements a promise given to those affected by the tragic consequences of the Humbles case, particularly the father of the victim of the fatality, Mark McPherson. It is a promise easy to keep. For it is also complements the Government's already tough approach to illegal firearms and gun crime.

There are two central measures.

First, the bill designates the trafficking offences contained in s14 and s10C(10) of the *Firearms Act 1977* as 'serious firearm offences' in fulfilment of a commitment made by the Government in July 2014.

The bill also provides for a new extended statutory complicity offence, to ensure those offenders who commit serious firearms offences are held fully responsible for the consequences flowing from their offending.

The Bill

Serious Firearm Offences

In September 2012, Parliament passed the *Statutes Amendment (Serious Firearm Offences) Bill 2012* which was assented to on 27 September 2012. This Act is a series of interlocking measures that are aimed at attacking lawless firearms crime at the more serious end of the scale, with a view to the protection of the public and the deterrence of those who attack public integrity and wilfully ignore the message that gun crime will not be tolerated in South Australia.

A central feature of the Act is the imposition of a very severe approach to the sentencing of serious firearm offenders. The *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988* was amended to include in that category those offenders who commit a firearms offence involving the use or carriage of a firearm against the *Firearms Act 1977* and the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*:

- that involves in any way a firearm that is illegal under all circumstances;
- that involves in any way a fully automatic firearm; and
- that involves in any way a handgun that is unregistered and the person is unlicensed.

The consequence of falling within that category of offenders is that there will be a presumption that a sentence of immediate imprisonment will be imposed, and that the only reason for not imposing a sentence of immediate imprisonment will be 'exceptional circumstances'; and 'exceptional circumstances' cannot be found unless the sentencing court is satisfied by evidence on oath that the personal circumstances of the offender are sufficiently exceptional to outweigh the presumed primacy of public safety, and personal and general deterrence.

On 16 July 2014, the Government announced that it would change the law so that an offence of trafficking in a firearm would qualify as a 'serious firearms offence', with the result that a serious firearm offender must be sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that sentence cannot be suspended unless the offender can demonstrate to the court exceptional personal circumstances of mitigation such that the statutory policy of the criminal law to deter serious firearm offenders is outweighed.

This Bill implements that promise. The Bill amends the current provisions to add to the categories of serious firearm offender referring to the use or carriage of a firearm offences of trafficking in a firearm contrary to sections 10C(10) and 14 of the *Firearms Act 1977*. In particular, that involves amending the definition of 'serious firearm offence' in s 20AA(1) of the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*.

Derivative Liability Offence

The liability of a person who is complicit in the criminal offences committed by another is governed by the law of complicity. It is partly statutory and partly common law. The statutory part is contained in s 267 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*. That says:

267—Aiding and abetting

A person who aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission of an offence is liable to be prosecuted and punished as a principal offender.

But that is not the only source of derivative liability. At common law, a person may be found guilty of a crime committed by another if it was committed under a common purpose (sometimes known as 'joint enterprise') or, further, via a doctrine known as 'extended common purpose' (or 'extended joint enterprise'). The differences between these forms of liability rest on what the offender contemplates might follow from the joint enterprise. This is most simply illustrated by example.

The most obvious example is the Humbles case. The defendant gives the principal offender a gun and the principal offender commits murder with it. Under what circumstances will the defendant be guilty of a homicide offence?

The leading case on this particular question is *R v Bainbridge* [1960] 1 QB 129. The defendant in that case supplied oxy-acetylene torches to the principal offender who, in turn, used them to rob a bank. He was convicted of aiding the commission of the back robbery (and hence was convicted of bank robbery). On appeal, he agreed that he suspected that the torches would be used to commit a crime, but did not know which one. The court on appeal held that it was sufficient that he knew the general type of crime in contemplation—in this case a theft type of crime and upheld the conviction.

The law on point was recently explained by Kourakis CJ in *R v B, FG; R v S, BD* [2012] SASC 157. He said:

It is the state of mind of the alleged accessory at the time that the assistance is given that determines his or her liability. The degree of knowledge or belief of what the principal is doing or might do that is necessary for liability will depend on the facts of each case. For example, a garden and hardware salesperson who merely suspects that a customer intends to use the purchased items for an unlawful purpose is unlikely to be culpable. On the other hand, a salesperson who believes that the purpose is unlawful, perhaps on the basis of an overheard conversation, may be culpable even if his belief is not sufficiently certain to be characterised as knowledge. Much will depend on the degree of certainty, the existence of a lawful excuse or reason for providing the assistance and whether or not the alleged accessory desires the commission of the offence.

The law requiring proof of the state of mind of the accessory for liability in complicity is complicated and hard to explain to a jury. Moreover, it has a tendency to limit extended complicity liability to cases in which there is temporal immediacy between the joint venture or common enterprise and the criminal outcome. The closer the link in time, the easier it is to draw the inference of foresight of the possibility of the type of crime actually committed.

But it is arguable that the commission of a firearms offence is a special case. A firearm is a uniquely lethal weapon of spectacular danger. Laws surround its use and possession in great detail for that reason.

The policy of the law should be that, if you put a gun in the hands of an irresponsible person, and you do so illegally, then you wear the consequences of that action. Cullen should be guilty, not just of the weapons offences, but of murder or manslaughter. Firearms are uniquely and directly dangerous to life and limb and should be a special case.

The Government therefore proposes that the law should be changed so that, if a person commits a firearm trafficking or supply offence, and the commission of that offence results (in fact), directly or indirectly, in a firearm coming into the possession of an unlicensed person, the first person is liable for certain offences committed by the second person with that firearm, whether the subsequent offence is committed in this State or, in accordance with a suggestion of the Commissioner of Police, in another jurisdiction. In the case of an offence committed in another jurisdiction, the liability of the defendant will be determined by reference to the actual offence committed in that jurisdiction, not by reference to the corresponding South Australian offence. For example, if the firearm is used in the course of a bank robbery in Victoria, the exposure to criminal liability of the defendant for the offence against new section s267AA will be equivalent to that for the relevant Victorian offence.

The derivative offence has been designed to be a stand-alone offence, with a maximum penalty of a term of imprisonment no longer than the maximum term of the subsequent offence, being the offence committed by the person who has received the gun from the supplier.

The emphasis has been placed on the conduct of the person supplying the firearm, rather than the outcome of the actions of the second (principal) offender.

The new derivative liability offence is not unfair or unreasonable. It has its own maximum penalty, the supplier can be sentenced and the individual circumstances of their offending are then taken into consideration. The penalty is still related to the subsequent offence, to ensure that the supplier is still responsible for the consequences of their actions in supplying the firearm.

The extended liability provision will apply to juveniles. So it should. That is the case responded to. By correct analogy with complicity, the juvenile caught by extended liability will be treated as a principal offender. The Bill says so. That means that the juvenile caught for homicide will be treated as a young offender. The critical age is the age of the offender at the time that the supply offence was committed.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

4—Insertion of Part 7C

This clause inserts new Part 7C into the principal Act. Part 7C inserts section 267AA.

New section 267AA creates an offence where a person who, in the course of committing a prescribed firearms offence, unlawfully supplies a firearm to another and that firearm is subsequently used in the commission of an offence against the principal Act, or an offence under the law of another jurisdiction consisting of conduct that would, if engaged in this State, be an offence against the principal Act.

A prescribed firearms offence is an offence against section 10C(10) or 14(1)(b) of the *Firearms Act 1977*.

The maximum penalty for the new offence is imprisonment for a term not exceeding the maximum term that may be imposed for the subsequent offence.

Part 3—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*

5—Amendment of section 20AA—Interpretation

This clause amends section 20AA of the principal Act to include an offence against section 10C(10) or 14 of the *Firearms Act 1977* in the definition of *serious firearm offence*.

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

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (IMPLEMENTATION OF CORONER'S RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 June 2015.)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (16:12): This bill passed the House of Assembly on 2 June with government amendments. The bill is part of the government's response to the damning report from the State Coroner, Mark Johns, arising out of the death of Chloe Valentine. The bill should be understood in the context of the government's record. The Weatherill Labor government has both a poor record of managing child protection services and a poor record in delivering system improvements.

During the last 13 years, the Labor government has received reports from a range of inquiries, including the Layton review, two inquiries by Justice Mullighan, the 2009 legislative select committee, the Debelle inquiry, as well as numerous reports from the Child Deaths and Serious Injury Review Committee and the Coroner's Court. Many recommendations from these reports have not been implemented, even when the recommendations have been accepted by the government and even when the recommendations are recurring.

The Legislative Council has been so concerned about poor implementation of system improvements in this area that earlier this year it gave an additional reference to the Select Committee on Statutory Child Protection and Care to see the committee overview the implementation of the series of reports, including this Coroner's recommendations from the inquest into Chloe Valentine's death.

What was the government's response? On 17 June, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars came into the council accusing the opposition of trying to 'take what was a specific and limited terms of reference and make a committee with the power to look into any matter pertaining to child protection in this state'. In fact, contrary to the assertions of the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, on 7 May 2014, in moving for the establishment of the committee, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire said:

The terms of reference are naturally broad. The intent, as the next motion will discuss, will be for referral of specific issues in addition to the broader work of the committee.

In speaking to the notice of motion on 21 May 2014, I said, and I quote:

The Liberal Party supports the establishment of a broad parliamentary committee on Families SA...The focus of the motion is on foster care…but the motion is broader than foster care. The committee that is proposed is to 'be established to inquire into and report on statutory child protection and care in South Australia' and it goes on to refer to foster care.

Later in my comments I floated a range of possible future references. My comments specifically foreshadowed the referral of a review on implementation, and I quote that section:

Another aspect which I believe would come within the terms of reference and which would be a potential issue that this committee might choose to look at would be, in fact, the review of the progress and the impediments to progress in the implementations of the reviews. I know that there is scholarly consideration in the child protection area as to the impact of reviews and in what circumstances they are positive and in what circumstances they are negative…We need to make sure that efforts towards continuous improvement do not lead to processes and a culture that focuses on compliance, rather than real outcomes—real protection for children and young people.

Accordingly, it should have come as no surprise to anyone that, on behalf of the Liberal team, I moved the reference on monitoring implementation just one year later. Contrary to the comments of

the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the committee was established as a broad committee and the Liberal team felt there was more work to be done after consideration of the foster care reference. On 7 May, when the committee was being considered, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire said, and I quote:

> I hope that the government does not just come out and say it is going to boycott this select committee if it gets up, as they did with the last select committee. I thought that that was very unfortunate because this should be above party politics. The number one thing that any government, any parliament and any decent person should do is ensure the protection, wellbeing and welfare of our children.

Initially, the government did cooperate with the committee. Government members were appointed to the committee and participated in the foster care inquiry. However, when the council referred a second matter to the committee the government members resigned. I would put it to the government that if the government is serious about bipartisanship in child protection, then rejoining the committee would be a tangible expression of that commitment.

Child protection is a whole of community conversation. For the government to appoint reviews and say that the conversation must stop until those reviews are completed is bizarre. That is not what I call a community conversation. It will inevitably delay the progress of reform and delay improvements.

This bill in particular is a response to the tragic death of Chloe. On 20 January 2012, Chloe Valentine, a young four year old child, died. Her case has penetrated the heart of the South Australian community. Photographs of Chloe speak of the essence of childhood: energy, innocence and trust. Her mother and her mother's partner were the only ones who harmed Chloe, but the community as a whole has let her down.

I would pause here and acknowledge Chloe's grandmother, Belinda Valentine. Belinda did not choose to enter public life but, still living with the grief of losing Chloe, she has become a strong voice for children like Chloe. She brings together lived experience and an uncommon wisdom.

On 9 April 2015, the State Coroner, Mark Johns, handed down the findings of the inquest into the death of Chloe Valentine. He found that Chloe's death was caused by a closed head injury, with possible contributing factors of extensive subcutaneous and intramuscular haemorrhage. The Coroner's report was extremely strong in its criticisms of Families SA. The Coroner's findings included 21 recommendations to change the child protection system that currently operates in South Australia. On 13 April the government indicated its support for 19 out these 21 recommendations. This bill seeks to amend the Children's Protection Act 1993 in order to implement three of the 21 recommendations—namely, recommendations 22.2, 22.11 and 22.12.

Recommendation 22.2 of the Coroner's report has been described as Chloe's Law. The bill seeks to amend the Children's Protection Act so that a child born to a person who has a conviction in respect of a child previously born to them for a qualifying offence would be placed from birth under the custody of the minister. Qualifying offences include criminal neglect, endangering life, causing or creating risk of serious harm, manslaughter or murder.

According to these changes, if the chief executive becomes aware that a child is residing with a parent who has been found guilty of one of these qualifying offences, he or she must issue an instrument of guardianship in respect of the child. The guardianship period would be for 60 days; the 60-day guardianship period and restraining notice periods would provide time for an investigation of the family's circumstances to be undertaken. Evidence and information gathered would be presented to the Youth Court as part of the application for a care and protection order which must be applied for under section 37(3).

The government amendments passed in the House of Assembly have clarified that this 60-day period commences from either the service of the instrument of guardianship or its lodgement at court, whichever is earlier. Sadly, in the tragic case of Chloe Valentine, because Ashlee Polkinghorne and Benjamin McPartland had no prior convictions for child abuse and neglect, this new provision would not have benefited Chloe.

The bill has gone one step further than the Coroner's recommendations on this issue in that it provides that if the chief executive becomes aware that a child is residing with a person who is not a parent of the child but who has been found guilty of a qualifying offence, the chief executive must

issue a restraining notice to the offender unless it is inappropriate to do so. The restraining notice may impose a variety of conditions on the offender—for example, prohibiting the offender from residing in the same premises as the child or having any unsupervised contact with the child and so on. It will then be up to the parent or the person who has the conviction to demonstrate that they have been rehabilitated, reformed and are able to provide a safe and nurturing environment for the care of the child.

The bill also seeks to amend section 6 of the act to take up recommendation 22.11 and include a definition of cumulative harm which is to be considered as a relevant factor when making decisions about the care of a child. The bill provides that in assessing whether there is a significant risk that a child will suffer serious harm or a child has been abused or neglected, relevant officers will take into account the history of the child's care and the likely cumulative effect of that history. This amendment provides for the proper consideration of the effect of the type of chronic neglect that was so present in the short life of Chloe Valentine.

Recommendation 22.12 is pursued by making it clear that keeping a child safe from harm is a paramount consideration of the act. This attempts to make it clear that the paramount consideration in the administration of the act is to keep children safe from harm and that maintaining a child in his or her family must give way to a child's safety. Certainly, in the Select Committee on Statutory Child Protection and Care in South Australia a number of witnesses and people making submissions have expressed concern that Families SA at times gives too high a priority to the preservation of family units when that would actually be to put children at increased risk of harm.

The bill also originally removed the fundamental principles set out in section 4 of the act. A government amendment passed in the House of Assembly has restored to the act that a decision-maker must have regard to a child's views in making decisions under the act and has also restored the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle. The Attorney-General indicated in the other place that he would review other aspects of section 4 between the houses. I indicated to the minister that the opposition eagerly awaits advice of the result of that review.

In June, the opposition filed amendments in relation to compliance with section 20(2) of the Child Protection Act, which relates to mandatory drug assessments. Section 20 was amended in this respect in 2005-06 to add subsection (2). Subsection (2) provides that if Families SA suspects on reasonable grounds that a child is at risk as a result of the abuse of an illicit drug by a parent, Families SA must apply to the Youth Court to direct a drug assessment. This section provides one exemption to this provision; that is, if 'the chief executive is satisfied that an appropriate assessment of the parent, guardian or other person has already occurred, or is to occur'.

The findings of the Coroner in relation to the Chloe Valentine case concluded that there had been several occasions when there was ample evidence of methamphetamine abuse by Chloe's mother and multiple instances where there were grounds to suspect it. Despite this, no application was ever made pursuant to this section.

The evidence to the coronial inquest into the death of Chloe Valentine and other evidence given to the Select Committee on Statutory Child Protection and Care led that committee to the view that Families SA consistently tends to understate the risk to children of substance abuse.

On 1 May, following the coronial report, the government distributed a circular within Families SA to remind staff about the requirement. Personally, I regard an administrative memorandum as an inadequate response, particularly when it is being distributed in the context of persistent statutory noncompliance. I believe that the government should have at least provided more guidance to Families SA on what compliance looks like. In any event, the Select Committee on Statutory Child Protection and Care has recommended that section 20(2) be strengthened, and the opposition has filed amendments that seek to do that and therefore try to address the systemic failure by removing the discretion currently placed with the chief executive.

The chief executive would still have to suspect that a child is at risk in order to enliven the section 20 drug assessment; however, we believe, as does the committee, for that matter, that it is appropriate to remove the discretion as we are seeking to ensure that when there are reasonable grounds to suspect harm from drug use, a drug assessment must be undertaken. My understanding

is that that was the intention of the parliament in 2005-06. The parliament, through this bill, will have an opportunity to reiterate its intent.

There were other matters that the Attorney-General took on notice, and we look forward to that information being provided either at the summing up stage or at the committee stage. In concluding my remarks, I would like to take the opportunity to quote from the Coroner's report. The Coroner's report quotes from a document called 'Do Not Damage and Disturb: On Child Protection Failures and the Pressure on Out-of-Home Care in Australia'. I think it is worthy of further consideration:

> An enlightened truth, and the bedrock of sound child protection, is that childhood is fleeting. This time of life must be optimised for children's sake, and for society's good, because bad early experiences have deleterious, life-long consequences. Because today's child is tomorrow's citizen, modern nations place a premium on the care, education and socialisation of children. That adults have a duty to nurture and not damage, disturb and distress children is a universal aspiration shared by all civilised peoples. That Australians allow this social norm to be transgressed in our rich and prosperous country is what's so shocking about the harm done under the rubric of child protection. The wrongs hereby perpetrated are of biblical proportions; doubly wicked are those who protest otherwise but must know, in their hearts, minds and consciences, that what they say is false.

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

TATTOOING INDUSTRY CONTROL BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

At 16:31 the Council adjourned until Tuesday 27 October 2015 at 14:15.