

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 22 June 2016

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley)** took the chair at 14:18 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The **Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:18)**: I bring up the 26th report of the committee.

Report received.

Ministerial Statement

ELECTRICITY PRICES

The **Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:19)**: I table a copy of a ministerial statement made by the Treasurer in another place on ESCOSA advice on electricity prices in South Australia.

COWPER, MR B.

The **Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:19)**: I table a copy of a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Veterans Affairs in the other place on the passing of Squadron Leader, Bob Cowper.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Question Time

CHILD PROTECTION

The **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20)**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government a question about the children of South Australia.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY**: It is now incontrovertible that this government has failed the children of South Australia. The opposition has known this for a long time, while the government has been in denial. It took a royal commission for the Premier to acknowledge the government's failings in the protection of children. South Australians have sat by helplessly and watched the Premier's failed egotistical experiment unfold, which saw him merge Families SA and the department of education. The Premier's shameful decision has resulted in the systematic failure of this crucial function.

The Premier created a department which oversaw a litany of disasters at the expense of South Australia's most vulnerable children. In 2011, after serving as education and child protection minister, the Premier thought it best to merge these two departments. Since the establishment of the Premier's super department there has been tragedy after tragedy, perhaps most notably was Chloe Valentine. After a Coroner's inquest, Coroner Mark Johns said, 'Nothing less than a massive overhaul of Families SA and its culture and training of its staff will be sufficient.' Yet these recommendations,

sadly, fell on deaf ears. Then there was the shocking case of Shannon McCooles, a Families SA worker who committed an unspeakable list of offences against children in state care.

Finally, the Premier was forced to take his head out of the sand and call for a royal commission. However, this was too late for too many children in South Australia. Yesterday, Commissioner Nyland handed down an interim recommendation and told the Premier what we had been telling him for years. Commissioner Nyland said, 'It is clear from our investigation that Families SA needs to be completely overhauled.'

As elected representatives of the Parliament of South Australia, it is our role, first and foremost, to ensure the safety and security of all South Australians. The Premier has failed in what should have been his first and most important order of business and as a result, sadly, there are children who have paid the ultimate price, and he has put our state's most vulnerable people at risk.

My question to the minister is: how can the Leader of the Government in this place have confidence in a Premier who established and oversaw a department that was so systematically flawed that it put South Australia's most vulnerable children at risk and resulted in the death and abuse of children?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for his question. As Commissioner Nyland has made interim recommendations and the government has accepted those recommendations, they are now being implemented and, quite frankly, I will not be playing politics with the issue of child protection: it is too important for that.

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): I have a supplementary question. Do you have confidence in the Premier to lead this state in the light of these findings of the royal commission?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:22): Absolutely.

ADELAIDE DESALINATION PLANT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:22): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Water and the River Murray a question on the subject of the Adelaide Desalination Plant study.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: On 22 March, the minister announced that an independent cost-benefit study to determine if water from the Adelaide Desalination Plant should be used to boost irrigation allocations during a time of low water availability would be undertaken, stating that the findings would be available in May 2016. This comes at a time when Riverland irrigators are facing a minimum opening water allocation of 36 per cent for the 2016-17 year. Can the minister advise where the report is and when we can actually expect to see it? That is basically it: where is it?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. The report will be handed up soon.

ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS AND TRANSLATORS

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:23): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation questions in relation to Aboriginal language interpreters and translators.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The Department of State Development's Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Program is responsible for coordinating the work of the South Australian policy

framework for Aboriginal languages, interpreters and translators. This work includes coordinating the implementation of the policy across South Australian government agencies and services. As part of monitoring and implementing this policy, a reference group was established. I understand that all agencies have been made aware of the policy and provided with a quick reference document. My questions to the minister are:

1. What has been done to develop a coordinating system and to improve the level of awareness around the use of interpreters and translators for Aboriginal languages?
2. How often has the reference group charged with monitoring the implementation of the policy met in the past year?
3. What formal mechanisms are in place to ensure that Aboriginal community members, interpreters and government agencies are able to raise any concerns they have with the reference group and do these mechanisms include the opportunity for concerned parties to meet face-to-face with the reference group?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for his important question and interest in this area. Certainly the issue of Aboriginal languages and the use of interpreters are very, very important issues. There are a number of reasons why it is important. In terms of language generally, we are fortunately seeing right across South Australia significant moves in terms of language revival, whether it be Kurna, Narungga, or the Boandik language revival, I have experienced most recently in the South-East, or recently on the Far West Coast in Ceduna, at the back of the Arts Centre there is a very impressive project with Mirning and Kokatha languages now being taught much further in schools and with young people.

In terms of interpreter and translation services, these are also very important for people who have English as a second language, particularly in central regions of South Australia, being able to access services more effectively and efficiently. In terms of meeting of a reference group, I do not have information about when a reference group last met, but I will take that on notice and bring back the answer to the honourable member's question and other questions he asked about the particular reference group and when it met and what it is doing. I will include his whole question in that. With my left hand, I did not get a chance to write down exactly what all parts of the question were, but please be assured they will be included in what I bring back.

AUSTRALIAN INFORMATION INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION AWARDS

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. Can the minister update the chamber on how the Australian Information Industries Association's iAwards is recognising innovators in South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for his question and for his ongoing interest in this area and particularly the digital economy area in South Australia. Last week, I was very fortunate to attend the 2016 State iAwards at the world-class Adelaide Convention Centre and to present the awards to state winners and merit recipients in South Australia and the Northern Territory.

The AIIA team, including Rob Fitzpatrick, national CEO; Phil Catley, AIIA SA Council Chair; and Byron Riessen, the General Manager of AIIA SA, delivered an exceptional evening, celebrating the achievements of our state's digital sector. The iAwards is Australia's leading awards program for innovation in the digital economy, with entrants competing in five base-award categories across consumer, community service, industrial and primary services, business service and public sector and government, as well as student categories and cross-categories. In South Australia, the AIIA awards also recognise the Premier's iAward for Public Sector Digital Innovation.

The iAwards is an opportunity to acknowledge outstanding achievement in digital innovation, recognising the crucial importance of the information industry to the landscape of our economy here in South Australia. The government has a proud and longstanding association with the AIIA and all

the benefits that our partnership has brought to our shared pursuit of economic development through innovation and the promotion of a digital economy that enables companies involved to act as agents of economic growth in South Australia.

We were particularly proud of the Premier's iAward for Public Sector Innovation, which after first being presented in South Australia in 2014 has been replicated in similar awards across other states. It is easy to recognise the huge potential of digital technology for the betterment of our community. You look anywhere in the world and you can see digital innovations are making significant improvements in public health, education, community safety and many more areas. We strongly believe in the transformative potential of innovative digital technology and we will continue to support our innovators, disruptors and cultural creatives in South Australia to deliver strong economic growth and high-tech job opportunities for our state. To make the short list for these awards, all the nominees brought game-changing ideas to the table, but the successful winners and merit recipients went further, creating disruptive innovation that has the potential to impact the full spectrum of our lives.

The 2016 winners and merit recipients across the five categories included, in the consumer category, the University of South Australia for the LiPo indoor positioning system; in the community services category, ETRAIN Interactive and TAFE SA for a 3D training simulator for nursing; in the industrial and primary services sector, Santos for predictive analytics in oil and gas; and in the public sector and government category, SA Health Integration, and the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion for a vacancy maintenance inspections app.

In the student category, the Leafy Sea Dragon National Park virtual world from Linden Park. I had the opportunity of meeting with them and looking through what they were doing. It followed on from some of the work that they had done in one of minister Hunter's areas in designing national park and park areas with Minecraft. I was impressed because judging from my kids, I thought Minecraft was only a game in which you killed zombies, but apparently you can design parks as well.

The senior students winner was VR Gallery. In cross-categories: the University of South Australia with MoOvi, a virtual reality training tool for chronic pain; PhoneLabs was the start-up of the year; Santos, again for their predictive analytics in oil and gas; ETRAIN, again, were winners in this area; and the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion. In the Premier's iAward, Primary Industries and Regions SA won for their AgInsight South Australia innovation.

All the winners and merit recipients across all categories will progress to represent South Australia and compete at the national iAwards which is to be held in Melbourne later this year. I congratulate all the recipients. I congratulate AIIA for the awards and I wish all our South Australian winners the best of luck in the national awards.

ADELAIDE TO ZERO CARBON CHALLENGE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing questions to the Minister for Climate Change about the Adelaide to Zero Carbon Challenge.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Minister for Climate Change in this place and the Premier in his media release on this Adelaide to Zero Carbon Challenge program have previously championed this challenge as encouraging the world's best and brightest entrepreneurs to help Adelaide become the world's first carbon-neutral city. In March, the Premier launched the first initiative in this challenge, that is a \$250,000 prize in seed funding which will be offered to these best minds locally, nationally and internationally to develop ideas covering energy, transport, waste and livability.

I congratulate the government on their progressive attitude in making Adelaide a carbon neutral city. However, I share concerns raised by some in the community that, while the Challenge seems to be carbon neutral, it has certainly not sought to be gender balanced in its leadership. Indeed, of the nine members of the panel of experts who have been appointed to assess the eligibility of applicants, only one of these members is a woman. This, of course, flies in the face of the government's stated objectives in increased involvement of girls and women in STEM, and of course a stated commitment to gender balance in many decision-making forums in our state.

The Greens welcome the low carbon entrepreneur prize, and the Adelaide to Zero Carbon Challenge, but note that these bold ideas that will help establish new jobs and new industries in South Australia while helping make Adelaide the world's first carbon-neutral city have a panel to decide that prize which is comprised of eight men and only one woman. It seems a very 19th century approach for such a 21st century venture. My question to the minister is: just how did the Weatherill government let this almost Smurf village-like gender imbalance go through to the keeper?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:32): I thank the honourable member for her question. The state government and the Adelaide City Council have a shared vision to make Adelaide the world's first carbon-neutral city, a showcase for renewables and clean technology. In embarking on this goal, we can create a more vibrant and sustainable city that attracts the best and the brightest. We know that moving to a carbon-neutral city will unlock innovation and technology and attract business.

Data from 2012-13 indicates, I am advised, that the City of Adelaide generated nearly one million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions from existing gas consumption, transport and waste. Stationary energy and transport were the primary sources of emissions, contributing 60 per cent and 35 per cent respectively, and in addition, waste disposed to landfill generated 5 per cent of the city's emissions.

Through our partnership with the Adelaide City Council we want to achieve an ambitious goal, and we have formalised our partnership through the sector agreement under the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007. I have been pleased to have such strong support from the council, led by the Lord Mayor, for this very important initiative.

In November 2015, the South Australian government and the Adelaide City Council jointly released their shared vision for a carbon-neutral Adelaide. The vision outlines a framework for becoming a carbon-neutral city, including an emissions profile of the city, as I just outlined. The Carbon Neutral Adelaide initiative is designed to drive further emissions reductions and increase the demand for renewable energy, build the state's green industries, increase resource efficiency, improve waste management and facilitate the transition to cleaner transport modes.

Our shared vision will be underpinned by an action plan that we are developing collaboratively with the council during this year. It will concentrate on realising the economic opportunities of transitioning to a low-carbon economy and unlocking investment in South Australia. Achieving significant emission reductions will require innovative solutions and will provide opportunities for the deployment of new carbon technologies.

As part of this innovative approach to reducing emissions, South Australia's Low Carbon Entrepreneur Prize, the first initiative of the Adelaide to Zero Carbon Challenge, has now closed and a judging panel is reviewing submissions to find innovative ideas to reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the City of Adelaide. The prize provides a total of \$250,000 in seed funding to develop ideas aimed at cutting greenhouse gas emissions and energy and transporting waste, enhancing the livability of the city. I am told that a total of 150 submissions were received, and am advised that a short list of entrepreneurs will be announced by the end of June 2016.

HALLETT COVE PIPELINE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Water and the River Murray a question about the Hallett Cove water supply pipe rupture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: A constituent contacted the opposition about the water supply outage at Hallett Cove yesterday. It was reported that many homes and a school were without water yesterday afternoon. The problem occurred when a significant water supply pipe, embedded in an embankment that crosses Waterfall Creek, was washed away due to the high rainfall at Hallett Cove.

The significant water supply pipe that crosses Waterfall Creek in an earth embankment is also a walkway, and the stormwater discharge pipe that passes through the embankment feeds the

flow of stormwater into a developed area, into the creek and eventually out to sea. It was noted by this constituent that the pipe was undersized to accommodate heavy flows.

Yesterday, the prolific flows backed up and flowed over the embankment and walkway, and subsequently ruptured the pipe. SA Water reported the incident on its website as 'support infrastructure being washed away,' which, according to this constituent, is not the case, as there was no engineering or support infrastructure in place; it was an earth embankment that was washed away. My questions are:

1. Can the minister explain why SA Water built a water pipe crossing an embankment that is highly prone to be washed away?
2. What risk assessments did SA Water undertake to ensure risk is minimised during heavy rainfall and bad weather?
3. Can the minister confirm how SA Water has fixed yesterday's pipe rupture?
4. Will the sizing of the pipe be re-evaluated and upgraded accordingly?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:38): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions. Of course SA Water, myself and the government regret any inconvenience caused to the community due to a washout that interrupts people's water supplies. As I have explained in this place many times before, SA Water crews are sent out to address these issues as a triaging project, to determine the most important jobs to be done first and what are of lower priority. Those decisions are based on issues of public safety, public amenity and also, of course, people's homes and businesses and the disruption that may be caused by such a problem.

The problem the honourable member mentions—which I also saw reported in the media—was an act of nature in terms of floodwaters washing out an urban embankment through which a stormwater pipe was laid. In terms of the details of the past engineering, I do not have that accessible to me at this time. Additionally, I do not have anything before me which tells me the technical crews' response in the last 24 hours, but I can undertake to find out that information for the honourable member and bring it back.

GLOBAL WARMING

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Climate Change. Will the minister update the chamber about action being taken to combat global warming in South Australia, and actions taking place at a national and international level?

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. We in this state pride ourselves on our clean and green image as a state, across many of our industries and our environment. It is important, of course, for our premium food and wine, as well as our tourism sectors. Tackling global warming is pivotal to the continued growth in these sectors. Our leadership, as a state, on climate change is a vital part of this image and we are showing that it is possible to reduce emissions and still maintain economic growth.

For example, I am advised that emissions in South Australia are 8 per cent lower than 1990 levels, while the economy has grown by over 60 per cent over that same period. While South Australia transitions as an economy to a lower carbon future, the same cannot be said of the federal Liberal government. The federal Liberals talk about jobs and growth in a transitioning economy, but they do not want to talk about climate change, because they are well and truly beholden to the global warming sceptics lobby.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The honourable members opposite are squealing because they don't want this exposed.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Squirring and squealing, as my leader reminds me, because they don't want to be reminded in the lead-up to the federal election, which is only days away now, how much their party has failed this country. We have a prime minister who used climate change to grab the top job, by saying he would never lead a party that was not as committed to climate change, and he has now channelled Tony Abbott and launched a second-rate climate change scare campaign.

The federal government's climate policy consists of direct action, or so they would say. A policy that has been attacked, not only by environmental groups but also by the Australian Industry Group, which represents more than 60,000 businesses, including those involved in transport, manufacturing and mining supplies. In an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* last year, the Australian industry group was quoted criticising the scheme because of its uncertain viability, and the fact that taxpayers—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, can you take a seat please. You don't have a conversation between benches while the minister is on his feet answering a question. It is totally out of order. I expect the minister to be able to get to his feet and give his answer without any interference. Minister.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President. Where shall I start? From the very beginning, I think. So, South Australia prides itself on its clean and green image—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon. Mr Maher, I must say, as the Leader of the Government in the house, you have more of a responsibility to show an example. And as the whip, Hon. Mr Dawkins, you should set an example as well.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, you may continue with your answer.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President. I won't provoke them any further—or perhaps I will. There is nothing like putting the facts on the table that provokes the Liberal Party in this place. We have a prime minister who used climate change to snaffle the top job of prime minister away from a former prime minister, and said that he would not lead a party that was not as committed to climate change as he was. And now he is channelling Tony Abbott, and launched a second-rate climate change scare campaign. The federal government's climate change policy consists of direct action—a policy that has been attacked, not only by environmental groups but also by the Australian Industry Group, which represents more than 60,000 businesses, including those in transport, manufacturing and mining supplies.

In an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* last year, the Australian Industry Group was quoted criticising the scheme because of its uncertain viability and the fact that taxpayers face a multibillion dollar bill to meet Australia's new pledge to cut greenhouse gas emissions. Even the old Malcolm was scathing about this policy prior to becoming Prime Minister, saying that it is nothing more than an expensive charge on the budget and it will not reduce emissions. That is our current Prime Minister speaking of the former prime minister's policy, which he has now adopted holus-bolus.

Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull then was right. He was right: Australia's emissions are now rising. What Mr Turnbull knows, but is afraid to admit now, is that Australia needs an emissions trading scheme. That is what almost every economist advises as the most efficient way of tackling global warming. That is what the federal Labor Party is committed to implementing if it wins office. The need for an emissions trading scheme—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: It is surprising. Those opposite are champions of the free market. The champions of the free market run away screaming from a market-based mechanism when it comes to carbon: 'We will have a market for everything else. We will have market for health care. We want to privatise Medicare. We will have a free market approach to Medicare, but when it comes to the environment, when it comes to carbon, oh no, we do not want to have a free market approach.'

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down. Let's all settle down.

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

The PRESIDENT: It gets a little bit awkward when the minister is being attacked from the front, attacked from the rear.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I am used to it, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I can't hear what the minister is saying. I am actually interested in what the minister wants to say. Minister, continue with your answer.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President. The Liberals start squealing when you start to dig below their skin about how committed they are to free markets—only some free markets, not others. No free markets in emissions trading, no free markets in carbon, but lots of free markets in Medicare, lots of privatisation in Medicare, that's what they stand for over there. Every economist advises that the most efficient way of tackling global warming is to use a market mechanism.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, can you just take your seat for a minute. The Hon. Mr Stephens, I don't think the word you used was an appropriate word. I won't even mention it. I think it would be appropriate if you withdrew whatever you said.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I am a little confused as to which word you might be referring to.

The PRESIDENT: A few people heard it. I heard it. I heard it quite clearly. Do you want to withdraw it?

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I am confused as to which word you are talking about, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Well, you called the minister a wanker.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: No, I didn't.

The PRESIDENT: You did. I heard you.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I said, 'This is a wanky answer.' I didn't call him a wanker.

The PRESIDENT: That is a totally inappropriate word to use during a debate.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I was certainly talking about the minister when I said 'a wanky answer'. Mr President, I withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you. Can the minister please get to the crux of his answer.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: It is coming, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: There are a number of crossbenchers who want to ask questions. Continue with the answer.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The need for an emissions trading scheme is even recognised by the Business Council of Australia, perhaps more traditional allies of the Liberal Party than they are of the Labor Party. Its chief executive officer, Ms Jennifer Westacott, has been quoted as saying:

The Federal Opposition's climate change action plan...could provide a platform for bipartisanship to deliver the energy and climate change policy durability needed to support the critical transformation...The last thing Australia needs is to start from scratch on carbon policy. With the support of business and the community in developing specific measures, the Opposition's plan could build a bridge from the existing regulatory frameworks to the first phase of their proposed emissions trading scheme.

That was the Business Council of Australia. Even they think Prime Minister Turnbull's approach, which he adopted from the former prime minister Tony Abbott, doesn't really work. Australia needs both an emissions trading scheme and stronger emissions reduction targets if we are to meet the commitment we made under the Paris Agreement to keep global temperature rises to below 2° ;

otherwise it is just a worthless piece of paper with a scribbled signature on it. Let's put it another way. Another Liberal leader, former leader John Hewson, said:

It was all a bit much for me to see Environment Minister Greg Hunt wallowing in the signing of the Paris Agreement on emissions reduction in New York this week. His commitment to its ratification by year end, after opposing the pricing of carbon and attempting to close down the renewables industry, is nothing short of blatant hypocrisy.

Another Liberal leader: 'blatant hypocrisy,' labelled by his own party; that's what they have come to. It is time the Liberals became serious about global warming. The need to set higher targets and join South Australia in making a commitment to zero net emissions by 2050 is paramount. Global warming poses a significant challenge for this country and for the world, and as the driest state in the driest inhabited continent, it is important that South Australia makes all efforts to limit global warming.

Data from NASA shows that April was the hottest ever recorded, making this the seventh month in a row that has broken a monthly record. If Malcolm Turnbull is genuine about the undertaking he gave in Paris, then the Liberals must adopt the target recommended by the Climate Change Authority and proposed by a future Labor government—namely, a 45 per cent cut on 2005 levels by 2030—instead of the current policy under this Liberal government, summarised by Erwin Jackson from the Climate Institute as, 'We've got a 2030 target consistent with 3° to 4° of global warming.'

We have 3° to 4° of global warming under the existing targets set by the current federal government. We have a domestic policy framework that has seen emissions increase under the current federal Liberal government. Surely Australians deserve better than that. They have their opportunity to make sure they get that on 2 July.

SA WATER

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Water. Earlier this year, the minister provided answers to questions that I had asked in relation to SA Water's maintenance program. In the response, the minister advised that:

...the condition and the performance of individual pipes within the water network are also monitored and recorded every day by SA Water.

Can the minister advise why there have been 14 bursts in approximately the last three months if the condition and performance of SA Water pipes are monitored every day? Surely the likelihood of a burst should have been detected if the pipes are monitored every day.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his most important question, and I come back to the information I have given the chamber in the past. We have 14 bursts every day. We have 27,000 kilometres of pipeline—27,000 kilometres of pressurised water pipeline, which is much more than New South Wales and much more than Victoria—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: We are not interested.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The Hon. Mr Brokenshire says, 'We don't care about water businesses elsewhere.' He doesn't care at all. Out of his own mouth, the Hon. Mr Brokenshire says he doesn't care. Well, we know that, Mr President; all he cares about is himself.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Oh yes, like fun! The Hon. Mr Darley wants to know about the maintenance programs of the pipes and I have given that chapter and verse in this place before. The average age of our pipes in South Australia is 51 years. This is well below the lifetime that many of those pipes were built for, which is on average 150 years. We have a continual maintenance program where we address the issues of the replacement of the pipelines. We spend over \$300 million on average every year to make sure that we are renewing our infrastructure. Of that, \$50 million alone is spent on the water pipes themselves.

We have a very active program of maintaining our pipes, checking them and getting to them promptly when they do have bursts. As I said to the honourable member previously—which the

Hon. Mr Brokenshire does not care about—every water delivery system has leakages and bursts—every single one. The trick is to have the bursts reduced to a manageable level. In this state, we achieve that better than most other water utilities in the country. We are up there in the top four because of our continued maintenance program.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

SA WATER

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): What is the average response time from when a leak is reported until it is actually attended by SA Water or their contractors?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:53): It varies from site to site.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: They laugh because they have no comprehension—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: They have no comprehension, Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: They think if there is a water burst outside their house there is someone there straightaway. Usually there will be in about two hours, but we also have water bursts out in the country areas. We have to have crews travel to get to those bursts and so our response times for those teams are an average across the state. The honourable member hasn't got the first clue about how to run a water business.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Water and the River Murray a question regarding EPA water licensing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: On 24 May this year, the Department of Defence notified northern suburbs councils of their planned investigation into the potential existence, and the levels of, certain constituents of aqueous film forming foams, which were once commonly used as fire suppressants, in and around RAAF Base Edinburgh. This testing was brought about after public health issues arose from the use of chemicals at RAAF Base Williamstown in New South Wales which are known as perfluorooctane sulphonate (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA).

It was reported recently in *The Advertiser* that the Salisbury council and its water business unit has switched off its Edinburgh South and Kaurna aquifers as a precaution pending the outcome of the RAAF investigation. The article also stated that while the EPA, and the water licences granted to Salisbury council by it, do not require testing for PFOS or PFOA chemicals, the council is testing for them anyway as a precaution. I praise the council for doing so in the best interests of the public.

The chemicals that the Department of Defence and the Salisbury council are testing for have been linked to a cancer cluster in Victoria which led to the closure of the Country Fire Authority's Fiskville training centre last year and has led the federal Labor Party to commit to fund 10,000 voluntary blood tests at affected sites and the Coalition government to commit to voluntary blood tests and counselling services if re-elected.

Given that the local council, the minister's federal colleagues and the federal government have considered the potential for PFOS and PFOA chemical contamination so hazardous that they have taken steps to minimise the public risk, why hasn't the EPA added testing for these chemicals to the Salisbury council's stormwater re-use licences?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:56): I commend the

honourable member for his most important and intelligent question, as well as his wonderful pronunciation.

Perfluorinated compounds are manufactured chemicals that do not occur naturally. They are also sometimes called perfluorinated alkylated substances (PFAS). Specific types of PFCs include perfluorooctane sulphonate, as the honourable member said, and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA). I am advised that these chemicals are of emerging concern in Australia and internationally but of largely recent historical times.

PFCs have been in use since the 1950s in a range of industrial applications, particularly at airports and major hazardous facilities, including refineries, fuel and chemical terminals, and firefighting and training facilities, with the highest proportion of use, I am advised, in firefighting foams for liquid fires. Although not banned, I am advised that they have been largely voluntarily phased out, in this state at least, and replaced by chemicals that break down faster. My advice is that they were phased out by the MFS in 2007.

In 2010, nine new chemicals, including PFOS, were added to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. The Australian government is currently undertaking work to ratify this amendment, I am advised. I understand also that the Australian Department of Defence has been subjected to considerable community and media attention as a result of the identification of PFCs at defence bases, notably at Williamtown in New South Wales and Oakey in Queensland, where it is known that it has migrated to groundwater and nearby water bodies. As a result, Defence has embarked on a national review of its use of PFC-containing firefighting foam. Defence has identified 16 sites across Australia that have been subjected to the use of PFC-containing firefighting foams, including at the Edinburgh Royal Australian Air Force Base.

I understand that testing of council-owned public water bores has commenced at the Edinburgh RAAF Base, or will commence shortly. The EPA licences the City of Salisbury for its managed aquifer recharge scheme, and the licence requires monitoring for a range of parameters but not PFCs. Given the investigation of the RAAF Edinburgh, the EPA has discussed the need to test for PFCs with the council.

I am informed that council took samples in May and June of this year but have not yet received those results—at least I haven't been advised of them. The Mayor of the City of Salisbury on radio on 21 June advised that council was taking precautionary measures and testing water samples from the area and confirmed that the council had not yet received the results. As part of its review of PFCs, the EPA is discussing the need to test for PFCs with other operators of managed aquifer recharge schemes in close proximity to potential sources.

I can advise that in South Australia groundwater is not widely used for drinking, and tap water is not sourced from groundwater in any great amount. The SAEPA has advised the Department of Defence of its obligations under the Environment Protection Act 1993 for any offsite work undertaken and the need to develop a meaningful and effective community engagement program to ensure the local community is informed and engaged throughout the process.

Recognising the potential concern and the scientific uncertainty around the health effects of these chemicals, a meeting of the Australian chief health officers has developed a national fact sheet, which is available from the commonwealth Department of Health website. I am informed the fact sheet was developed by the Environmental Health Standing Committee and endorsed by the Australian Health Protection Principal Committee on 15 March 2016. I will keep a close eye on the national investigations, particularly those at RAAF Edinburgh, and work closely through the EPA with the City of Salisbury in its consideration of the test results that are yet to be received.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:00): Supplementary question: given, as the minister I think has acknowledged, that the potential source of pollution is on commonwealth controlled land, what power does the South Australian EPA have to direct on-site monitoring or testing?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:01): We have an advisory role; we do not have any particular power on commonwealth land. The same thing would

apply to the Adelaide Airport, for example. But, nonetheless, we work very closely with organisations and usually our involvement is welcome, and I expect it has been in this case and will continue to be.

ADELAIDE PRE-RELEASE CENTRE

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Can the minister advise the house about the recent visit by His Excellency the Governor-General and Lady Cosgrove to the Adelaide Pre-release Centre on Monday 20 June 2016?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for her question. I was very honoured earlier this week, on Monday, to meet His Excellency the Governor-General of Australia, the Hon. Sir Peter Cosgrove and Lady Cosgrove, who came to the Adelaide Pre-release Centre this week. This was quite an honour for a number of people, including myself, but particularly for the staff and those who are associated with the Adelaide Pre-release Centre. It was an outstanding opportunity to speak to someone with a national perspective on the corrections system.

It was clear from my time with His Excellency that he has a real passion for rehabilitation and reintegration programs and the incredible good they can bring. David Brown, the chief executive of the Department for Correctional Services, the APC General Manager and I led a tour of the centre for His Excellency, showcasing some of the initiatives running at the Adelaide Pre-release Centre (or the APC).

The APC was established in 1984 and is South Australia's main pre-release facility for male and female prisoners. The prison is located within the Northfield precinct and has the capacity to accommodate 80 low-security male prisoners and 24 low-security female prisoners in cottage-style accommodation. Prisoners at the APC are generally in there for the last 12 to 24 months of their sentence, and are able to participate in accompanied and unaccompanied family leave and education programs, as well as, critically, work release and community service programs.

Male and female prisoners may face many barriers on the road to successful reintegration back into the community beyond the nature of their original offending, simply by virtue of being imprisoned. While Corrections can offer support to prisoners to gain or improve marketable skills, securing employment prior to or just after release has been shown to be one important component in overcoming the key challenge when exiting prison, namely, staying out of prison. This is obviously of critical importance to the individual seeking reintegration within society, but it is also important to our community as a whole, because when a former prisoner falls back into committing crimes there is a substantial cost associated with that. There is a social cost to the community as more people become victims, and there is a financial cost to the taxpayer as our budget needs are substantial as we need to spend more money on incarceration.

A united approach to pre and post release training and employment improves a prisoner's motivation to go straight because there is a light at the end of the tunnel by means of providing financial support to themselves and indeed, occasionally, to their family. A number of prisoners in South Australian prisons who work in prison-based industries also attend specialised programs, vocational training and education courses. It is not just specific to the APC, though there is a strong emphasis here given that these prisoners are nearing the end of their sentence.

Examples of vocational training include getting a white card, first aid, welding, traffic management, WHS, agri-foods, forklift, working at heights, computer courses, learning to drive and other qualifications that may be required, depending on the prisoner's particular employment focus. Applying these skills and qualifications in the Prison Industries workplace and not just in the classroom has shown to be highly effective and helps prisoners to be work ready on their way to paid employment.

There are a number of things that we know from enormous amounts of experience and research that shows us that if a prisoner is able to achieve three key things post their release, the likelihood of them reoffending dramatically reduces. One of those things is access to housing post their release; the second is the quality of support they can get from family and friends and the positive

influence they can have upon an ex-prisoner to prevent them from reoffending; but the third thing, and this is A1 critical to ensure they are not likely to reoffend, is the likelihood of having a job.

If a prisoner comes out of prison and is able to become an employee the likelihood of them reoffending dramatically reduces. So much of the work that is done at the APC is orientated toward giving that ex-prisoner the chance to be able to get a job and all the dignity that comes with employment. That is why the work that is done at the APC is so critical. The APC has partnerships with a whole range of organisations in order to be able to achieve this objective.

I learned about one of these on Monday with Seaview Joinery that has a work release program. The Governor-General and I met a man on Monday who now has paid employment at Seaview Joinery. Seaview Joinery has done a great thing by employing this individual and giving him a new lease on life and the pride and the dignity that this gentleman could talk of as a result of employment that he has was nothing short of inspirational. This gentleman now has his life very much on track and has been out of prison for a number of years.

These are the stories that we want to replicate. Other partnerships are with Cleland Wildlife Park, the South Australian Amateur Football League—that has a program which we are working on and which I am looking forward to talking about more in the future—the National Parks Program, and Housing SA has a restoration program, and there are others. These are the critical works that I found incredibly inspiring as I learnt more about it as time went on.

Just as equally, the Governor-General of the nation was utterly impressed with the work that goes on with the APC. He was very quick and keen to congratulate all the work that is going on in that centre. We want to take those congratulations on and use it as a source of inspiration to continue to enhance the model that we are working on at the APC and we want to continue to see it developed into the future.

WATER ALLOCATION

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:08): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the River Murray questions about water allocation to irrigators.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: In the last few weeks the minister made an announcement that high security water allocations to irrigators along the River Murray would be reduced from what they hope is a 100 per cent allocation to a 36 per cent allocation.

A similar announcement was made by a former minister, the Hon. Paul Caica. In a given year a few years ago the minister made an announcement that there would be even less than 36 per cent allocation. As a result of that, many irrigators went to their banks and purchased temporary water. Less than a couple of months after that announcement, the Premier made an announcement that there would be an additional increase in water allocations.

I am advised that irrigators, based on the minister's announcement, have been to their banks and have purchased temporary water in this financial year so that they can have carryover water to get through what is an unacceptable allocation at this point in time. I am also advised that many of these irrigators are very stressed as they approach a season not knowing whether they are going to be able to get the production opportunities and requirements for financial cash flow.

I would ask the minister to actually answer these three questions. My first question to the minister is: has the minister left water allocation up his sleeve, and has he announced a 36 per cent water allocation based on an absolute worst-case scenario? Has that assessment of that allocation worked on a scenario that there would be no inflow into the water system of the Murray-Darling Basin for this next irrigation season?

Secondly, can the minister advise the house whether his department has told him that that is already flawed because there are already inflows into that system? The third and final question is: is the minister prepared to comment on or agree with irrigation trust authorities in the Riverland that are telling some irrigators, I am advised, that they could end up with as much as total allocation for this irrigation season? I ask for an answer to those three questions, not diatribe from a briefing note.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for his stupid question. He is worried about getting diatribe from a briefing note. You are going to get better information from a briefing note than you will ever get from his questions and his explanation. What an embarrassment this man is to this chamber.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Stop being so arrogant. That's the hallmark of this government: arrogance.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: He does not even understand the first basic—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Right from the very top. It's happening in South Australia right now: arrogance.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Those opposite do not give a damn either. The honourable member, in asking this question, should at least do the very basic research into what allocations mean. He has shown by his question that he has no clue, not a single clue. I will have to try to break it down to very simple things for the honourable member to understand.

The first thing is this: this is the first year we have given early opening allocations. Historically, our allocations are issued in June. But the industry itself, the irrigation community, came to the government and said, 'We think it would be beneficial for us if you give us early allocations like they do in Victoria.' That is exactly what we have done. But it is incumbent on the Hon. Mr Brokenshire and others to understand what that means.

When you give opening allocations, you give them based on the previous several months of inflows into the system. If you are giving early opening allocations, in April, you are basing that on what has been coming into the system in the previous three months, which, surprise surprise, is summertime. The usual allocations in June are based on what comes into the system through the autumn and winter rains. That is why there is a difference.

Early opening allocations will always, generally speaking, be lower than what the opening allocations will be in June. That is the first thing the Hon. Mr Brokenshire needs to try to understand. This is what the Victorian irrigators have been living with for a long time. They understand it, the irrigator trusts understand it and the irrigators themselves understand it. The Hon. Mr Brokenshire clearly has not got the first clue. So let me take it back to first premises for him. As I have previously said in this house, the outlook—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: He's going to sleep?

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: No, I am listening to your nonsense.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: I want answers to my questions, not a lecture from a failed schoolteacher.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I don't know who you're referring to—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: You're the worst water minister we've ever had.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I am not sure who you are referring to in that respect, Mr Brokenshire, but it is better to be a failed schoolteacher—at least you have some achievements teaching children—than a failed Liberal government minister, which is the only record the Hon. Mr Brokenshire has to be complaining about.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: We fixed your mess up, mate, and you've done it all again! You've just done another State Bank mess again!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: You've done it again!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: What an embarrassment this man is.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: You've bankrupt the state twice!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: No wonder the Liberal Party would not have him back, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, just sit down for a minute. We have 7¼ minutes to go. There are a number of crossbenchers who want to ask questions, who may get an opportunity. I think the Hon. Mr Brokenshire, you have asked your question, you might not like the answer, but it is the answer you are being given, so let's all sit in silence and get on with question time. And the Leader of the Opposition, just show a bit of responsibility at question time. Minister.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you Mr President. The Hon. Mr Brokenshire, I am sure, will listen in silence to my erudition.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, just get on with your answer, please.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: As I have said previously in the house, the outlook for the River Murray water resource availability in 2016-17 continues to be poor due to dry conditions and low storage volumes upstream. In the light of this, on 28 April I announced a minimum opening allocation—on 28 April, Hon. Mr Ridgway, listen for a change—a minimum opening allocation for SA River Murray irrigators of 36 per cent for 2016-17. This opening allocation will apply to holders of all consumptive entitlements, other than those entitlements held for critical human water needs purposes.

The announcement was based on a conservative planning scenario, and I have mentioned that before, Mr President, based on a conservative planning scenario in which only five in 100 years would have lower inflows. I also announced that private carryover will be available for holders of eligible entitlements in 2016-17. For example, irrigators can carry over unused allocations from 2015-16 up to 20 per cent of entitlement volume. Allocations traded from interstate will now, for the first time, also be factored into eligibility. I will announce the actual opening water allocations before 1 July 2016.

Increases above the opening allocation, back in April, for the Hon. Mr Brokenshire, who may not be following, for irrigators will require improvements in water resource availability above the level assumed in the opening scenario. For example, by the end of 2016-17 irrigation allocations would increase to 65 per cent if water resource availability reaches 1,310 gegalitres under a very dry scenario, and irrigation allocations will be at 100 per cent if water resource availability reaches 1,560 gegalitres under a moderate scenario. High reliability irrigation allocations under a similar very dry scenario for the River Murray system in Victoria are expected to commence on 0 per cent allocation and in the Goulburn River system in the range of 0 to 1 per cent, is my advice.

High reliability irrigation allocations for the River Murray in New South Wales are estimated to commence at around 80 per cent allocation. It should be noted that at 80 per cent allocation this volume is less than the volume allocated at 36 per cent for River Murray allocations in South Australia. In subsequent allocation announcements there may also be scope to revisit allocation for irrigators in light of water availability in the Adelaide Mount Lofty Ranges, which affects Adelaide's demands on River Murray water, and/or the outcomes from a cost-benefit study on the potential use of the Adelaide Desalination Plant to offset reductions.

I know it is very difficult for the honourable member, but what he needs to understand is the government cannot allocate water that is not in the system. The government cannot allocate water that is not in the river system. So, the honourable member might care to refer to an article that appeared in the *Adelaide Advertiser* on 30 May. There was a graph, a table, in that article which showed water inflows into the system over a previous number of years, I have forgotten how many it was, it might have been five or 10 years. In relation to the water inflows into the system for the

previous 12 months, you could not see it on the chart, you could not see any colour in the bar of inflows in the last 12 months, that is because the inflows have been very low. That is why we have low opening allocations.

Had we stuck to just the June allocations, with the benefit of the inflows that come in in the preceding three or four months, it is possible—we do not know what the final figure is yet—the allocations would have been higher, but that is to ignore the point that the industry actually asked for early opening allocations, early opening allocations, which means then you base those early opening allocations on the information you have before you of what is in the water system now. Not what you hope it might be, because that could lead to some very serious mistakes down the track. You can only deal with the information that is before you, you can only deal with the water that is in the system, and to do otherwise would be misleading.

The Hon. Mr Brokenshire, if he needs a refresher in this, I can bring some officers in to his office and sit him down and go through it. It is important that he understands this. The industry asked for these early opening allocations, understanding what it meant. It is incumbent upon the Hon. Mr Brokenshire that he understands what it means as well.

BUILDING FAMILY OPPORTUNITIES

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:19): My question is for the Minister for Employment. Can the minister advise the chamber how many people have gained employment through the Building Family Opportunities program since the program was extended in 2014?

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Could I have a bit more information?

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: The minister has asked for more information, Mr President. It is a program called as I have described, and the chamber was informed about it by the former leader of the government, the Hon. Gail Gago, in question time on 19 June 2014.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his very important question. He regularly asks very sensible, well thought out questions on many areas. He has asked very good questions about the Micro Finance Fund and a whole lot of other areas. I don't have information on that particular program.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to go away and find out about that particular program.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: We have 1¼ minutes to go. The Hon. Ms Franks would have liked to have asked a question, but I don't think it is going to happen. Minister, is that it? Have you finished?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No. For the honourable member's information, there is a whole range of programs in my portfolio areas that are great programs that provide jobs, and I know the honourable member is familiar with a number of programs. He regularly asks about those programs. The SA Micro Finance Fund, as the future leader of the opposition in this place, the gallant Hon. Andrew McLachlan, is well aware, has provided a number of grants over a couple of rounds to a whole range of South Australian firms and start-up companies.

We have programs where we work with our universities, including the NanoConnect program with Adelaide University and the Flinders University Medical Device Partnering Program. Our Innovation Voucher Program has been very successful in providing jobs through innovation in this state. We have manufacturing technology programs. Our Business Transformation Voucher Program has had great success in helping businesses transform to meet the challenges of the future. There are many other ways that we have provided job creation programs, not just in areas that I have direct portfolio responsibilities over but in areas right across government. It is a great focus of this government that it is every minister's business to make sure that they are doing all they can to provide jobs in South Australia.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRICITY AND GAS) BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (YOUTH COURT) BILL*Final Stages*

The House of Assembly does not insist on its disagreement to amendments Nos 1 to 5 made by the Legislative Council.

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (PRESCRIBED DRUG OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL*Conference*

The House of Assembly requested that a conference be granted to it in respect of certain amendments to the bill. In the event of a conference being agreed to, the House of Assembly would be represented at the conference by five managers.

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:26): I move:

That a message be sent to the House of Assembly granting a conference as requested by the house; that the time and place for holding it be the Plaza Room on the 1st floor of the Legislative Council at the hour of 9.45am on Thursday 23 June 2016; and that the Hon. John Darley, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Andrew McLachlan and the mover be the managers on the part of this council.

Motion carried.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

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

*Matters of Interest***VIETNAM ENVIRONMENTAL DISASTER**

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:27): I rise to speak about an ongoing environmental disaster in Vietnam. The mass death of fish along the north-central coast of Vietnam is a significant concern for many Vietnamese people as well as the Vietnamese community living overseas. I am told that since early April 2016 tonnes of dead fish have been washing ashore along hundreds of kilometres of coastline.

This is a tragedy, because many people depend on fishing and tourism to support themselves and their families. Around 13 million Vietnamese people currently live below the poverty line, on as little as \$2 a day. This disaster puts livelihoods at risk, as fishermen can no longer turn to the seas and live off their daily catch. Furthermore, affected people are left starving or otherwise face serious illness by eating contaminated fish.

There are allegations that a local steel plant owned by Formosa Ha Tinh Steel, and operating in the area, is responsible for a leak of toxic chemicals through illegal pipes, which is causing the mass fish death. I am advised that the Vietnamese government promised to investigate when this issue was first brought to light months ago, but thus far people have been kept in the dark.

I am told that thousands of people took to the streets of Vietnam in the past month, demanding answers from the government and appealing for better environmental protection. Sadly, these demands were ignored and, in some cases, people were detained by the police. What concerns local communities is that even now the official cause of this crisis is unknown. There are widespread suspicions that corruption between government officials and Formosa Steel is the reason behind the Vietnamese government's silence.

Any individuals or corporations found to have acted unlawfully must be held accountable by the Vietnamese authorities. If contamination was caused by the Formosa steel plant, then its operations must cease immediately until the plant complies with all environmental regulations.

Rallies are being held around the world by Vietnamese people living abroad, in support of their former compatriots. I commend the Vietnamese community in Australia for their campaign to raise awareness about this environmental disaster. I congratulate members of the Vietnamese community in South Australia, whose voices rang out strongly during the rally held recently in front of this parliament. We are fortunate to live in a transparent and compassionate country like Australia. When Australia has been faced with disasters that devastated communities, such as drought, bushfires and floods, the Australian government would step in and provide emergency relief to give people a helping hand during this difficult period. Government transparency is paramount during any disaster. American author Suzy Kassem said, and I quote:

A great leader must serve the best interests of the people first, not those of multinational corporations. Human life should never be sacrificed for monetary profit.

In light of the suffering, I call on the Vietnamese government to put these words into action by disclosing the cause of this environmental crisis without delay. With livelihoods at stake and families gripped by financial hardship, Vietnamese people are in desperate need of financial assistance. I call on the Vietnamese government to keep its people informed about this crisis and provide them with adequate emergency relief.

I am told that, during President Obama's recent visit to Vietnam, the United States offered to independently investigate the suspected toxic leak. Unfortunately, this offer was refused. If the government is incapable of conducting the investigation, they should not let Vietnamese people continue to suffer for the sake of saving face. I urge the Vietnamese government to call on the international community to intervene and provide much-needed relief.

LR&M CONSTRUCTIONS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:32): I am delighted to rise today to speak about the incredible contribution by the civil industry of South Australia, and in doing so, put the spotlight on a proud South Australian family business, LR&M Constructions. As the shadow parliamentary secretary for small business and investment, I have the privilege of working closely with many industry bodies and business associations, including the Civil Contractors Federation, CCF SA, and the Urban Development Institute of Australia, UDIA (SA). This month, I was very honoured to be invited to the UDIA's event, which was sponsored by LR&M Constructions, as the company chose to mark its 50th anniversary year at the June luncheon.

Many South Australian businesses have to overcome difficult challenges to operate in the tough economic climate in South Australia. For a local family business like LR&M to reach a milestone of 50 years in its operation and to continue to make a difference in the industry and for the South Australian community, it ought to be highlighted and congratulated. LR&M Constructions, led by chairman John Chamberlain, has played an integral part in building South Australia over the past 50 years, collaborating with various companies and project teams to deliver residential development projects and nation-building infrastructure that are now an integral part of our state.

Many of my parliamentary colleagues, of course including the Hon. John Dawkins, and I have had the great privilege of knowing John and Yvonne Chamberlain and their family over the years. They are just wonderful people. They have a resilient commitment to working closely with the development industry in building South Australia. Their sound business acumen, exceptional personal and professional qualities, along with strong family values, demonstrate what a proud South Australian family business is all about. It is a great success story that is a source of inspiration to all of us.

That their relationships within the civil and development industry have sustained LR&M's business for over half a century is testimony to the values of their founders and the fortitude of those who have followed. LR&M Constructions was established by the Chamberlain family by Mr Lionel John Chamberlain, with his wife Mrs Miriam Chamberlain and son, Ronald Chamberlain. The company name, LR&M, came from the initials from the first names of each of the founders: Lionel, Ronald and Miriam.

The company had a humble beginning in 1966 and started as a one-man trucking operation founded after World War II by John Chamberlain's father, Lionel. LR&M was always a family company and remains so today, with John, his wife Yvonne, son Rob and two nieces, Britt and Amanda, forming a strong and cohesive workforce and management of the company.

Over the past 50 years, the organisation has operated right across the construction sector, with activity spanning earthmoving, civil contracting, quarrying, ready-mix concrete supply, pre-cast concrete product manufacturing, civil construction, residential subdivision, and land development. Today, family-owned LR&M is one of South Australia's most successful civil construction companies, employing 75 staff and with an annual turnover of about \$30 million.

The company specialises in civil infrastructure works across the public and private sector and has built a particular reputation for wetlands development, earthworks, roadworks, airport runways, etc. LR&M has a diverse range of skills and expertise allowing them to be totally flexible in the range of projects that can be undertaken.

Due to their incredible dedication and hard work, LR&M has been awarded a number of distinguished industry awards throughout their history. The Institution of Engineers Australia SA Division awarded them South Australian Engineering Award. LR&M won these award in 1987 for the Lochiel Trial Pit Project, then again in 2002 for the Southern Expressway Stage 2.

CCF SA, in the Earth Awards, awarded LR&M the South Australian Award in 1995 for the Barker Inlet Wetlands and in 2001 for the South Expressway Stage 2. The Civil Contractors Federation also awarded them SA Training Awards' Award of Excellence in 2011. In 2016, CCF acknowledged the President's Lifetime Achievement Award, awarded to the company and to John Chamberlain. John Chamberlain is a true gentleman and a well-respected leader within the civil industry. He has been awarded a number of life memberships for his contributions, including:

- Earthmoving Contractors Association of SA Life Membership in 1990;
- Civil Contractors Federation Life Membership in 1996;
- Civil Contractors Federation Hall of Fame in 2012; and
- Urban Development Institute of Australia Fellowship Award in 2013.

It is my honour today to convey my heartfelt congratulations to John and Yvonne Chamberlain and the entire team of LR&M Constructions for their 50 years of achievements in South Australia.

FEDERAL ELECTION

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:38): While Dignity for Disability is not running in the federal election, we certainly have plenty to say about this national poll. Firstly, we believe that people with disabilities have the same right to access voting, and all the information associated with it, as everyone else on the electoral roll. This means a few things, depending on the disabilities that a person might have, and how that impacts on their access to policies and announcements in the media and on websites as well as leaflets posted out to voters. Your disability, or status as a family carer, might also impact on how you vote on or before polling day.

If you have an intellectual or cognitive disability, or brain injury, for example, it may be helpful if political candidates and parties can provide policy information in the simplest language possible. Easy English is best practice, but straightforward explanations certainly help too. How our national economy operates and all the policies and laws that define how we operate as a society can be difficult to comprehend.

Explaining things clearly also assists young people voting for the first time, and electors with a non-English speaking background. It ensures not just policy experts, political journalists and politicians can understand the matters being discussed, because as we all know that many of these can be very complex. Similarly, if you have a sensory disability such vision impairment, blindness or you are deaf or hard of hearing, you may need either audio description, open captions or AUSLAN interpretation for video.

If you are blind, you can register to vote electronically over the phone at federal elections—and Dignity for Disability has brought legislation to the parliament to achieve that here in this state—

ensuring that your vote remains anonymous, as the rest of the population can enjoy. This mechanism is not currently available at state elections, and it is something that we will again be attempting to change in the near future.

It is also helpful to blind and vision-impaired voters if some materials are provided in alternative formats. People with physical disabilities and medical conditions might need to vote, or choose to vote, using a postal method. You can be registered with the Electoral Commission to do this ahead of election day on 2 July but, of course, this should not be the only option. Our legislation also calls for a greater number of accessible polling booths.

If you do plan to vote on 2 July and use a mobility aid such as a wheelchair, you may well require greater accessibility at a polling booth. Currently, only about two-thirds of polling booths are partially or fully accessible, and this can be checked on the Electoral Commission's website, in newspapers next week or by calling the commission on 13 23 26.

Another consideration Dignity for Disability believes is very important ahead of casting votes is to check the commitment of each candidate and party to support the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS). With the full rollout commencing here in South Australia on 1 July, we believe it is important to assess what commitment politicians in both the House of Representatives and the Senate have to the provision of the NDIS as legislated and all the funding and resources needed. We say 'as legislated' because we mean in line with the National Disability Insurance Scheme Act 2013.

It is essential and it is an obligation that every NDIS participant have a comprehensive plan and a goal-oriented plan following meetings between the participant (and/or their family carer or advocate) with a qualified National Disability Insurance Agency planner. As the full rollout of the NDIS commences here in South Australia on 1 July (the day before election day), it is critical that the missteps that we have previously seen in reaching for bilateral agreements are overcome and that everyone eligible for an NDIS plan receives all that is necessary and reasonable for them to live with the autonomy, the dignity and the support that they require and deserve.

With these issues in mind, I certainly look forward to bringing this legislation again to parliament to make sure that future state elections are more accessible to people with all manner of needs, whether or not it be disability or another factor, and calling on federal parliamentarians and Senate hopefuls as well to think about what they might do to increase their accessibility to all voters, all of the population, because it does not matter what your disability status is, your right to vote and to have privacy and autonomy in that vote is inalienable.

LGBTIQ COMMUNITY

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (15:42): This past week has seen the world react in shock, horror, anger, devastation and also solidarity in reaction to a number of tragedies. One in particular resulted in a large number of deaths, and that was the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando. Forty-nine people lost their lives, and another 53 people were seriously injured when a gunman armed with an assault rifle took aim at a crowded Latin dance night in the LGBTIQ nightclub, Pulse.

It is, sadly, all too common that events like this occur, but there are some that touch all of us as a community more deeply than others. The shooting at Pulse is one of those events. Around the world, vigils were held for those who lost their lives, those who had been injured and also their families. In Orlando, people lined around the block to donate blood for victims. Muslims came out and held public mass prayers in support of the victims, and our own Adelaide Oval was lit in rainbow colours in honour of the victims, and hundreds gathered at Elder Park Rotunda on Friday night to express their sadness, their shock and their solidarity.

The Orlando shooting has shocked us not just because of the large number of people who were killed, or the horrific way that they were killed, but in particular because of who the victims were. It is a sad reality that LGBTIQ people are often still the target of extreme violence and hatred from society. The Australian Human Rights Commission reports that six in 10 LGBTIQ people are subject to verbal abuse and two in 10 to physical abuse based on their gender and sexuality.

It is still very common for LGBTIQ people to hide their sexuality and gender for fear of discrimination and violence against them. LGBTIQ people have been under attack by society for

much of history, and the Orlando shooting highlights what many like to ignore, but these attitudes still exist and still irreparably damage lives. We have certainly progressed with regard to LGBTIQ rights in recent decades, and the South Australian government has acted to continue to decrease legal discrimination against LGBTIQ people, ordering the report from the Law Reform Commission on discrimination against LGBTIQ people in our laws, which has so far brought about a gender identity and equity bill to remove discriminatory language. However, even moves to help LGBTIQ people have come under fire, such as the Safe Schools Program, a program aimed at tackling homophobic bullying in schools, where 80 per cent of gender and sexuality-based bullying occurs, according to the Australian Human Rights Commission.

Australia lags behind similar nations in respect for LGBTIQ rights. Even the notoriously conservative Catholic nation of the Republic of Ireland has given the right to marriage equality, while Australia languishes behind the curve. These law changes may seem semantic to people not affected by them, but to the LGBTIQ community it is not semantics—it is about their human rights and their place in society.

The Orlando tragedy shows us how important attitudes towards LGBTIQ people can be. The shooter has been variously reported as enraged after seeing a gay couple kissing. A number of reports also suggest that he has been secretly active in the LGBTIQ scene himself, and I quote, 'a man who could not come to terms with his sexuality', which again highlights the absolute importance of education programs such as Safe Schools.

Either way, what is clear is that toxic dangerous attitudes about the LGBTIQ people reside within the shooter, and those attitudes do not exist in a vacuum. We as a society form and shape these attitudes and how they are expressed, with up to 40 per cent of the LGBTIQ people still hiding their identity in certain situations. It shows that Australia still has a long way to go to remove these barriers, and an important path to that is to remove the laws that are discriminatory.

The response to the Orlando shootings shows that we are capable of changing these societal attitudes. The tragedy of Orlando brings with it hope, and it is now our responsibility to use that hope and that solidarity to bring about change in society and tackle homophobia so that in future no LGBTIQ person feels they have to hide or be afraid.

MOUNT COMPASS AREA SCHOOL

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:47): I rise to put on the Hansard public record of the state parliament and the Legislative Council my appreciation of the great work being done at my home public school in our town of Mount Compass, and that is the Mount Compass Area School. The Mount Compass Area School is a unique school because it actually has a full general curriculum program that is achieving very good SACE results and outcomes for students, but it also has a diverse agricultural and environmental program that integrates with TAFE opportunities on that campus. It is a school that is integrated from preschool right through to year 12.

I particularly want to congratulate the agriculture teacher, Mrs Kiara Edwards, and her lovely young son, who are working with the students at the school to actually rear chickens, from the time those chickens effectively are hatched through to the point where they are grown pullets ready to start laying and are then sold to parents and locals of the school. Our own chooks come from that school, and I am very much looking forward to the next batch of chickens the students are currently rearing to go with the other poultry we have for our own personal use.

It takes a very good principal, a very committed and dedicated principal, to run a good school, be it public or private, and we are fortunate to have a very committed, experienced and capable principal who has brought with him and developed around him a very committed teaching staff and SSO staff. I believe they are the three key ingredients to develop good outcomes for our young people. Of course, the better the education, as we all know, the better the chances of that young person's personal future and their contribution to South Australia and Australia.

One of the things that I am concerned about, which I hope will be corrected in this next budget's capital works program, is some of the capital works requirements that are needed at that school. Many parents have said to me that, whilst they are very pleased with the way the school is going, they would like to see some money spent on capital improvements. I would have to agree with

that. I have met with the school council and the principal, and I know that the principal is working with the department on some innovative ways to see how they can improve some of the very tired buildings at that school. Some of them have been there for at least 40 to 50 years and are due for either significant refurbishment or indeed replacement.

I ask the Minister for Education to look at not only the good outcomes coming from that area school—a school that serves a district much broader than our own Mount Compass district, because of what it offers in the way of curriculum—and how good the public education is at that school but to also look strongly at trying to help them with capital works. My own family is involved with the school when it comes to 'cows create careers'. We have just brought back home to our farm a couple of bobby calves that have been at the school for about a month. Every year we put bobby calves into the school and the students learn how to rear them, but at the same time they also learn about the dairy industry. Of course, it is multifaceted as to what economic and job opportunities are available within the dairy industry.

I feel that whether these students go on to an agricultural career or whether the mere fact that at the Mount Compass Area School they have been able to engage with agricultural science, it augurs well for their understanding and knowledge and care of planet Earth, of growing crops and growing vegetables, of healthy eating and nutrition, and the dairy, cattle and sheep industry. They get involved in the led steer competition at the Royal Adelaide Show. All these things help to make a well-rounded student.

I would encourage the principal and his staff to continue to put in the energy and the commitment they have because they are certainly getting great outcomes for their students. As a member of parliament and as a local citizen, having had my children attend the Mount Compass Area School when they were being educated, I am very proud to stand here today and congratulate the school on its efforts. I encourage the government, whatever its colour, to keep a focus on the education department budget because that is paramount also to the future of South Australia.

TOURISM

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (15:53): My colleagues in the other place have often had to suffer through the four-minute burst of shallow political spin when the Minister for Tourism rises to answer a Dorothy Dixier or deliver a ministerial statement. The Minister for Tourism certainly likes to selectively quote tourism statistics when they are favourable and question their veracity when they are not.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Is that the one who flies all over the world?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: That is the one who is always travelling all over the world. Your local member, the member for Mawson, is the one who spends time drinking Argentinian wine instead of promoting our great state. However, I have become distracted, Mr President. Who could forget the way the minister embarrassed himself by questioning the statistical data released by Tourism Research Australia, having previously quoted those very same statistics?

I welcome any increase to the number of tourism visitors and overall tourism expenditure; however, what I do not welcome and what the Minister for Tourism has failed to articulate is that the long-term trend in our tourism industry is not as perfect as the minister would have you believe. One key statistic that the Minister for Tourism continues to ignore is the number of tourism visitor nights spent in South Australia.

Quite simply, the number of domestic visitor nights spent in South Australia is less than what it was in 2003 and 2004. The number of international visitor nights spent in South Australia is less than what it was three years ago in 2013. In 2004, there were just over 21.6 million visitor nights spent in South Australia. Fast forward to the latest data for the year ending March 2016, and there are over 640,000 fewer domestic visitor nights spent in South Australia. Similarly, in 2013 there were almost 10.5 million international visitor nights spent in South Australia, and again fast forward two years and we find that there were some 636,000 fewer international visitor nights spent in South Australia.

The number of visitor nights is a very important indicator. It is an important indicator because a decrease in visitor nights effectively amounts to forgone tourism expenditure, that is, the more

nights both domestic and international tourists spend in South Australia the more money they spend. The more nights these tourists spend in South Australia directly translates to more money spent in our hotels, our restaurants, our bars, our pubs, our shopping centres. It is more money for local business, and importantly it is external money being brought into South Australia's economy. It is all about an opportunity to create more jobs in South Australia which is something this government has failed to do.

Another damning statistic is that South Australia's share of the overall national tourism pie has been trending down for more than a decade. While the number of tourists and tourism expenditure continues to increase, our proportion of the pie is trending down. By way of example, had South Australia's share of the pie with respect to international visitor nights remained the same as it was in 2005, then our state would have had almost 2.5 million more international visitor nights in 2015. That is 2.5 million nights less because we have not kept pace with the rest of the nation.

The Minister for Tourism, perhaps ignorant of that fact, was out there beating his chest and telling everyone how great the state was and how great he was doing. Over that 10 year period between 2005 and 2015, South Australia has effectively forgone 10.6 million visitor nights. Based on the most recent average international visitor expenditure per day, that amounts to just over \$1 billion in forgone tourism expenditure. That is \$1 billion less spent in South Australian hotels, pubs, restaurants, bars and retail outlets. That is \$1 billion less being brought into the state's economy. This is just the international visitor nights, mind you, not the domestics, which would further inflate the figure.

South Australia is in an economic rut. We are fast becoming the economic basket case of Australia. We have the highest unemployment in the nation at some 6.9 per cent, and our domestic growth has completely flatlined at almost 0 per cent. We are losing thousands of our youngest and brightest to the greener pastures of the eastern seaboard every year. The government is going to fail the South Australian tourism industry in assisting it to reach its potential of \$8 billion by 2020. The current projections indicate the tourism industry will fall approximately \$1.3 billion short of its target.

I reiterate that South Australia's long-term tourist trend is not as good as it could be. We have forgone \$1 billion of expenditure. If the government had kept pace with the growth of the rest of the nation, we would not be falling short of that target. South Australia's proportion of the international tourism pie is continuing to trend downwards. I suppose this is indicative of all other key economic indicators in which our state is fast finding its way to the bottom of the pack, if it is not there already. South Australia's tourism industry has a great deal of potential; however, the current government is failing to assist our tourism industry in reaching its potential and regaining our rightful share of the national tourism pie.

UMBRELLA: WINTER CITY SOUNDS

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:57): Recently I had the pleasure of attending the launch of Umbrella: Winter City Sounds music festival. Umbrella: Winter City Sounds is a brand-new live music festival that runs in the city and near surrounds, celebrating live music in Adelaide for three weeks from 15 July to 7 August. On 1 June, the official Umbrella program, Adelaide's latest addition to the festival calendar, was launched to a packed room of industry and artists at popular live music venue The Jade. It featured the release of 30,000 copies of a printed guide packed with over 200 music events for the inaugural festival.

Funded by the state government through Arts South Australia's Music Development Office, the event is being produced by non-profit organisation Music SA, with sponsors including Adelaide City Council, Adelaide Festival Centre, Australian Hotels Association SA and Channel 9, to name but a few. The program celebrates a vast range of genres including punk, electronic, hip-hop, acoustic, metal, folk, pop, cabaret, classical and more, and will be hosted at 60 venues across Adelaide.

As well as the city's best-loved live music venues, performances can also be found at a selection of more unusual spots. Do not be surprised if you see acts popping up in spaces and places not traditionally used to stage live music. Thanks to the Premier actively working to change regulation that has seen live music restricted in some venues, you will see the positive changes coming out of this work in Umbrella and beyond. For example, Wyatt Street UPark will be transformed into an all-

ages rooftop party. Cinema Place will become a public lounge room of electric jams, Adelaide Zoo will enjoy a live music matinee series, and making its South Australian debut is Melbourne's widely celebrated Tram Sessions. Event co-ordinator Sharni Honor was quoted in the InDaily independent news as saying that the new stages 'bring a bit of life and sunshine and those lovely vibes into a somewhat mundane environment.'

To help create this gamut of live music experiences, the festival introduces a unique model for events of its kind, with the combination of a curated program and a grassroots open access element. It has commissioned 17 emerging music entrepreneurs to bring their artistic vision to life, and enticed hundreds of other artists and ancillary services to participate in the festival, creating new paid opportunities for the sector. Music SA is also working with several tech start-ups to deliver the content digitally, including a NXTGIG app, UNESCO Live Music Walking Trail app and more. When interviewed, local artist Thom Lion was quoted by the ABC as saying:

...it shines a light on SA's absolute best talent, and is a great promotional tool and puts everyone to the fore for Adelaide.

Other highlights in the Umbrella program include a mini hip-hop festival presented by The Hilltop Hoods' label Golden Era Records. Families can enjoy karaoke with a live band, and public spaces such as Rundle Mall and the Adelaide Railway Station will come alive with acoustic acts throughout the festival. A new partnership also sees Umbrella: Winter City Sounds working with the internationally recognised Adelaide Guitar Festival, with the inclusion of the new Guitars in Bars program as an official part of Umbrella.

With its breadth, depth and sheer creativity, Umbrella attests to Adelaide's designation as a UNESCO City of Music. It not only activates the city during a traditionally slower time of the year but also rounds out a busy calendar of events, proving that Adelaide extends well beyond Mad March. It is not just the buzz that we all love about our music festivals; it is also about the contribution that it makes to our economy. As the Premier acknowledged on 10 February 2016:

From both a creative and an economic standpoint, live music is an important piece of South Australia, contributing more than \$260 million to our economy and supporting more than 4,000 jobs.

Registration for artists and venues to become involved in the program is free and online registrations are still open until 8 July. It is expected that the event list will grow even further beyond the 200 performances already listed. The Umbrella program really highlights what a great offering of talent we have here, and the only challenge will be making it around to see it all.

Congratulations to Music SA on bringing together such a fabulous program of live music for our city this winter. I encourage all South Australians, and indeed my parliamentary colleagues, to promote and support the wonderful music industry we have here in South Australia and to get to as many shows as possible.

Motions

LGBTIQ COMMUNITY

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (16:03): I move:

That this council—

1. Expresses its heartfelt condolences to the families and friends of the victims of the recent horrific mass shooting in Orlando, Florida; and
2. Stands together with the LGBTIQ community around the world to condemn such a senseless act of violence and denounce all forms of discrimination that may contribute to such hatred.

Like many in this chamber, on Monday 13 June I awoke to the news of the tragic mass shooting at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida. The level of carnage was hard to fathom. Forty-nine innocent people were dead and over 50 injured in what was a horrific massacre. This was the worst mass shooting in US history.

This was an act of hatred and terror that was focused on the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, intersex and queer (LGBTIQ) community. It clearly targeted this community because of their sexuality. It again shows us the prejudice and hatred that surrounds homosexuality and demonstrates that this hatred is still very much alive. It shows us the tragic consequences of that

homophobia. None of us can imagine the sheer terror that the victims would have felt simply because they came from the LGBTIQ community or were associated with it. The perpetrator was a sick and deranged individual.

I am saddened to say that the prejudice and hatred that led to the Orlando tragedy is alive and well in some sections of our community here in Australia. In talking to a gay friend of mine in the past few days, he confirmed to me, with his own experience, how prejudice breeds hate. He recalls how, when he was young, he was savagely attacked one night on his way home. That attack left him with three broken teeth and damage to facial nerves that still affect him to this day. He suffered mental flashbacks of the incident for over six months. A positive outcome, thankfully, was that it gave him the determination to work even harder to stop the prejudice and discrimination that he and others in the LGBTIQ community face every day.

Returning to Orlando, one thing that was particularly disappointing was the response of the Republican presumptive nominee to the US presidency, Donald Trump. His vilification of the Muslim community as a result of the Orlando tragedy was uncalled for and shows why he would be a disaster as the notional leader of the free world. His words breed prejudice and hatred and it ultimately leads to violence. I notice that he did not suggest that the radical Christians should be banned from immigrating to the United States, even when an anti-gay Westboro Baptist Church sought to protest at the funerals of some of the Orlando massacre victims. Now we hear that a Florida prosecutor, Kenneth Lewis, has been suspended by the state's attorney's office over an offensive Facebook rant posted just after the Orlando massacre. Yes, sadly homophobia is alive and well, Mr President.

Another way prejudice is spread is through the use of sham organisations that purport to be authoritative. Let me give you an example of one such organisation, the American College of Pediatricians. On the face of it the name sounds particularly authoritative, but when you scrape the surface you find some interesting facts. The Hon. Dennis Hood quoted the group in a recent second reading speech in this council on the Statutes Amendment (Gender Identity and Equality) Bill 2016. Mind you, the honourable member is not the only person or group to quote the American College of Pediatricians. Another was Family Voice Australia.

Initially, I did a Google search on the American College of Pediatricians. I found it particularly interesting that the group does not list its membership groups or numbers. I then asked the parliamentary library to do some research on the American paediatric bodies and here are some of the details of that report. There are two bodies that purport to represent the views of paediatricians in America: the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) and the American College of Pediatricians (ACP).

I will quote excerpts from the parliamentary library report entitled 'American Pediatric Bodies' by Dr Andrew Russ. The American Academy of Pediatrics was formed in 1930 and is a US professional membership organisation of 64,000 primary care paediatricians, paediatric medical subspecialists and paediatric surgical specialists. It has districts and chapters across the United States and Canada.

The American College of Pediatricians, on the other hand, was formed in 2002, when a group of concerned paediatricians left the umbrella national organisation, the AAP. They protested and ultimately seceded from this principal institution because of the institution's support for the adoption of gay couples. The ACP is self described as being 'as one with Judaeo-Christian traditional values', which it describes as life being at conception and that the traditional family unit headed by an opposite sex couple poses far fewer risk factors in the adoption and raising of children.

The American College of Pediatricians has attracted considerable controversy. The ACP was founded on the belief that the predominant national professional body, the American Academy of Pediatrics, was too beholden to what is considered mainstream nonreligious progressive ideas around children, family and sexual identity. Some commentators have noticed, however, that despite the fact that they purport 'to engender the honest interpretation of scientific paediatric research, without deference to current political persuasions' they have in fact been accused of being dishonest in the interpretation of scientific paediatric research, as well as letting research be persuaded by their own political/social/religious views. Some observers go as far as to say that the group misrepresents

itself as a medical organisation and is instead a fringe group with a deceptive agenda, while others view it as an anti-LGBT hate group.

Clearly, from the parliamentary library report one could say that the American College of Pediatricians is not representative of the mainstream, but they use their notional professional status to masquerade as an authoritative view of American paediatricians, which is not the case. Clearly, the American Academy of Pediatrics is by an overwhelming margin the representative body of paediatricians in the United States and Canada, with over 64,000 members. I raise this to illustrate how the homophobic narrative can seek to claim legitimacy.

The senseless tragedy that occurred at the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, Florida just over a week ago is a wake-up call (if we need it) to address the discrimination and prejudice that continues to stalk the LGBTIQ community. I think my gay friend is absolutely right in his assessment that prejudice leads to violence. Let us not forget that to this day the murder—yes, the murder—of Adelaide's law lecturer Dr George Duncan on 10 May 1972, over 40 years ago, has not seen anyone held to account. At least the tragedy of Dr Duncan's death and the circumstances around it became a catalyst for gay law reform in South Australia.

I acknowledge the role of this chamber in that change. I particularly note the role of the Hon. Martin Cameron, a Liberal member of this chamber, in progressing the law reform in this area. Finally, I wish to ask those opposite to have their federal Coalition members come clean on what question will be put to Australian voters if a plebiscite on gay marriage occurs.

I think this is a very critical question, because there has not been any coming clean on this issue. I further ask—and this is an even more important assurance—that the federal coalition make no exemptions to any anti-discrimination laws during any possible future plebiscite. There are some groups in this country that are clearly seeking to have the federal government, the federal coalition, weaken our anti-discrimination laws during that plebiscite debate, if it occurs. I urge people: do not go there; clearly, do not go there.

In conclusion, one can only hope that the Orlando massacre could be a catalyst for the end of discrimination and intolerance of the LGBTIQ community across the world. We can only hope.

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

Bills

STEEL INDUSTRY PROTECTION BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:16): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the use of Australian steel in designated public works constructed by or on behalf of a public authority. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:17): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this bill is to secure a future for steelmaking at Whyalla and also at Port Kembla in the Illawarra region of New South Wales. As we know, the blast furnaces are at serious risk of closure from a prolonged downturn in international steel prices and also by the dumping of below-cost product by foreign competitors and manufacturers. The Whyalla blast furnace must find a market for the 1.2 million tonnes of steel it has to produce each year to remain viable. It is a continuous steelmaking facility and it is not possible to simply turn it on and off to meet higher or lower demand.

The South Australian government, the South Australian parliament, indeed all Australian governments, should step up to this challenge. It is important to note that the threats to both Australian steel plants are not caused by the workers or their lack of skills or innovation; we have some of the highest skilled, most productive and most innovative steelworkers in the world. However, the global market is in the grip of a price war with government-owned and supported furnaces primarily in, but not limited to, China, selling at or below cost.

Indeed, Australia's ruling free trade ideology has left the industry unprotected against international predatory behaviour. The global steel market is a global failure. We are seeing global economic failure in the steel market and it is the responsibility of state and federal governments to step in and address that global failure. South Australia would not be the first or only government in the world to act on protection of its steel industry.

This bill is largely based on a similar bill introduced into the New South Wales parliament by my colleague the Hon. David Shoebridge MLC which should pass the upper house of that parliament this week, with the support of the Labor Party and the whole of the crossbench. In New South Wales so far only the coalition is voting against it.

The United States, which is often held up as a free market champion, has a long tradition of procurement policy focused on the steel industry. You can see this in states such as Pennsylvania and Illinois. I understand that the origins of my bill, which I say were based on the New South Wales bill, are in turn based on previous work done by legislators in Pennsylvania and Illinois.

When you look at those states overseas, you realise that they get it. They understand the importance of their steel industry. The rest of the world does not understand that, without intervention and with a failing global market, the steel industry will fail. With the loss of the steel industry comes a loss of strategic capacity for world economies, and that is why it is so important that we hang onto that industry here in South Australia. The American federal government has taken action through legislation. Members might have heard of their Buy American Act, and most recently their American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. That act, which is part of the so-called Obama stimulus package, includes a provision that the multibillion dollar public works projects that are funded by that act need to be made not only out of American steel but all manner of American raw materials and manufactured goods.

In recent months, the Senate Standing Committee on Economics has undertaken hearings on the future of the Australian steel industry. It has received strong submissions from industry and unions. I just want to refer briefly to one of the submissions that was referred to by the Australian Workers' Union, and that is a submission prepared by the consulting firm BIS Shrapnel. I will just read a couple of sentences from that report because I think it sums up, pretty simply, the importance of governments and parliaments taking action. The executive summary of this report, entitled 'The Benefits of a Government Procurement Policy for Local Steel', reads as follows:

The Australian steelmaking industry is under severe pressure from rising imports, in particular escalating imports of cheap steel from China. A significant proportion of this steel being exported to Australia is reputed to be 'dumped' at prices which are below the cost of production i.e. at a loss by the Chinese and other Asian producers. For the Australian steel industry to remain viable and profitable, it firstly needs to produce at (or near) capacity and secondly, sell as much of its product as possible into the domestic market, and sell less into the less profitable (or often unprofitable) export markets where global oversupply has pushed down prices and margins.

The construction sector is the key source of domestic demand for steel (over 80%), but demand from the private sector is expected to decline over the next 3 to 4 years due to a contraction in private sector construction and the shutdown of local motor vehicle manufacturing. Public sector demand, on the other hand, is set to increase as public infrastructure construction picks up and (later) as public non-dwelling building moves into an upswing.

That is the consultant's summary: that the key to the steel industry is in public infrastructure spending. What the BIS Shrapnel report said was that at present less than 50 per cent of steel used in Australian public sector construction is produced domestically. That share, BIS Shrapnel says—and I think this is generally agreed—is forecast to fall to just 43 per cent by 2019-20, as government contractors increasingly turn to cheaper imported steel. That steel is imported not because it is necessarily cheaper to make but because it is being dumped in Australia. It is being sold in Australia through a failing global steel market.

The BIS Shrapnel report identifies a readily achievable target of 90 per cent of Australian steel used in infrastructure projects. That would increase annual domestic demand by some 778 kilotons. That would be enough to keep viable not just the Port Kembla furnace but also the Whyalla furnace. So what would the cost of this be to Australian governments? The fact is that it would be insignificant compared to the benefits of local procurement.

The consultants advise that the total cost to all Australian governments of a national steel procurement policy would be in the order of \$61 million to \$80 million a year, and it would effectively

be about one-fifth of 1 per cent of total infrastructure costs. The Greens' view is that that is a very small price to pay. In fact, it is a price that would be paid back many times in returns from state and federal taxes and in the avoidance of additional costs that would come if the industry shut down and towns like Whyalla went into a prolonged economic malaise as a result of that shutdown. The Greens say we cannot allow that to happen. I was interested to get the preliminary response from the state Treasurer to the Greens' proposal, quoted yesterday in InDaily. It states:

Treasurer Tom Koutsantonis told InDaily: 'What a wonderful compliment from Mr Parnell and the Greens that they seek to put Labor's steel procurement policy into legislation'.

I will take the Treasurer's congratulations and thanks wherever I can get it. Mind you, he has not yet said that he is going to vote for it, but certainly he is acknowledging that he is proud of his government's steel procurement policy and he sees it as a compliment that the Greens are seeking to legislate in this space.

One of the issues that is often raised by people who do not believe that we should go down a path of mandating local procurement is this issue of international treaties. As members might recall, I asked a question yesterday, which has now been referred to the Treasurer, in relation to a specific international treaty on government procurement that Australia is about to sign. If that treaty is signed, it will put additional unnecessary barriers in the way of national interest policies such as protection of our domestic steel industry.

My advice to the federal government is: do not sign it. Similarly, the Greens' advice to the federal government is: do not sign the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement either, for the same reason. As members might appreciate, these treaties incorporate provisions that allow foreign companies to effectively sue the Australian government for perceived breaches of these free trade agreements. So, if we try to do something as dastardly as protect our steel industry then the argument goes that we are leaving ourselves open to legal liability.

The point that I have made is that just about every country has found ways around these provisions—certainly the Americans have, certainly the Chinese have. I prefer a more honest approach. I would rather we not sign these treaties in the first place, rather than seeking to find backdoor methods of getting around them. We know that international trade is important but so too is our national interest. I will turn now briefly to the provisions of the bill. Clause 4 is the key operative provision. It is quite simple. It provides:

A public authority must not construct designated public works unless steel, other than excluded steel, used in the construction of the works is Australian steel.

Clause 5 provides:

A public authority must not construct designated public works unless steel, other than excluded steel, used in the construction of the works is manufactured in a blast furnace or electric arc furnace located in Australia.

That gives you the definition of Australian steel. There is a comprehensive definition in clause 3 of what is excluded which, in short, covers any forms or quality of steel not manufactured in Australia, or could not be manufactured in Australia for a reasonable cost, or specialty imported items or components that are not made, or could not be reasonably made in Australia and would impose unreasonable costs if required to be made from Australian steel. So, basically, once you have sorted out those exemptions it still leaves us with about 90 per cent of the steel used in infrastructure projects being able to simply be Australian steel.

In terms of reasonable costs, the bill includes a definition so that that phrase means a cost imposition that does not exceed 20 per cent of base costs. Clause 5 also provides that relevant contracts are to include a penalty clause, because there is no point in having a statutory provision without having another provision that makes it enforceable, and that penalty clause would impose a financial penalty on any contractor who breached the Australian steel requirements, and that penalty would be equal to the product of the quantity of the steel used in the contract that did not conform to the provision of the bill and a penalty price set by regulation that would be at least \$1,000 a tonne.

Clause 6 of the bill provides that all relevant contracts are to include provisions requiring contractors and subcontractors to submit a cumulative steel usage report to the public agency with which they have contracted before any progress payment or a final payment is made. The cumulative

steel usage reports are to specify the quantity of steel that is used, broken down by the origins of that steel, along with evidence that establishes the veracity of the quantities and the origins.

Clause 7 of the bill requires annual reporting by public authorities so that the community can see that the requirements of the bill are being met. The bill also has a number of relevant definitions. I have already mentioned the definition of 'excluded steel'. There are also definitions to ensure that the bill covers the gamut of public authorities and designated public works. 'Public authorities' would include the South Australian government agencies, Public Service agencies, local councils, state-owned corporations or any other personal body that is prescribed by the regulations to be a public authority for the purpose of this act. So, for example, it would automatically include SA Water, but extra steps would be needed to cover public infrastructure projects that are undertaken by private companies, such as SA Power Networks—they would not be automatically included.

The reason I use the example of SA Power Networks is that I received a piece of correspondence just yesterday from someone who had been out and about and got talking to some contractors who were working on stobie poles. In talking to these contractors, it became apparent that stobie poles made in South Australia are made from Chinese steel. Stobie poles in South Australia that are repaired are repaired using Chinese steel.

I have not had a chance to ask a minister in question time yet about the veracity of that claim, but let us say that it is true, let us think that through. The stobie pole, is one of the National Trust-listed heritage icons of South Australia: it is on a list that includes Balfour's frog cakes, Bickford's lime juice cordial, Haigh's chocolates, the Hills Hoist, the kitchener bun, pie floaters, Popeye and the deposit container legislation system. Stobie poles are on that list. If my correspondent is correct, and if all new stobie poles are being made with Chinese steel, then I think that is an outrage. Maybe we will see BankSA and the National Trust, who I think together maintain this list of heritage icons, remove the stobie pole from the list as no longer being truly South Australian.

In conclusion, if the Whyalla steel industry shuts down, it is never coming back. We do not get a second chance at this, but with the right policy we can ensure that this industry, which has operated for well over half a century, operates for another 50 years. We can protect good, honest, solid jobs and support countless more across the state, and we can use the steel industry as a springboard for a high-tech manufacturing revolution, but we will only get investment in the steel industry if we give the industry security, and that means long-term security with a long-term commitment to take Australian steel and use it in public infrastructure projects, and that is what this bill provides.

This is a future that we can make happen if Australian governments join the rest of the world in acknowledging that the global steel market is failing. The Australian steel market is the subject of predatory action from international competitors who have no interest in Australia retaining its steel industry. The national interest requires common-sense intervention to protect the strategic steel industry in Australia. Saving the Australian steel industry should be something that all parties in this parliament, and in other parliaments across country, can unite behind to protect this important industry.

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

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (TRANSPARENCY OF MINISTERS DIRECTIONS) AMENDMENT

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:35): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Natural Resources Management Act 2004. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill is not a large bill. It relates to the matter of the government's current cost recovery from NRM boards which for 2015-16 is \$3.5 million and which rises to \$6.8 million in the 2016-17 financial year,

which is effectively adding to the tax burden of those who pay water levies—and they are our food and fibre producers in South Australia.

The bill has also been promoted by my colleague the member for Chaffey, Mr Tim Whetstone, and he will be introducing it into the House of Assembly at some stage. It is not a complicated bill but it arises because of this particular budgetary decision which was snuck in in last year's budget and which is going to cause quite a lot of difficulty. I would like to thank at the outset the member for Chaffey and also the member for Bragg in this matter.

I understand that there are some similar provisions within the NRM Act already which relate to annual reports and reporting by the minister to the Natural Resources Committee of parliament. What this piece of legislation does is that if there is a directive which is given to NRM boards by either the minister (being the Minister for the Environment) or the Treasurer, those directives will be placed with the Natural Resources Committee within 14 days.

What this does is to expose state government decisions as they have in this instance decided to raid the NRM boards to pay for departmental costs, it will also provide some public exposure for NRM boards that really have been prevented from being able to expose this as a government decision rather than their decision, and it will give early notice to the Natural Resources Committee members so that they are aware when any budgetary reports are brought to their attention. Already within the NRM Act there is a range of similar functions where NRM boards or the Natural Resources Committee must provide certain reports or ministers must provide certain reports, so it is similar to that concept and really is a measure to improve the transparency of the system.

I would like to save the rest of my remarks for the budget decision because it has been outrageous, and in many ways I am speaking also to the motion on the *Notice Paper*, which is the private business, 'That the Report of the Natural Resources Committee on Natural Resources South Australia Business Plans and Regional Levies, 2016-2017, be noted.' So I will not be making a long contribution on that particular motion given that most of my remarks relate to the same matter.

How this came about: the 2015-16 budget contained two items which we did not know at the time were related, but the government has decided to link up. First and foremost, number one, its decision was to abolish the Save the River Murray Levy, which results in revenue forgone of \$108.9 million over four years. We said, in the Liberal Party, that this is long overdue. It has been our longstanding policy, now that we have the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement in place, that there are a number of means to address those issues, and this was really just a tax burden on South Australian households. So we welcomed the loss of that particular tax.

In estimates, we did see commitments that the programs funded by the levy would continue to be funded from general revenue. I must say we were led to believe, by both the minister for the environment and the Treasurer, that they would. I would just like to quote from estimates last year. Minister Hunter was asked in estimates on 22 July 2015 by the member for Flinders:

Mr TRELOAR: I refer to Budget Paper 5, page 7, Save the River Murray. It shows that the Save the River Murray levy has been abolished from 1 July 2015. Minister, will the programs that were funded from the levy be funded at the same rate?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: My understanding is that all the programs will continue. They will just be now funded through consolidated revenue into the future.

Minister Hunter also advised in that estimates session that South Australia's contribution to the MDBA joint programs in 2014-15 was \$15.5 million. Members will recall that, shamefully, this government chose to slash this program and its contribution to those critical programs, but that is a discussion for another day. The budget amount for the MDBA for 2015-16 is \$19.05 million.

The Treasurer was asked similar commitments regarding the Murray-Darling programs by none other than the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Norwood, Mr Steven Marshall, as follows:

Mr MARSHALL: Referring to Budget Paper 5, page 7, it states:

'The specific measures funded by the Save the River Murray Levy will continue to be delivered.'

Can the Treasurer provide a guarantee that all programs previously funded by the levy, including the River Murray improvement program, the South Australian River Murray salinity strategy and the South Australian environmental flows strategy will continue to receive the same level of funding in real terms?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is a matter for the minister in the budget process. There are some programs that are time-limited. They will be funded but, yes, we have replaced the levy with government appropriations through the budget process. The minister will bring to us programs and we will decide in the budget process whether we fund them or not.

Mr MARSHALL: But where it says quite specifically in your budget document that 'The specific measures funded by the Save the River Murray levy will continue to be delivered,' is that conditional in any way? Are you giving a guarantee to the people of South Australia that that funding, in real terms, will be preserved, or are you saying you are not prepared to give that guarantee?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, what I am saying is that, when the levy was in place, there were different programs that were funded at different times, so it is up to the department to come up with a quantum of programs that they wish to be funded. We are not attempting to spend any less on this important work. What we are simply attempting to do is benefit households by giving them a cost-of-living benefit by removing this regressive tax.

Mr MARSHALL: No guarantee.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think I just made it pretty clear.

Which, of course, is his form of spin. Item No. 2 in the 2015-16 budget is an item called 'Cost recovery for water planning and management costs'. We have seen this before. The origin was in a 2010-11 budget, that from the financial year 2011-12 the government would seek to recover water planning and management costs. From 2011-12, that amount was to be \$7.5 million, from 2012-13, \$15.5 million, and in 2013-14, \$21.6 million. Ironically, these items were listed under the title 'Non-taxation revenue measures'.

However, the government did not pursue cost recovery at the time. Why not, one might speculate. I have had speculation put to me that DEWNR (the environment department) did not actually know how much the water planning and management costs were. One suspects, in light of the evidence that has come through, that they had not worked out a justification for it as yet. SA Water has started paying its share since 2012, which in that year was \$16 million.

The 2015-16 version of the water planning and management costs made Liberal members very suspicious that these would result in cost shifting to licensees, and it was therefore the lead item in our questions before that section of estimates. I seek leave to incorporate the specific table from the budget papers, Ms Acting President.

Leave granted.

DEWNR savings measures

Budget implications (\$000)

	2014-15 Estimate	2015-16 Budget	2016-17 Estimate	2017-18 Estimate	2018-19 Estimate
Operating revenue	-13,627	-13,095	-13,554	-13,893	-14,239
Operating expenses	—	4,039	8,723	8,967	9,216
Investing receipts	—	3,000	—	—	—
This initiative reduces the water planning and management cost recovery target set in previous budgets and identifies specific measures to partially offset the budget impact.					
The specific measures are:					
	2014-15 \$000	2015-16 \$000	2016-17 \$000	2017-18 \$000	2018-19 \$000
Revenue measures					
Water planning and management—cost recovery target reduction	-13,627	-13,095	-13,554	-13,893	-14,239
Operating savings					
Corporate support services savings	—	350	357	365	372

	2014-15 Estimate	2015-16 Budget	2016-17 Estimate	2017-18 Estimate	2018-19 Estimate
Accommodation savings	—	—	1,400	1,435	1,471
Patawalonga Lake system—recovery from the AMLR NRM Board	—	952	976	1,000	1,025
Water planning and management—partial recovery from NRM boards	—	2,522	5,767	5,936	6,109
NRM land levies —recovery of levy administration costs from NRM boards	—	215	223	231	239
Total operating savings	—	4,039	8,723	8,967	9,216
Additional sales of land	—	3,000	—	—	—
Net change	-13,627	-6,056	-4,831	-4,926	-5,023

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In those budget documents, the 2015-16 target is \$2.5 million, rising to \$6.1 million in 2018-19, and the total amount is \$20.3 million over the next four years. However, we have, through other means, found that these items are actually \$3.5 million in 2015-16 and \$6.8 million in 2016-17.

The member for Chaffey led the questioning in this section of estimates and specifically asked about the water planning and management partial recovery from NRM boards. He said:

Obviously the NRM will now need to find an extra \$3.5 million of cost recovery through the NRM water levies for water management and planning functions. Recovering these costs will reduce the amount of funding available to NRM boards in 2015-16. The state government recognises that for NRM boards this may require prioritisation of activities in the short term.

I think he is quoting their documents here. He said:

There is an opportunity to consider the extent to which costs should be passed on to the users through increasing water levies in 2016-17, working with the NRM boards to establish a formula to fairly distribute the impact of these costs in 2015-16 and that smooth transition that all ratepayers would like as far as possible. Will the cost recovery be apportioned equally across all regions?

The minister then goes on. He did not provide a huge amount of detail, but said that he had asked the boards to provide him with advice. He said:

I have asked the NRM boards to give me advice on what the fairest way forward will be. I am still waiting on that advice from the boards.

It was confirmed that SA Water and the South-East forests would also be paying a contribution. Mr Whetstone then asked: 'Has the government calculated how many water licences are likely to be affected?' The minister then said:

Once again, you are putting the cart before the horse. I have asked for the boards to come back to me first with their advice, and before I receive that advice, I cannot think hypothetically what those outcomes might be, and I could be accused of prejudging their advice and none of us would want that.

Mr Whetstone then said:

How will this affect the NRM budgets? It is all very well to ask them to come up with their best, fairest, possible scenario, but how will it affect their budgets given that the budgets are already set through their business plans?

The minister started trying to be cute about what year he is talking about. The minister then said:

In which case I can advise that DEWNR will be picking up half of the revenue to be recovered. We have discussed this with NRM boards already and DEWNR will be utilising its own resources to cover half of the projections that the boards will need to come up with.

It is worth remembering that DEWNR has negotiated temporary relief since about 2011 against the cost-recovery target, but from 2015-16 this relief will no longer be provided. Boards will need to plan for their future cost recovery as required under the National Water Initiative—

which is the first time this policy is mentioned—

which this government and other jurisdictions have signed up to.

Not a great deal of detail from the minister through estimates. Since then, the government has clearly tried to sheet home a lot of the decision that it made to the boards. Mr Whetstone asked, 'As a landholder, as a water user, there is an increased tax?' to which the honourable minister replied:

There will be increased cost recovery, and this goes to the very heart of the National Water Initiative. Those people who receive a benefit should be paying for the government resources that are utilised in delivering that benefit. That is what cost recovery is about and that is what user-pays is about. I understand your party has signed up to those very same principles, have you not?

What we do know is that the government failed to consult with NRM boards beforehand. As the member for Chaffey pointed out, they had already set their business plans and this decision was lumped on them. To shift the blame from its own poor budgetary process, it has also, as I said, been made to sound many times like it was an NRM board decision. The government also blamed the National Water Initiative, and has consistently failed to provide details on how the quantum was arrived at.

I suspect that when the item first appeared in the budget in 2011, the government did not pursue it because it had absolutely no justification for that cost recovery. So, I turned to the good old Freedom of Information Act. In October last year I applied under FOI for:

...the dollar breakdown of the components of Water Planning and Management to DEWNR, in context to Budget Paper 5, page 39, DEWNR savings measures, 'Water planning management partial recovery from NRM boards.'

It took a while to get any response, as I think the department was scrambling around, trying to cobble things together. I received a response from the department which I think is so comically *Yes Minister* that it is worth reading into the record:

The dollar breakdown of the partial recovery from NRM Boards has previously been undertaken off ledger on an ad hoc basis using complex models. Unfortunately the costs are not easily identifiable from our financial systems. Information for data up until 2012-13 is only accessible from the previous Department of Water reporting system eFinancials. This reporting system has been shut down and would require a cost to reopen to search for data. This data would need to be thoroughly investigated to ascertain the availability of the information within scope of the request. This would result in many hours of searching and validating data.

To analyse prior years actuals centrally is also an impossible task as there is no one project or activity code that has accurately captured the actuals and as such, a 'breakdown' for anything pre 2014-15 would result in many hours of searching and validating data.

What that says to me is the department was really trying to scramble to avoid providing the data. Of course, I had the usual fudging from departments that we get, 'This is going to cost you too much,' and all those sorts of things. What they are really saying is that, even if they do have the information, they cannot really put it together because it is not available. It is in some old systems, they have not really been kept up to date, and it is all too hard.

This really begs the question that if the department does not keep this information and has not kept it up to date how can they justify putting this cost shift onto water levy payers? Enter, at some point in the last 12 months, the Natural Resources Committee of the parliament, which has parliamentary oversight of NRM. As part of its statutory responsibilities, this committee examines levy increase proposals when they are above CPI and is able to make recommendations to the minister.

Given the magnitude of these increases in the coming financial year and the impact on food producers, it received a lot of evidence this time. Six Liberal MPs presented to the committee on this issue (the members for Bragg, MacKillop, Chaffey, Hammond, Finnis and Stuart) as well as the boards, primary producer groups and the department.

At its conclusion, the non-government members voted against approving the proposed increases to NRM levies in 2016-17, and in that I acknowledge the Hon. John Dawkins, the member for Flinders, Peter Treloar, and the Hon. Rob Brokenshire, who voted against those proposals. The government members voted to allow them.

The government has failed to provide credible arguments to justify these costs. The department in providing evidence to that committee argues that the total cost to it for water planning and management is \$43.5 million. I seek leave to have that table incorporated into Hansard.

Leave granted.

Attachment 2: DEWNR water planning and management costs—by NRM region*

	Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges	Alinytjara Wilurara	Eyre Peninsula	Kangaroo Island	Northern and Yorke	SA Arid Lands	SA Murray-Darling Basin	South East	State-wide**	TOTAL
1. MURRAY-DARLING BASIN AUTHORITY CONTRIBUTION:									19,100,000	19,100,000
Delivery of South Australia's share of water in the River Murray system across the South Australian border, operation of locks 1 to 6, the Barrages and other asset management functions undertaken by SA Water including dredging of the River Murray Mouth and acceptable river salinities. Supports Basin-wide environmental water planning, delivery and monitoring.										
NOTE: In 15-16 the MDBA contribution of \$19.1m resulted in \$25.133m being returned to SA. Of this, \$18.696 million is directly spent in the MDB region on infrastructure and people. A further \$4.887 million is largely spent in the MDB region on infrastructure and staff. The remaining \$1.55 is spent in the AMLR region on staff based in Adelaide and research and monitoring contracts.										
2. RIVER MURRAY OPERATIONS:									2,300,000	2,300,000
Physical operation of the River Murray in South Australia to meet today's competing water resource needs while ensuring a healthy functioning river for the future.										
3. MANAGING WATER LICENSING, PERMITTING, COMPLIANCE AND TRADING SYSTEMS:	1,746,000		12,000		191,000	39,000	2,307,000	1,282,000	2,023,000	7,600,000
Administration of state-wide water licencing systems for all prescribed water resources in SA, including compliance activities to ensure sustainable use of SA's water resources.										
4. WATER SCIENCE:	1,055,000	93,000	617,000	244,000	697,000	598,000	2,075,000	1,021,000		6,400,000
Scientific analysis, advice, modelling, monitoring and data management to inform water management decisions.										
5. WATER MONITORING EQUIPMENT—CAPITAL EXPENDITURE:									2,000,000	2,000,000
Investment to manage and maintain the capital water monitoring infrastructure assets across the state. NOTE: The capital spend over a given financial year by region is risk based over the asset life cycle. The replacement value of assets across the eight NRM regions is estimated at \$180 million. The asset cost base by region varies.										
6. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES:									1,400,000	1,400,000
Provision of ICT infrastructure and systems to support water planning and management.										

	Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges	Alinytjara Wilurara	Eyre Peninsula	Kangaroo Island	Northern and Yorke	SA Arid Lands	SA Murray-Darling Basin	South East	State-wide**	TOTAL
7. WATER POLICY AND STRATEGY: Development of water policy and strategy to ensure sustainable, good quality River Murray, surface water and groundwater supplies for urban and regional towns and agriculture. Also, sustainable management of the Great Artesian and Lake Eyre Basins, and development of sustainable water supplies for the mining and petroleum industries.	70,000		24,000			76,000	300,000		4,230,000	4,700,000
	2,871,000	93,000	653,000	244,000	888,000	713,000	4,682,000	2,303,000	31,053,000	43,500,000

* The figures presented here are intended to provide an indication of what DEWNR spends on water planning and management costs in any given year. These figures are based on 2015-16 budgets and include minor components that would not be recoverable water planning and management costs under the National Water Initiative (such as ministerial services). It should also be noted that this represents a point in time snapshot, and the costs incurred across these functions and regions, and the total cost, will vary from year to year.

** Costs that are very difficult or meaningless to breakdown to a regional level. Includes overhead costs such as finance and business services, HR services, and accommodation costs.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: This is a table that has been provided to the committee, as I understand. It includes \$19.1 million of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority contribution, with the note attached to it:

Delivery of South Australia's share of water in the River Murray system across the South Australian border, operation of locks 1 to 6, the Barrages and other asset management functions undertaken by SA Water including dredging of the River Murray Mouth and acceptable river salinities. Supports Basin-wide environmental water planning, delivery and monitoring.

Note: In 15-16 the MDBA contribution of \$19.1m resulted in \$25.133m being returned to SA. Of this, \$18.696 million is directly spent in the MDB region on infrastructure and people. A further \$4.887 million is largely spent in the MDB region on infrastructure and staff. The remaining \$1.55 is spent in the AMLR region on staff based in Adelaide and research and monitoring contracts.

The reason I have pointed out that particular note is that the MDBA contribution used to be funded by general revenue and appropriation. It was funded for a while from the Save the River Murray levy. In the current financial year we are in, 2015-16, it has been funded from general revenue or appropriation, and next year, in 2016-17, it will be funded entirely from NRM water levies, and yet it is a responsibility of the state as a whole.

The second matter is that the note points out that \$19.1 million of South Australian funding to the MDBA results in a \$25.1 million amount returned to South Australia, which is a net return to this state of \$6 million. Where does that \$6 million go? It is not, unfortunately, reducing the burden for South Australian food producers. In appearing before the committee the CEO of the department, Ms Sandy Pitcher, advised that the \$6.8 million in water planning and management cost recovery, which is in the budget for 2016-17 is going to Treasury. So, let's be honest, this is just a tax. The Hon. John Dawkins asked:

...can you tell me whether the \$6.8m raised (if the levy increases are approved) will go to DEWNR or will they go straight to Treasury?

Ms Pitcher said:

They go straight to Treasury—and I'm not trying to be tricky—in that the savings probably appear in the DEWNR part of the budget, but it's a direct budget return. So, to Treasury effectively—we won't see it.

That is from 27 April 2016. The government-controlled Natural Resources Committee sent, what I think we could describe in Sir Humphrey's language as a brave letter to minister Hunter to outline their concerns, and they clearly had concerns about the lack of credible detail. Their letter is dated 9 May 2016 and it says:

After extensive deliberation, the committee remains concerned with the general lack of detail regarding several matters, especially given the short time frame for consideration by the committee. Although the committee began reviewing the draft levy proposals early in the year and has received some clarifications, information about a number of matters remains outstanding, notably:

- The method of distributing water planning and management costs across all the regions
- The extent to which WPM costs are recoverable
- Which WPM costs are attributable to which impactors
- The removal of the Save the River Murray Levy from the DEWNR budget and how the subsequent appropriation from Treasury to replace it is to be used towards WPM costs
- The marked inequality in available NRM funding across the regions
- The inclusion of corporate services fees as a sharp increase in proposed expenditure of all boards, most notably the smaller boards.

Further:

The expenses imposed on the boards this year are a heavy burden and might have compromised the ability of the boards to carry out their works effectively as well as caused possible damage to their relationships with their communities. This also has the negative effect of discouraging the next generation of board members.

We certainly know that to be true.

As I understand it, the committee is yet to hear back from minister Hunter regarding his response to that. We also know that Primary Producers SA, Livestock SA, DairySA and the various horticultural groups have been actively engaged in this issue. They and some of their members have raised concerns in the media, they have given evidence to the Natural Resources Committee, and they have been trying to extract details from the government about the WPM costs. I understand they have provided spreadsheets to the Natural Resources Committee, and I seek leave to incorporate one of those in my contribution.

Leave granted.

Attachment 1: DEWNR water planning and management costs [#]		
	Amount	Subtotals
1. Murray-Darling Basin Authority contribution	\$19,100,000	
Delivery of South Australia's share of water in the River Murray system across the South Australian border.		\$19,100,000
2. River Murray operations	\$2,300,000	
Provision of River Vessel Waste Disposal Stations to prevent untreated effluent flowing into the River Murray.		\$540,000
Lower Murray Levee Banks		\$200,000
Salt Interception Schemes.		\$300,000
Operations and Maintenance on Riverine Recovery Infrastructure.		\$300,000
River Murray Operations Program.		\$115,000
Hazard Management – Riverbank Collapse.		\$183,000
Water Resource Operations—River Murray bulk water management. ^{##}		\$483,000
Drainage Disposal Basins. ^{##}		\$79,000

Attachment 1: DEWNR water planning and management costs [#]		
	Amount	Subtotals
Overhead costs including finance and business services, HR services and accommodation. ^{##}		\$100,000
3. Managing water licensing, permitting, compliance and trading systems	\$7,600,000	
Administration of 14,722 water licences across 26 prescribed water resources, including water trade, customer service to support business, monitoring compliance with licence conditions and allocations, monitoring meters and water accounts from each licence to whole of resource.		\$4,240,000
Processing, administration and monitoring of between 2000-3000 permits and wells drilled across the state.		\$340,000
Raising, sending and collection of water based levies on behalf of five Natural Resources Management Boards.		\$210,000
Maintenance of the state water licence register, water licensing support for review, amendment and implementation of WAP's, statutory reporting.		\$1,340,000
Ensuring compliance with water licence and permit requirements. ^{##}		\$400,000
Overhead costs including finance and business services, HR services and accommodation. ^{##}		\$1,070,000
4. Water Science	\$6,400,000	
Operation, Maintenance, and monitoring of approximately 3445 Groundwater sites and 286 Surface Water sites for baseline, compliance and impact monitoring. This includes the collection and testing of water quantity and quality data. Impact surveillance monitors the response of a water resource to management actions.		\$2,000,000
Coordinated, timely, fit-for-purpose scientific assessments and advice on surface water, groundwater and ecological science to support water policy, planning and management.		\$1,300,000
Annual status reports prepared for 35 prescribed groundwater resources across the state with comprehensive base reports reviewed and updated every 5 years.		\$340,000
Technical advice and assessments in relation to implementation of water allocation plans (ie water allocations, trading, transfers, variations, well construction permits, drainage and discharge permits, s128 authorisations)		\$300,000
Managing data into, and access from, water resource databases (SA Geodata and Hydstra) that supports water resources planning and management.		\$160,000
Management and maintenance of the State water resource monitoring networks for the River Murray		\$350,000
Provision of scientific and technical Hydrological and hydro-ecological modelling and advice to support policy, planning and river operations for the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin, including analysis of flows, water levels, salinities and river dynamics.		\$420,000
Salinity Modelling and Hydrogeological advice to support the implementation of the water quality and salinity elements of the Basin Plan and the development of the Basin Salinity Management Strategy		\$900,000
Strategic scientific and risk assessment advice to water planning and management in the MDB, including: Basin Plan Implementation, River Murray Environmental Flow Planning, River Murray WAP, EMLR WAP Implementation, water management and planning in the SAMDB and environmental water reports for prescribed areas in the SAMDB.		\$120,000
Overhead costs including finance and business services, HR services and accommodation. ^{##}		\$510,000
5. Water monitoring equipment – capital expenditure	\$2,000,000	
Investment to manage and maintain the capital water monitoring infrastructure assets across the state.		\$2,000,000
6. Information Technology services	\$1,400,000	
Provision of ICT infrastructure and systems to support water planning and management.		\$1,400,000
7. Water policy and strategy	\$4,700,000	

Attachment 1: DEWNR water planning and management costs [#]		
	Amount	Subtotals
Support state participation in the Murray Darling Basin Authority joint venture, to implement the Murray Darling Basin Plan, and to address the state's environmental water planning requirements, water trading and salinity management obligations in the Murray Darling Basin.		\$2,000,000
Support statutory water allocation planning across multiple NRM regions.		\$1,000,000
Support state-wide water security planning.		\$500,000
Overhead costs including finance and business services, HR services and accommodation.##		\$1,200,000
TOTAL	\$43,500,000	\$43,500,000

[#] The figures presented here are intended to provide an indication of what DEWNR spends on water planning and management costs in any given year. These figures are based on 2015-16 budgets and include minor components that would not be recoverable water planning and management costs under the National Water Initiative (such as ministerial services). It should also be noted that this represents a point in time snapshot, and the costs incurred across these functions, and the total cost, will vary from year to year.

Costs that were not itemised in the 'What does DEWNR spend on Water Planning and Management?' factsheet.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Once again we can see the item \$19.1 million for the Murray-Darling Basin Authority contribution. There is an item of \$200,000 for Lower Murray levy banks, \$540,000 for River Murray waste disposal stations, \$300,000 for salt interception schemes, \$115,000 for River Murray operations, and \$79,000 for drainage disposal basins. Those items used to be paid for from general revenue. Certainly some of those items have been EPA and some of them have been DEWNR, and I think it is quite astounding that these items are now being used as an excuse for this government to push these costs onto water levy payers.

I would also like to draw members' attention to the last Save the River Murray Fund annual report, which was for 2013-14 and which was tabled on 5 May 2015 (we are yet to see the last one, for 2014-15). Those items I have just listed are absolutely identical to the Save the River Murray Fund, so it looks like DEWNR has gone through and, in a fairly shabby way, just pulled out certain items and shifted those straight across onto its WPM costs.

The minister has regularly used the National Water Initiative as a justification for the increase in the levy; however, I would like to refer to the Hon. Rob Kerin's evidence to the Natural Resources Committee where he pointed out water planning and management costs, which are an item in the National Water Initiative, a 2004 agreement between states, territories and the commonwealth. He quotes from that document, one of the appendices or annexures. It says:

It is important to note that the costs of all activities listed in the water planning and management activities... will not be fully recovered from water users. Charges for activities undertaken for the government (such as policy development and ministerial or parliamentary services) are excluded.

I note that in the table I have just referred to there is an item of water policy and strategy of \$4.7 million, so that is actually excluded from the NWI. And I continue:

Costs of the remaining activities will be apportioned between water users and governments in accordance with Principle 4. Where costs are recoverable from water users, they will be tested for cost-effectiveness by an independent party in accordance with Principle 3.

Rob Kerin then said to the committee: 'We are actually calling for an independent review; it is clear under the NWI.' I endorse his call for an independent review. The NWI is being used as an excuse, and the flaw in the government's argument is this: that it should be, first of all, partial recovery; there should be transparency, which clearly there is not; and there also should be cost efficiency tests, so that DEWNR can demonstrate that the WPM is being provided efficiently.

We know already that, with DEWNR's corporate cost recovery that it is shifting to NRM boards, it is anything but efficient. Clearly, this is all just an exercise in trying to shift costs in a very underhand way. Unfortunately, we have asked questions of the minister in this place, quite specifically about a number of matters that I have raised, but clearly the minister holds those communities in contempt with the answers that he has provided.

In summary, this decision is unfair to NRM boards, who were not consulted before the decision and are now expected to collect additional levies which were not in their business plans. This certainly does not assist their relationship with their stakeholders. In many ways, I think this decision—I have said this publicly before—is the final straw in any confidence that people might have had in NRM. NRM certainly has had its detractors since its inception; many of those are Liberal members. There are others who have tried to give it the benefit of the doubt; there are others who see benefit in a lot of the programs—and it has run a number of useful programs over the years—but these WPM costs, and also the corporate costs, really are bogus, and are being used, effectively, to fund the department.

Clearly, the Save the River Murray Levy, which was so-called 'abolished' in the 2015-16 budget, has been cost-shifted across from all SA Water users to water licensees. There needs to be an audit or an independent review of costs, as required under the NWI. NRM is clearly now just a taxation system aimed at raising more revenue from South Australian food producers, which puts them at a disadvantage compared to competitors and is potentially costing jobs in our most successful sector, primary industries.

The reduction in programs leads to those paying levies asking where and how the money is spent. There is a complete lack of transparency, and I believe levy payers have been patient enough. The lack of transparency by the minister and his department in providing a breakdown of the WPM costs just shows further ineptitude on his part. If DEWNR cannot justify a breakdown of these costs, then how can they justify this latest cash grab? The minister has stated publicly that he is happy to open up financial records to any interested party, yet his own department cannot even provide those details, as demonstrated through their FOI.

This bill is one effort to improve transparency in NRM cost recovery, and I endorse the bill to the house.

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

Parliamentary Committees

**NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: NATURAL RESOURCES SOUTH AUSTRALIA
BUSINESS PLANS AND REGIONAL LEVIES 2016-17**

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

That the report of the committee on Natural Resources South Australia Business Plans and Regional Levies, 2016-17, be noted.

(Continued from 8 June 2016.)

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (17:10): As a long-term member of this committee, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the Natural Resources Committee's report. First, I would like to acknowledge the Chair of this committee from the other place, the member for Ashford, the Hon. Steph Key, who continues to be an incisive, inclusive and steadfast Chair. I thank the member for her contribution and stewardship.

I am sure that everybody in this place will agree that our long-term economic and social wellbeing depends on the good management of our natural resources. No more important to us here in South Australia is water, a precious resource that needs to be valued and protected on behalf of our community, whether that be for residents, for irrigators or for our environment.

The South Australian government has invested a great deal in ensuring that our natural resources are properly managed. It has also taken up the fight to our interstate colleagues to ensure that they understand how precious a resource it is for our community. A big part of this is South Australia's internationally recognised natural resources management model that directly involves communities in managing a healthy and productive environment.

NRM boards undertake a wide range of important work, including supporting premium food and wine production, ensuring sustainable industries, conserving natural ecosystems, encouraging community participation, developing climate change adaptation plans, supporting regional tourism opportunities, and leveraging a significant amount of commonwealth funding. I commend the NRM boards for this important and vital work. I sincerely appreciate the NRM boards that presented to the

committee during the last few months. It was a valuable experience to hear from them and better understand the vital work they do on behalf of their communities. However, the boards need funding in order to stay in this work, especially in light of falling commonwealth funding.

Regional NRM levies are an important part of sharing the cost of managing natural resources, including water planning and management. The water levies support, among other things, water allocation plans to ensure that we manage water resources sustainably in order to safeguard food production and agriculture into the future. Other activities associated with water management include water licensing; compliance activities; science to support the development and management of water resources; the development, review and amendment of water allocation plans; and debt recovery.

Currently, the state government contributes \$43 million per year towards ensuring our water resources are managed sustainably. Recovering some of the costs involved in water planning and management is in line with the government's commitment to the National Water Initiative's user pays principles, which we committed to nationally in 2011. This is a national commitment.

During the course of the committee's work and the contributions from various members in this place and the other place, no-one has argued that the principle of user pays as outlined in the National Water Initiative is wrong. No-one has argued that those who benefit most from strong water planning and management should not be contributing to the cost of that. We should be clear that, during the course of the committee's work, we heard that 84 per cent of the contribution to water planning and management funding came from the state government, including SA Water's contribution of nearly \$18 million. So, we should be clear that we are talking about a partial cost recovery. In effect, it amounts to approximately 16 per cent of what will actually be spent in 2016-17.

The government is bearing 84 per cent of the cost. We heard on the committee of the NRM boards taking social and economic impact statements to guide their levy rate decisions. I am advised that the South-East and the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin NRM regions undertook an independent assessment—an independent assessment! It showed that for most farms the combined levies, that is, land and water, are less than 1 per cent of a total cost of running a farm.

This government has chosen not to implement full cost recovery, but rather to continue to subsidise these costs to provide some protection to water users from the financial burden. The government is taking a sensitive approach to introducing a contribution from beneficiaries to water planning and management costs. It is important to note that, while all jurisdictions have taken a different approach to issues of water-related cost recovery, South Australia's charges are lower compared to our interstate competitors. As set out in the ACCC's most recent water monitoring report, our \$6.30 per megalitre water levy proposed for the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin for 2016-17 is well below the equivalent charge in New South Wales, which is \$10.51 per megalitre, and Victoria which is \$11.05 per megalitre.

I believe this is a sensible and well-balanced outcome. It is based on extensive community consultation, which has been undertaken by NRM boards, as well as through thorough social and economic impact assessments about the proposed increases. These assessments showed that the levy would not have a significant impact on food production or agriculture in the region or in this state. The regional NRM levies are a way of sharing the cost of managing our natural resources, because a loss of NRM funding will most certainly have a negative regional impact and jeopardise the sustainable management of natural resources in the state.

Before I conclude, a number of issues were raised by my colleagues in this chamber, they being members of the Natural Resources Committee, to which I would like to respond. I was disappointed that the Hon. John Dawkins chose to denigrate a senior officer of the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM because he did not know his way around the Pinery fireground. I know the honourable member was very knowledgeable in terms of the area he came from, but it is my view that his comments were unbecoming, unnecessary and petty, particularly as both the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM and the Northern and Yorke NRM had kindly facilitated the NRC's visit to the Pinery fireground.

I was also surprised that the Hon. John Dawkins went down the path of making the issue an urban versus rural levy payers issue. The Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges region collects by far

the greatest amount of NRM levies, due to the number of levy payers, and in some cases urban metropolitan contributors pay a substantially higher land-based levy, based on higher capital values, than many comparable country levy contributors. I am not sure if the honourable member is suggesting that urban levy contributions should be increased. If that is what he is advocating then let him be clear about it.

Now to some issues raised by the Hon. Robert Brokenshire: first, the issue of recovery of overhead costs incurred by NRMs. The overhead costs we are talking about are the likes of accommodation, electricity, vehicles, fuel, uniforms, computer communications and other on-costs. From my personal experience, on-costs can typically be in the level of 50 to 100 per cent. As an example, when the honourable member calls a tradesman out, a plumber or electrician, if he is lucky he might only have to pay about \$100 call-out fee and then \$100 per hour for the tradesman's services. I can assure you that that is far less than the tradesman (if he is an employee) earns an hour, so the charges in that case cover overheads and profit.

The honourable member talked about another issue, and I presume it was about the Western Mount Lofty Ranges Prescribed Water Resources Area. Yes, this financial year irrigators have had to pay a water levy because the area was prescribed in 2013. I am advised that the water users in the Barossa Prescribed Water Resources Area, the Northern Adelaide Plains Prescribed Water Resources Area and the McLaren Vale Prescribed Water Resources Area have paid water levies since before the NRM board was formed. These three prescribed areas previously, since the introduction of the NRM board, paid water levies of \$5 per megalitre on allocated water and \$5 per megalitre on used water.

What the honourable member failed to mention was that irrigators in the rest of the region had their water levies substantially reduced from \$10 per megalitre to effectively \$6 per megalitre. This was the result of equity being applied to all irrigators in the region. It should be noted that the \$6 per megalitre rate has not been adjusted for the 2016-17 year. I am not sure if the honourable member has a pecuniary interest in this matter but I would have thought he would have mentioned it if he had.

Once again, I commend the NRM boards for the important work they do on behalf of our community and I have no doubt they will continue the good work.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:22): I will make a brief contribution on this motion given that I have spoken at length when introducing my bill just moments ago. The Natural Resources Committee has a very important role in the oversight of these levies. I would like to endorse the comments made on 8 June by our Liberal member on the committee, the Hon. John Dawkins, and also for those who are looking for the full package of speeches on these matters they might like to also read the contributions of a number of Liberal House of Assembly members on 8 June who spoke about levies for the 2016-17 financial year in their particular districts.

I acknowledge the role of the committee. I do not know if the previous speaker wrote the speech, or who wrote it for him, but I thought that it was unnecessarily narky and engaged in shooting the messenger. However, that aside, I am proud of the Liberal members for voting against the levy increases for the 2016-17 financial year. I do give credit to the Labor members of the committee for expressing concerns about the levy increases for the coming financial year.

The way that these increases have been done has, I think, really been contemptuous of water levy payers in South Australia. They are being lumped with a whole lot of Murray-Darling Basin costs which I think most South Australians would say are the responsibilities of the state. We were led to believe, through last year's estimates, that those Murray-Darling Basin costs would be paid for through general revenue and here we are, less than 12 months later, the irrigators staring down the barrel of being forced to pay for them by this very cynical government.

I have often said before that I see this as the straw that will break the camel's back as far as any confidence in the NRM system is concerned. Many people say that they do not know where their levies go. Under the previous system, weeds used to be managed, pests used to be managed, and the water catchment boards operated effectively and their soil boards operated effectively. Now, nobody knows where those costs go. The costs are, in a large quantum, actually being used to prop

up the environment department's budget. Effectively it is a tax, and I think I have outlined that in relation to the bill that I have introduced today.

I would like to acknowledge the work of the boards and say that we do understand what has been shunted upon them by this government. I think it will be more difficult in the future to find people who are willing to serve on those boards. I think it is time that there be a complete rethink about this particular program, given that a lot of the programs that used to be funded are now no longer able to be funded. It is quite a broken system. The grand promises that were given when the system was established by this Labor government in 2004 have shown manifestly to be a complete and utter failure and this government has nobody else but themselves to blame for it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.W. Ridgway.

Bills

WATER INDUSTRY (COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OR DAMAGE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 May 2016.)

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (17:27): I did introduce this bill on the last Wednesday of sitting, and I just wish to conclude my remarks on the second reading speech as to why I believe it is very important that this bill be introduced and debated and hopefully voted on in a bipartisan way. It is well documented that there has been a spate of burst water mains that has wreaked havoc all over Adelaide in the past few months, causing major damage to properties while leaving residents without water supply.

I have personally spoken to some of those residents, and they are not interested in what happens in New South Wales, contrary to what the minister thinks. They are not interested in what happens in Victoria, or for that matter in any other state. What they are actually interested in is getting proper compensation and some care from the government and SA Water when, as a victim, they end up with water on their carpets and other damage.

It is not good enough for the minister, on behalf of the government and SA Water, to say, 'Go and see your insurance company.' It should be that the lead agency, in this case SA Water, the perpetrator of the issue even if it is perpetration simply by the fact of what has happened, clay moving or whatever the minister argues—the fact is there are victims in this and they are not customers of SA Water, they are victims. Their properties are damaged and they need proper compensation.

What is concerning is not only the damage to homes, cars, roads, and lengthy delays for road users but also that SA Water has been slow to respond to these issues. Frankly, they have shown a lack of accountability. The start of a burst water main often can be just a little bit of seepage along the road or coming out onto the kerb. People ring up and report that. SA Water asks whether or not there is any threatening situation, and they say, 'Well, not at this point in time, but water is leaking up through the bitumen.' It could be, I am told, several days before there is even an inspection, and that is not satisfactory.

A number of residents affected lack an appropriate level of insurance cover and are under enormous financial pressure while already suffering from emotional distress. Through amendment of the Water Industry Act 2012, this bill seeks to rightfully compensate the victims of burst water mains and leaks. Under this bill, a water industry entity, that is SA Water, must compensate property owners for any loss or damage caused by water infrastructure.

My advice is that if SA Water does damage to other agencies, such as DPTI or any other government agency, SA Water has to fully compensate the other agencies for all the costs in repairing it back to its original state. Why is it that SA Water has to do that for other government agencies but not for private citizens and individual property owners? Moreover, SA Water is to provide immediate financial relief to affected persons for essentials, that is temporary accommodation, food, clothing, etc., depending on the state of damage to the property.

Under this bill, so that the minister does not flippantly say, 'Oh, we can't support this because people will double dip', there is a clause where there will be no double dipping of compensation. The compensation paid from SA Water to an owner is allowed to be taken into account by an insurer in determining the amount payable under the relevant insurance policy. Importantly, insurance companies will not be let off the hook, which addresses the government's main concern. The water industry entity must also cover the cost of excess or any shortfall payable under an insurance claim.

I am told that most of the time these people certainly are out of pocket for much more than the excess, but my argument is that if they do have a claim, why should they have to pay the excess when they are a victim? I will not go through all of them, because all colleagues know that I would be here for hours—actually here for hours—if I was to list every individual water burst in this state since just March. I would be here for hours. I can just quickly say that there were plenty of bursts in March, there were plenty of bursts in April, plenty in May and they are still occurring as recently as, I understand, yesterday.

In relation to SA Water and minister Hunter's defence, SA Water has claimed that incidences of burst water mains are not uncommon for this time of the year, due to weather changes affecting soil and water pressure. Just as an aside, I happened to talk to quite a senior person who is now retired from SA Water, and he told me that there ought to be some investigation into what has happened since they put the desalination plant through and put pumps on the western side of the main lines and the western side of Adelaide, that is through the western suburbs, to push that water to the east.

He said, 'Maybe you ought to do a bit of investigation there, because you might find that they are trying to push more water at higher pressure through the same volume of pipe and the reality is that you can only, no matter what pressure you put it under, get so much water through a given diameter of pipe before you are going to blow a pipe.' It would be interesting to get some truthful answers on just what has happened.

The Hon. G.A. Kandelaars interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The Hon. Gerry Kandelaars will have a chance to talk about this in due course, and I look forward to his support. I look forward to his support looking after the constituents who he represents, rather than what he generally does, which is to look after the government. He is here elected by constituents right across the state, and he should be out there with a blue jumpsuit and a brown belt too, helping to fix these mains and helping to redress the problems with the constituents, rather than just defending the government.

One thing I have learnt in politics is that no government is perfect. I am sorry to tell the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars this, but no government is perfect, and this government is far from perfect—far, far from perfect, this government, believe you me. We will read more about that, I suggest, in *The Advertiser* soon after about midnight tonight, if you want to get a print edition.

We see an increase in pipe bursts at this time of the year that will continue until the rain settles down, minister Hunter says. However, this is little comfort for those left with water damaged homes, which based on the reports is a substantial number of people.

The Advertiser also reported that water minister Ian Hunter, 'is failing to speak with those affected,' instead shifting that responsibility onto SA Water officers. This is despite the minister conceding that SA Water does have areas that need to improve, including, as he stated in a recent interview with Channel 9, 'customer relations'. The Premier also recently conceded that the government must do more to reach out to people inconvenienced by the bursts. The Premier said:

What we can do though is respond quickly and also show people that we care and then actually offer a helping hand when their lives have been disrupted.

I actually agree with the Premier on that. It should include financial reimbursement. We are not talking about a profit; we are simply talking about financial reimbursement back to cost neutral for the persons affected. That is what this bill is about.

Water infrastructure in some cases is getting up to 80 to 100 years old. It is suggested that preventative maintenance work may not be happening, which is worrying, given the age of the pipes throughout the city. I know for an absolute fact, from inside sources, that when SA Water changed

their outsource company from United Water to Allwater, there was a dropping of the ball and a delay of up to 12 months. The actual replacement program fell apart and did not occur.

It might have been good for SA Water's financials at that time, but they now clearly have to catch up. I know that for a fact. I ask the minister to bring in any evidence he has which proves me wrong. The opposition recently produced state budget documents which show that there have been cutbacks from \$47 million to \$32 million this year in the SA Water pipe network renewal program. You do not hear that from the minister, but I trust that the opposition has those figures, which show a net reduction of \$15 million.

The need for this bill is clear and common sense: victims should rightfully be compensated for the damage and the inconvenience caused by the woeful state of SA Water infrastructure. This bill does not let SA Water or the government off the hook and holds them accountable for their failures, which have caused widespread damage and much distress.

The National Performance Report: Urban Water Utilities prepared by the Bureau of Meteorology, which was used by the minister to praise SA Water, also revealed other things. For example, SA Water takes the longest time, 163 minutes, to reconnect water after an unplanned shutdown. If we want to talk about other states, like the minister always does, the fastest performer was Barwon Water, which only requires 88 minutes on average. SA Water takes longer to restore services, at 243 minutes on average, than any other provider. Why? Please, minister, tell the public why.

They are ranked seventh in capital expenditure per customer to help stop leaks and breaks. They are ranked 10th in capital expenditure per customer to help stop sewerage leaks and breaks. Thus, SA Water is one of the smallest spenders on capital infrastructure of any city service. That is the point: it is the city service. You have to compare apples with apples, and this minister tries to compare a banana with a pear. No wonder things are pear-shaped for the minister and SA Water.

The worst sewerage breaks and chokes per 1,000 properties—29 a year. SA Water ranked eighth for the number of sewerage mains breaks for 100 kilometres of water pipe. I just want to finish on the lack of compensation, as reported by *The Advertiser*:

Paradise resident Linton Schiller and his family have only recently returned to their Willow Drive home—10 weeks after it was inundated.

'Contemptuous was really how I'd describe his attitude when he came out,' he said [of the minister for Water].

[As at 17 May] Mr Schiller said he was still yet to receive any compensation from SA Water.

Another affected resident, Diane Vereyken, still remains out of her home and said she was yet to receive compensation aside from a \$100 voucher on the day the mains burst.

I mean, what a disgrace, a \$100 voucher. This bill will not only provide legislative guarantees but also peace of mind to those who are affected by SA Water negligence. I ask the government to seriously look at this bill and I would applaud the government if it wants to receive the kudos and take this bill over and put its name on it. All I want, and I am sure all my colleagues want, perhaps other than government colleagues, is a fair and reasonable compensation for the victims of burst water mains throughout the state of South Australia. I commend the bill to the house.

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

Motions

CHINESE WELFARE SERVICES OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA INC.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the Chinese Welfare Services of South Australia Inc. for celebrating its 25th anniversary in 2016;
2. Acknowledges the work and commitment of the committee, staff and volunteers of Chinese Welfare Services for delivering important services to its members and the broader Chinese community of South Australia; and

3. Recognises the importance of their contributions in developing tailored programs and strategic partnerships that are socially inclusive and beneficial to members of the diverse Chinese community residing in South Australia.

(Continued from 8 June 2016)

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (17:41): I rise to support this motion. Recently, I visited the Chinese Welfare Services of South Australia and I met with Vivien Shae, the president of the organisation, to see and further understand the operation. Established in 1991, the aim of this non-profit organisation is to advocate on behalf of the Chinese community in South Australia. They provide assistance to new migrants of Chinese descent and offer a range of services to the elderly and fragile.

Since its establishment, the Chinese Welfare Services of South Australia has expanded significantly, offering a range of services to the Chinese community. They now offer Chinese classes to English speaking children, basic English classes for migrants new to South Australia, and a range of home-support services to the elderly. Many of these services are made possible because of dedicated volunteers. With only two full-time workers, they rely heavily on the work provided by nearly 80 volunteers on their team. These volunteers assist Chinese Welfare Services with a range of services, such as help with transportation of their clients, cooking meals for events, administrative work and also teachers for language classes they conduct.

One of the largest services the association offers is in-home support. The service provides elderly clients with assistance in their homes to undertake everyday tasks and it also provides respite care for carers. This service caters for up to 200 clients and is achieved through a number of brokerages with organisations such as care support, ACH, UnitingCare Wesley Brompton and Helping Hand, to name a few. These brokerages provide Chinese Welfare Services with resources and qualified volunteers to run this vital service.

As well as in-home support services, Chinese Welfare Services South Australia offers persons over the age of 65 centre-based care, centre-based care funded by the department for families and communities, and offers a range of activities aimed at increasing balance and coordination of clients, as well as various information services, such as basic computer skills. These activities offer social support for the elderly within the Chinese community, particularly to those who may be at risk of isolation. It also provides an opportunity for clients to stay connected with their families and receive news and information from their home towns.

Another service the association provides is a community visiting service, where volunteers visit older clients, and their carers, in their own homes. This provides an important social support and keeps clients connected with their community. The Chinese Welfare Association is one of very few organisations in Adelaide to assist the Chinese community. Because of this, the Chinese Welfare Association is incredibly important. There are many diverse cultures and languages within China. The Chinese Welfare Services encourages acceptance of this diversity amongst its clientele.

As Chinese Welfare Services are connecting with people from different age groups and many different areas in China, this is a challenge that the association faces as it is important for them to understand the differences throughout Chinese culture. This may be in things such as language and dialect, traditions, and food and cuisine. Through this they are able to offer services to people from many different areas in China and teach their clientele about the differences within the Chinese culture, which is quite diverse.

The number of Chinese persons accessing the services offered by Chinese Welfare Services has increased over time. As an example, the tax help program has increased to 48 participants, the aged-care facility visit program has almost doubled to 40 participants, and their carer retreat has increased from 38 carers in 2014 to over 46 in 2015.

Chinese Welfare Services will be celebrating their 25th year of service to the South Australian Chinese community this year. They plan to continue and expand their work within South Australia and to continue to advocate and support the Chinese community. I commend Chinese Welfare Services of South Australia for the important work they undertake within the Chinese community in South Australia.

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

Bills

**ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA YANKUNYTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (17:47): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act 1981. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (17:48): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016. This bill provides for amendments to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act 1981 (the APY Act) to improve the overall governance and administration of the APY lands by Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (the APY).

The APY Act was enacted over 30 years ago in 1981. It established an APY body corporate comprising and representing all Anangu, and transferred to this body the freehold title of over 103,000 square kilometres of land, as described in schedule 1 of the APY act.

The governing body of the APY is the APY Executive Board. Currently—and this will change—the board has 10 members elected every three years from 10 electorates, with residents of each electorate voting for one representative on the board. The executive board's integrity, leadership and representative capacity directly affects decision-making and good governance of the APY lands.

Strong governance is essential if the APY Executive Board is to operate as an institution that is effective and accountable to the communities it represents. The APY Executive Board has faced difficulties in achieving stable and effective governance, with organisational instability and problems with financial management. However, over the last 12 months significant progress has been made by the APY to improve its administration and financial accountability. A range of new processes have been implemented, including training to develop employee capability with respect to financial management.

APY funding for 2014-15 was released contingent on new requirements and conditions being implemented, which included:

- the implementation of strict delegations for approving payment, with only the general manager having authority for approval;
- the undertaking of an independent audit of spending and financial controls for the period July 2014 to December 2014; and
- a requirement for specific documentation to be provided on the APY website, including minutes of APY Executive Board meetings, monthly financial reports and annual reports.

The Auditor-General noted in his 30 June 2015 report:

It was evident from our review that DSD and the Minister...had implemented more stringent conditions on the release of the grant funding in...2014-15 and...continued to facilitate processes that aim to improve governance and accountability arrangements for APY, including initiating a number of external reviews.

Assistance to improve the executive board's governance was sought by the former minister in 2013 through the commissioning of an independent, limited review of the APY Act. This review examined potential improvements to the election process and the composition of the board. The Independent

Review Panel, comprised of its chair the Hon. Dr Robyn Layton AO QC, Mr Harry Miller, Ms April Lawrie-Smith and Mr John Hill, consulted extensively on the APY lands throughout 2013. The panel visited the APY lands eight times for 24 separate meetings. In April 2014, the panel submitted its final report to the former minister, who provided it to the APY Executive Board.

The key recommendations of the Layton review included creating gender balance on the APY Executive Board, changing the electoral process to improve representation of all Anangu and changes to candidate eligibility requirements for election to the board. The Layton review's recommendations were carefully considered in the development of the draft 2015 bill for consultation.

From December 2015 until May 2016, consultation on the 2015 bill was undertaken by departmental staff who conducted 22 feedback sessions with key APY leadership groups on the APY lands and in Alice Springs, including the APY Executive, members of the Law and Culture Committee and chairs of community councils. Consultation also occurred with government and non-government stakeholders in Adelaide and Port Augusta, and five written submissions had been received.

The feedback received from the consultations, as well as the Layton review recommendations and the government's policy approach have all informed the development of this Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016. In summary, this bill seeks to improve governance and administration within the APY lands through its key reforms, which:

- provide for gender balance on the APY Executive Board;
- establish seven electorates whose composition creates a more even population spread;
- provide for an APY Executive Board of up to 14 members;
- establish APY Executive Board member minimum eligibility criteria, thereby improving board member respect and leadership;
- provide greater certainty for election dates, ensuring elections are held between 1 May and 31 August every three years;
- establish a panel of conciliators, thereby providing a more effective and transparent process for their appointment;
- provide greater consistency of eligibility criteria for APY statutory officers and APY Executive Board members;
- ensure that APY Executive board members live in their electorate for the majority of their term in office;
- establish eligibility criteria for Anangu voters through an electoral role, providing more certainty in election outcomes;
- remove voting by marbles to facilitate greater voting options for Anangu;
- enable absentee voting for Anangu out of their home communities; and
- provide transitional provisions, including for the first election under the new regime, to facilitate a timely first election following the passing of this bill.

These are important reforms that will bring greater diversity, credibility and representation to the APY Executive Board, as well as improving APY administration and the electoral process. The intention of the amendments contained in this bill is to provide for a strong and representative APY Executive Board, half of whom will be Anangu women, whose membership will have the respect of their community and whose members will be leaders well placed to meet the challenges of governments on their lands.

Good governance will positively affect the health and wellbeing of about 2,500 Anangu living in the APY lands. Strong leadership and decision-making can build the confidence of the community and external stakeholders, facilitating the provision of services, programs and development initiatives. Not only do Anangu benefit from good governance but all South Australians are enriched by improving the health and vibrancy of Anangu culture and communities, and by recognising and

respecting the continuing practices of the world's oldest living culture. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to have the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act 1981*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of 'serious offence' into section 4 of the principal Act.

5—Amendment of section 4A—Objects

This clause amends section 4A of the principal Act to include, as an object of the Act, the fact that both Anangu men and Anangu women are afforded the opportunity to have equal representation on the Executive Board.

6—Amendment of section 5—Constitution of Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara as body corporate

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 5 of the principal Act.

7—Amendment of section 9—Executive Board of Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara

This clause amends section 9 of the principal Act to vary the composition of the Executive Board so that it now consists of up to 14 members (being 1 man and 1 woman from each of the electorates).

The clause substitutes new section 9(6)(a), prescribing the period within which elections must be held.

8—Amendment of section 9D—Casual vacancies

This clause amends section 9D of the principal Act to provide further grounds on which a casual vacancy occurs in an office of the Executive Board.

First, the Executive Board may remove a member if he or she resides (without leave) outside of the electorate from which he or she was elected for a total period of more than 3 months in any 12 month period.

Second, a member's office is automatically vacated if he or she is found guilty of a serious offence as defined.

The clause also makes consequential amendments to the holding of supplementary elections arising out of the new gender requirements for members.

9—Amendment of section 10—Procedure of the Executive Board

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 10 of the principal Act.

10—Amendment of section 13B—Director of Administration

This clause amends section 13B of the principal Act to make consistent the kinds of conduct that will see a person prevented from being appointed as Director of Administration.

11—Amendment of section 13D—General Manager

This clause amends section 13D of the principal Act to make consistent the kinds of conduct that will see a person prevented from being appointed as General Manager.

12—Amendment of section 13G—Termination of appointment of Director of Administration or General Manager by Executive Board

This clause makes amendments to section 13G of the principal Act consequent on the amendment of sections 13B and 13D.

13—Substitution of section 35

This clause inserts new sections 35 and 35A into the principal Act as follows:

35—Minister to appoint panel of conciliators

This section empowers the Minister to establish a panel of conciliators and makes procedural provision accordingly.

35A—Application for conciliation

This section enables an Anangu who is aggrieved by a decision or action of the Executive Board to apply to the Minister for conciliation, and makes provision as to how the Minister is to deal with such applications.

14—Amendment of section 36—Conciliation

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 36 of the principal Act reflecting the change from a single conciliator to a panel of conciliators.

15—Amendment of section 37—Order compelling compliance with direction of conciliator

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 37 of the principal Act reflecting the change from a single conciliator to a panel of conciliators.

16—Amendment of Schedule 3—Rules of election under section 9

This clause amends Schedule 3 of the principal Act to vary the rules by which an election of members of the Executive Board is to be conducted. The changes of note are as follows:

Subclause (3) requires 7 electorates to be constituted by regulation.

Subclause (7) sets out changes to requirements that must be met for nomination for office, including a requirement that the candidate have lived in the relevant electorate for the 3 months preceding nomination, and a requirement that a criminal history report be obtained in relation to the candidate before the election (to be paid for by the Electoral Commissioner).

Proposed clause 6A of the Schedule provides for the establishment of an electoral roll for elections, with eligibility to vote requiring enrolment.

Subclause (10) inserts a requirement that the returning officer provide for absentee voting in Adelaide and Alice Springs on election day.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Executed documents

This clause continues to apply section 5(4) of the principal Act (before amendment by this measure) to documents executed before the commencement of section 6 of the measure.

2—Casual vacancies

This clause provides that section 9D(5) and (6) of the principal Act (as in force before the commencement of this clause) do not apply to certain vacancies in the office of a member of the Executive Board, in effect allowing those vacancies to not be filled until the next election.

3—First election of members of the Executive Board

This clause makes special provisions for the first election of members of the Executive Board under section 9 of that Act following the commencement of this measure. In particular, the clause sets out the electorates, disapplies certain provisions of the principal Act specifying time limits and requires the first election to be held as soon as is reasonably practicable. The clause also allows the returning officer to make further rules, or to modify existing rules, to allow the election to be conducted in appropriate manner.

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

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (PRESCRIBED DRUG OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Conference

The House of Assembly agreed to the time and place appointed by the Legislative Council for holding the conference.

At 17:57 the council adjourned until Thursday 23 June 2016 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***WATER ALLOCATION PLANS**

In reply to **the Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition)** (1 December 2015).

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

1. The Drought Concessional Loan scheme is an Australian government scheme delivered in South Australia by the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA (PIRSA) under a Service Level Agreement. The agreement requires PIRSA to administer the scheme in accordance with the agreement and scheme guidelines.

The Australian government is responsible for establishing the scheme guidelines which include the need for satisfactory security to be provided.

Water entitlements are not deemed personal property for the purposes of the national *Personal Property Securities Act 2009* (Cth), meaning there is no ability for a financier to register a security instrument over water entitlements on the national register.