

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10 February 2015

Opening of Parliament

Parliament, which adjourned on 4 December 2014, was prorogued by proclamation dated 18 December 2014. By proclamation dated 18 December 2014, it was summoned to meet on Tuesday 10 February 2015, and the Second Session began on that date.

The house met at 14:30 pursuant to proclamation. The Speaker (Hon. M.J. Atkinson) presiding.

PROROGATION

The Clerk (Mr R. Crump) read the proclamation summoning parliament.

The Speaker read prayers.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded to the Legislative Council chamber to hear the speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the assembly chamber and the Speaker resumed the chair.

Members

MEMBERS, NEW

The SPEAKER (15:28): I have received the return of the writ issued by me for the election of members to serve in the districts of Fisher and Davenport in place of the Hon. R.B. Such (deceased) and the Hon. I.F. Evans (resigned). Natalie Fleur Cook and Samuel John Duluk have been certified to be duly elected for the districts of Fisher and Davenport. I invite the members for Fisher and Davenport to come to the table and to take and subscribe the oath of allegiance.

Ms Natalie Fleur Cook, to whom the oath of allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took her seat in the house as member for Fisher, in place of the Hon. R.B. Such.

Mr Samuel John Duluk, to whom the oath of allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took his seat in the house as member for Davenport, in place of the Hon. I.F. Evans.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—Audit of the Gillman site transaction: Key shortcomings in accessing an unsolicited proposal Supplementary Report December 2014

Local Government Annual Reports—

Adelaide City Council Annual Report 2013-14

Adelaide Hills Council Annual Report 2013-14

Alexandrina Council Annual Report 2013-14

Ceduna District Council of Annual Report 2013-14

City of Salisbury Annual Report 2013-14

Coorong District Council Annual Report 2013-14

Copper Coast, District Council of Annual Report 2013-14

Elliston, District Council of Annual Report 2013-14

Gawler, Town of Annual Report 2013-14

Kangaroo Island Council Annual Report 2013-14

Karoonda East Murray District Council Annual Report 2013-14

Kingston District Council Annual Report 2013-14
Light Regional Council Annual Report 2013-14
Loxton Waikerie, District Council of Annual Report 2013-14
Marion, City of Annual Report 2013-14
Mid Murray Council Annual Report 2013-14
Mitcham, City of Annual Report 2013-14
Mount Barker, District Council of Annual Report 2013-14
Mount Gambier, City of Annual Report 2013-14
Mount Remarkable District Council Annual Report 2013-14
Naracoorte Lucindale Council Annual Report 2013-14
Northern Areas Council Annual Report 2013-14
Norwood, Payneham and St Peters, City of Annual Report 2013-14
Onkaparinga, City of Annual Report 2013-14
Peterborough, District Council of Annual Report 2013-14
Playford, City of Annual Report 2013-14
Port Adelaide Enfield, City of Annual Report 2013-14
Roxby Council Annual Report 2013-14
Salisbury, City of Annual Report 2013-14
Tea Tree Gully, City of Annual Report 2013-14
Tumby Bay, District Council of Annual Report 2013-14
Unley, City of Annual Report 2013-14
Walkerville, Town of Annual Report 2013-14
Wattle Range Council Annual Report 2013-14
Whyalla, Corporation of the City of Annual Report 2013-14
Yankalilla District Council Annual Report 2013-14
Yorke Peninsula Council Annual Report 2013-14
Road Safety, South Australia's—Addendum—Community Road Safety Fund
Annual Report 2013-14

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Legal Practitioners Guarantee Fund—Statement of Comprehensive Income for the
year 2013-14
Summary Offences Act 1953—
Dangerous Area Declarations Report for Period 1 April to 30 June 2013
Dangerous Area Declarations Report for Period 1 April to 30 June 2014
Dangerous Area Declarations Report for Period 1 January to 30 March 2014
Dangerous Area Declarations Report for Period 1 July to 30 September 2013
Dangerous Area Declarations Report for Period 1 July to 30 September 2014
Dangerous Area Declarations Report for Period 1 October to 31 December 2013
Returns of Authorisations issued to Enter Premises Report for Period 1 July 2013
to 30 June 2014
Road Block Establishment Authorisations Report for Period 1 April to 30 June 2014
Road Block Establishment Authorisations Report for Period 1 January to
31 March 2014
Road Block Establishment Authorisations Report for Period 1 July to
30 September 2014
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Expiation of Offences—Variation of Regulations
Independent Commissioner Against Corruption—Declared Public Officers
Rules made under the following Acts—
Magistrates Court—
Civil—Amendment No 7
Criminal—Amendment No 52

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Private Parking Areas—Variation of Regulations (Expiation of Offences)

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Work Health and Safety Act 2012—Report of the Review of the Operation of
November 2014
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Return to Work—Transitional Arrangements
Work Health and Safety—Application of Regulations

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Government's response to—Statutory Authorities Review Committee—Inquiry into
Funds SA

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Police Superannuation—Variation of Regulations (Commutation of Salary)

By the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Australian Energy Market Commission Establishment—Variation Provisions
Mining—Interpretation
National Energy Retail Law (South Australia)—Variation of Regulations

By the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Variation Licensing Agreement between the Minister for Business Services and Consumers
and SA Tab Pty Ltd—30 January 2015
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Liquor Licensing—
Dry Areas—
Dry Areas
Elliston—Port Kenny
Kingscote

By the Minister for Recreation and Sport (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Major Events—
ICC Cricket World Cup 2015
Santos Tour Down Under 2015

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

Local Council By-Laws—
Berri Barmera Council—No. 6—Cats

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Children's Protection—Assessment
National Parks and Wildlife—Yumbarra Conservation Park

By the Minister for the Public Sector (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability)—Return to Work Advisory Committee
Freedom of Information—Exempt Agency Variation

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia)—Amendment of Act
Road Traffic—Variation of Regulations (Expiation of Offences)

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:52): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the restoration and introduction of government bills before the Address in Reply is adopted.

Motion carried.

Ministerial Statement

GILLMAN LAND SALE

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:54): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: For the past three decades, successive state governments have regarded the largely vacant and unused land at Gillman as ideal for future urban and industrial development. It has the potential to create jobs for South Australians. This is reflected in the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide, which identifies Gillman as a 'key industry area', albeit presently constrained by zoning, infrastructure and environmental issues.

Proposals to develop the Gillman land in the past have relied on the state government committing to spend taxpayers' funds in one of two ways: either facilitating private sector investment by funding infrastructure improvements or subdividing part of the Gillman land into allotments that would be suitable for a particular business to purchase. Both options were highly speculative with no guarantee that the state would recoup any investment. In the latter case, the piecemeal sale of the land may also comprise the prospect of any larger vision for the precinct.

In June 2013, after having first approached the Economic Development Board, Adelaide Capital Partners wrote to the Premier with a unique concept to develop over 400 hectares of the Gillman land to support economic development and jobs growth, including use as an oil and gas servicing hub. Faced with a proposal with the potential to create thousands of jobs, the government decided to enter into exclusive negotiations with ACP without a tender process. In its approach to the government, ACP stated the following:

In discussions with our funding advisors and potential funding partners it has been specifically stated to us that international investors will not participate in a generic tender process without the required certainty of being able to proceed if the planning process is successful.

In other words, the most likely way to secure the employment prospects outlined in the ACP proposal was to progress negotiations in the manner in which we did.

The government maintains the view that the deal with ACP represents value for South Australia. Although the process under which the transaction was approved has been criticised, there is no evidence that the state would have received a higher price for the land by going to tender.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will say that again. There is no evidence that the state would have received a higher price for the land by going to tender. Indeed, the Auditor-General—

Mr Tarzia: What did the court say about it?

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is the first person in this session warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is sad: he is starting this year as he wishes to continue. Indeed, the Auditor-General in his most recent report states that a subsequent valuation of the land at 2013 values remained consistent with the valuation used by Renewal SA. Put simply, \$30 per square metre—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order. The deputy leader is warned for the first time and will apologise.

Ms CHAPMAN: I apologise.

The SPEAKER: Do you know what you are apologising for?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You will withdraw the term and apologise to the house.

Ms CHAPMAN: Sorry, sir, I understood your instruction was that I am to apologise. I have apologised. Now you want me to withdraw and apologise?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: I withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Is that what you are doing?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Splendid. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think that is what they call in Latin 'insultus interruptus'. Anyway, the Auditor-General in his most recent report states that a subsequent valuation of the land at 2013 values remained consistent with the valuation used by Renewal SA. Put simply, \$30 per square metre is a good price. I am advised that the state has not received a higher offer from any interested party since the time of the transaction. More broadly, the agreement with—

Mr Marshall: Why didn't you put it out to the market?

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They can't handle the truth.

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the first time.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is called to order.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, that is a very interesting quote, but accordingly the member for Mount Gambier, being out of order, is called to order. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: More broadly, the agreement with ACP envisages the development of an oil and gas hub. As with any commodity with price rises and falls, there is never any guarantee that the private sector will establish within this precinct. However, we are doing everything we can to enable and facilitate investment in that sector within South Australia. We are increasingly a highly prospective region. At a time when the state's automotive sector is receding due to the announced

closure of Holden's automotive manufacturing plant at Elizabeth, the prospect of a new industrial precinct creating thousands of jobs less than 30 minutes drive from the Adelaide CBD provides opportunity for the future.

This transaction involves commercial intellectual property on the part of ACP and has been subject to a review by the Supreme Court. For obvious reasons, the state has adhered strictly to the obligations of confidentiality imposed upon it. Following crown legal advice, I am advised that the state and ACP have agreed that certain information falls outside of the bounds of the contractual confidentiality provisions and, as such, I seek leave to table that material now.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier can table papers without leave.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am tabling the papers. Mr Speaker.

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Last week I released the Transforming Health proposals paper which outlines how we plan to meet the clinical standards of care proposed by our health care professionals. These standards were developed by our doctors and surgeons, nurses and midwives, and scientific and allied healthcare professionals. They have been working over the past nine months to develop ways of making our health system work better. They have told me that, although we have areas of excellence, we also have areas where we can do much better. Despite our having more doctors, nurses and hospital beds—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —per head of population than any other state in the country, there are around 50 quality standards that cannot be met the way our healthcare system is currently configured. This is in no way the fault of the clinicians in our system. On the contrary, we have highly dedicated staff who go to work each day to make their patients' lives better but our systems do not always support them.

Since 2002, we have invested in the physical infrastructure of our health system to remedy the neglect we inherited when we came into government. We have redeveloped hospitals and updated equipment and facilities, but now we need to change the way our services are arranged so we can deliver consistent, quality care across the metropolitan hospital system.

Most South Australians imagine that the same services are available at every one of our metropolitan hospitals, day or night, weekday or weekend, but this is not so. Senior doctors are not always available on-site at some of our hospitals overnight or on weekends. Many of the diagnostics and specialist services needed by patients are not available out of hours. This means that the health outcomes for patients can depend on where and when they present to hospital.

Some may ask why we cannot simply upgrade all of our emergency departments to deal with every possible emergency, but South Australia does not have the population size or the number of specialists to manage major emergencies at seven different hospitals, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. There would not be enough complex care patients for that number of specialist staff to be able to keep their skills at an optimal level.

Under our current structure, people may go to one hospital, be assessed at the emergency department, only to be transferred by ambulance to another hospital that has the appropriate senior staff, skills and equipment to deal with their condition. This delay can result in poor health outcomes for patients. Transforming Health is about getting the right care for patients first time. We know that this will save lives.

I want to emphasise that, under the Transforming Health proposals, no service is ceasing. Every service currently being provided will continue but some will be at different locations. These

proposals have been developed with the doctors, nurses and other health professionals who work in our health system every day. Like me, they want the best possible hospital system for South Australia. They have told me that the changes proposed for our entire health system will provide better care for more patients.

I invite members to read the Transforming Health proposals paper with an open mind and a readiness to think constructively about improving care in our system. It is a challenging document because it asks us to think differently about better ways to deliver health care. It asks us to consider how the quality standards for care can be met in our system. South Australians can provide feedback on the proposals paper by 5pm on 27 February by visiting www.transforminghealth.sa.gov.au.

SAMPSON FLAT AND TANTANOOLA BUSHFIRES

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (16:08): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: On Monday 29 December 2014, the Bureau of Meteorology advised the South Australian Country Fire Service that significant fire weather was approaching that would impact on the majority of the state. On Friday 2 January, the actual weather conditions reached those forecast and a number of fires started across the state, including at Sampson Flat and Tantanoola—areas that had been declared as catastrophic fire districts the previous afternoon.

Through Friday and Saturday, the Sampson Flat fire intensified, threatening the towns of Kersbrook, Gould Creek, Hermitage, Inglewood, Paracombe, Cudlee Creek, Gumeracha, Kenton Valley, Birdwood, Forreston, Mount Crawford, South Para and Humbug Scrub. It also threatened the heavily populated suburbs of Greenwith and Golden Grove.

The Sampson Flat fire, with a perimeter of 222 kilometres, was the most significant in size and danger that has been experienced in the Adelaide Hills since the 1983 Ash Wednesday fires and, accordingly, the police commissioner declared a major emergency. As usual, our volunteers sprang into action to protect not only their communities but also the communities of others. In fact, close to 200 CFS brigades from across the state joined the fight, comprising about 3,500 firefighters.

The CFS were supported by many other agency staff and volunteers, including hundreds of SES staff and volunteers, almost 500 MFS firefighters, and significant contributions from SAFECOM, SAPOL, St John, Salvation Army, SAAS, SA Water, ForestrySA, SAVEM and DEWNR, amongst many others. The CFS issued 25,000 voice messages and 160,000 text messages to warn people in the vicinity of the fires of the impending danger and how best to respond. Relief centres were also established in Golden Grove and Willaston to accommodate residents who had heeded those warnings and left their homes.

This fire burned over 12,500 hectares, and it is truly remarkable that no-one was killed. While it is devastating that 27 homes were lost, this number could have been much higher. Another 34 houses were damaged and 103 outbuildings destroyed. Over 200 vehicles were also destroyed, along with approximately 900 livestock; 11 small businesses have also been significantly affected by the fires.

During the fires, there were 62 firefighter-related injuries reported. All of these were considered minor in nature. We are extremely grateful that the volunteers returned home safely. This is a testament to the training and professionalism of the emergency services sector. The fire was finally considered contained on 7 January.

It must not be forgotten that, at the same time as the Sampson Flat fire, CFS staff and volunteers, along with ForestrySA, were busy fighting the Tantanoola fire in the South-East. I visited the affected area, and this fire had the potential to travel through the outskirts of Mount Gambier and beyond towards Victoria, impacting the surrounding communities. Due to the remarkable efforts of firefighters, the Tantanoola fire was quickly contained as it moved out of the plantation forest before it could impact on the surrounding communities.

While the flashing sirens have stopped and the media has abated, local, state and commonwealth government agencies are continuing to work together to assist people affected by the fires. The state government has committed \$21 million of assistance to the communities affected by the bushfires. Ms Karlene Maywald has also been appointed as the Local Recovery Coordinator. Importantly, the community has pulled together to help their friends and neighbours to recover from the fire, and the State Emergency Relief Fund has received almost \$1.5 million from 3,000 generous donators.

At this point, I would like to acknowledge the great support our firefighters received from our interstate colleagues, particularly from the New South Wales Rural Fire Service, who sent almost 600 personnel, as well as the 280 personnel from the Victorian Country Fire Authority and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning. The New South Wales and Victorian governments also contributed 15 firefighting aircraft.

Other jurisdictions also provided offers of assistance and made contingency plans to assist our state, if needed, for which the government was extremely grateful. I have written to my counterparts thanking them for their support. I would also like to thank the commonwealth government and particularly the Department of Defence, which provided—

Mr Marshall: The CFS.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Sorry?

Mr Marshall: How are you going to thank the CFS?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I also would like to thank the Department of Defence and the commonwealth, who provided access to the RAAF base at Edinburgh, which was used for refuelling firefighting aircraft.

Once again, our emergency services and the community have banded together against mother nature and showed the strength of our state and its communities. On behalf of the state government, the parliament and the people of South Australia, I again thank the CFS and our emergency services personnel, and all those staff, volunteers, community groups and individuals who came together in our time of need.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (16:14): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: There have been important new developments raising doubts about naval shipbuilding in South Australia of which the house should be made aware. Earlier this week, South Australian senator Sean Edwards said he had sought assurances from the Prime Minister relating to the design and construction of Australia's future submarines. Senator Edwards said that Prime Minister Abbott had assured him the \$30 billion to build 12 submarines would now be opened up:

...to a competitive evaluation process and it would be a fully competitive tender, and the implication of that...is that South Australian shipbuilders would now be able to throw their hat in the ring.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE: Mr Speaker, with a ministerial statement there is normally an accompanying document.

The SPEAKER: It is a courtesy extended to the house, and in particular the opposition, to provide a copy of the ministerial statement contemporaneously with its delivery.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: It is not available on this occasion, sir, I am afraid.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Perhaps the minister could come back to it when copies are available so we maintain the convention. Ever so briefly, I will go to the minister—

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I do not think that will be possible today, sir.

The SPEAKER: It is an extempore ministerial statement. Minister.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: A competitive evaluation process does not, however, guarantee that submarines will be built in Australia. The state government was encouraged by the assurances given by the Prime Minister reported by Senator Edwards, although Senator Edwards was attacked by his colleague Mr Briggs (the member for Mayo) who questions his assertions.

Today's further explanation of the term 'competitive evaluation process' by defence minister Kevin Andrews suggests intentions fall well short of what was promised to South Australian voters in November 2013. That promise, delivered by the Coalition in the presence of the state Liberal leader, was clear: 'We will deliver those submarines from right here at ASC in South Australia,' he said outside the Australian Submarine Corporation's Osborne headquarters. 'The Coalition is committed to building 12 new submarines here in Adelaide.'

The most recent assurances by the Prime Minister and the defence minister are far less than that, and should be drawn to the attention of the house. The commitment given to Senator Edwards was, as he put it, 'a chance for the ASC to throw their hat into the ring'. ASC is a shipbuilder, not a naval ship or submarine designer. It can partner with one or several design bids, but under the commonwealth government's recent assurances, there is no guarantee of a local build.

The process must ensure that the submarines are built in Australia, based in Adelaide. The federal government must mandate that design and construction tenders include Australian-based shipbuilders utilising local supply chains. This would allow the ASC and other Australian-based shipbuilders to participate in the tender process, and guarantee jobs for Australian workers and supply chain opportunities for Australian businesses.

We are encouraged by the Prime Minister's assurances and the visit of defence minister Andrews, but as you can see, we have not got there yet. During the state government's Defence Industry Policy Summit on 21 October last year, experts from government, industry, unions and academia discussed the merits of an Australian-built submarine and for greater investment in Australia's defence industries. Their statements clearly showed that the economic and security benefits of this approach far outweigh any argument for a cheaper offshore solution. The government will soon release a summary of those statements in the final report of the Defence Industry Policy Summit.

The South Australian government intends, on behalf of South Australian families, workers and businesses, to keep the federal government to their firm commitment, not just a broad assurance in the context of a leadership vote—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is called to order.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —but also that they keep their election promise to build our new fleet of 12 submarines in Australia, centred on Adelaide. South Australians will demand that this 'competitive evaluation process' follows the correct framework for defence procurement along the lines of a competitive tender, where the best solution is chosen for our Navy and for the sovereignty of Australia.

Our constituents have a right to expect that this process is carried out by an independent and expert panel away from the influence of a 'captain's pick'. Yesterday the Prime Minister stated that 'good government starts today'. The South Australian government believes the best way to show good government is for the Prime Minister and the federal government to commit to a local bill to back local jobs and local families to start where this all began, back before the last federal election.

The people of South Australia have this state government's commitment to hold the federal government to account for its promise to this state and to our valuable defence industry and all who make it possible.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

Mrs Vlahos: You're laughing about the jobs on the line in the submarines. You're laughing about it. What a joke as an opposition leader you are. What a joke of an opposition leader you are!

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor is called to order and will not provoke the opposition.

Opening of Parliament

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER (16:21): I have to report that the house has, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the Governor, attended in the other place where His Excellency has been pleased to make a speech to both houses of which speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be published.

Parliamentary Procedure

SESSIONAL ORDERS

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:22): Without notice, I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion for the adoption of sessional orders relating to a direction to leave the chamber and a time limit for answers to questions without notice.

The SPEAKER: I understand there is an absolute majority present. I accept the motion. Is the motion seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:23): Pursuant to order, I move:

That for the remainder of the session, sessional orders be adopted so as to provide a direction to leave the chamber and a time limit for answers to questions without notice as detailed in the draft sessional orders circulated to members.

The SPEAKER: Is that seconded?

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:23): I wish to speak against the motion as moved by the minister. In doing so I remind the house that I spoke strongly against this when this house first adopted these measures and I now wish to bring to the attention of the house the way that I believe these powers that are conferred upon the Speaker of the house have been abused. I refer to the *Hansard* of 18 November last, page 2915. On that afternoon during question time the member for Torrens asked the following question:

My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house of the effect of the proposed federal government cuts to ABC operations in Adelaide?

Sir, the Premier started to answer the question to which I rose and called a point of order. *Hansard* has me saying:

I'm struggling to understand what responsibility the Premier has for this—

And that's all that is recorded in *Hansard*, sir. At which point, the Speaker ruled:

It's a bogus point of order. The member for MacKillop will leave the house for an hour.

Sir, what I was trying to bring to the house's attention, of course, was that the Premier had no responsibility to the house for ABC operations—no responsibility to the house. I contend that it, indeed, was not a bogus point of order. I refer to Erskine May, 24th edition 2011, page 360, with regard to questions, ministerial responsibility of questions:

Questions to ministers must relate to matters for which those ministers are officially responsible.

It goes on for several pages. I will not bore the house with all of that, but it has always been the convention of this house in the time that I have been here that questions were ruled out of order which did not relate to a minister's responsibility to the house. It may well be pure coincidence that the very next day there was a major feature article in *The Advertiser* newspaper quoting from the Premier's statement that he made in answer to the question after I was ejected from the house, and that is but one example.

I contend that this sessional order has done nothing to promote the use of this house for the good of the people of South Australia. It is indeed being used, in my opinion, to stifle full and open debate on numerous matters and it has been aimed at quelling the opposition doing its duty on behalf of the people of South Australia. For those reasons, I argue that the house should reject these sessional orders.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (16:27): This is an important matter. The tone and civility of the house is an important issue which goes to the heart of one of the central issues which I think is at stake in politics at the moment, and that is people's regard for politics and politicians. One of the central images that is often transmitted from this place is of an unruly house, with people squabbling amongst each other in a way which creates a very unfortunate impression about the nature of the political process. The truth is 90 per cent of the things that we do in this place are agreed and only a very small proportion of those things that are advanced here are not agreed; but the impression that is created through the media because of the event that we created in this house is the impression that is created to the broader public.

I said when I first took on this role that I wanted to introduce higher standards of civility. I know that is a quaint notion, and it was ridiculed and laughed at in some quarters, but the truth is it is important. I fully accept that there was a period in the life of this government where we did not properly respect those standards, and I probably participated. My voice is not as loud as some, because I am not as well equipped, perhaps, to participate in it as well as others; but, the truth is our side of the chamber was as much to blame as those on the other side of the chamber. The truth is that these particular measures, these standing or these sessional orders that do provide greater powers, there is no doubt, for the Speaker to exercise control of the house have to be exercised with some degree of care and forbearance.

I must say that since, sir, you have ascended to the Speaker's role you have performed your function, I think, with great distinction. I think those opposite, if they were really honest with themselves and analysed the way in which the house is conducted, even they would say that they believe they are treated fairly, and of course through your own particular prism of fairness, which I accept has its own particular take but nevertheless there is a consistency. I think the house has been better run and is all the better for the way in which you have exercised your authority. It is probably appropriate that the honourable members—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, we are not meant to reflect on people not being in the chamber, it is disorderly to do so. I think it is not an unimportant issue. We all transgress from time to time, but I think more civility than less is better for the institution. More civility than less is better for our reputation. More civility than less is better for some of the arguments, if we are to advance them, about us being respected and properly remunerated for the work that we do in this place. These are important matters. I do not want to come in and be a part of an institution that has a low reputation.

I must say that, strangely enough, I found to my distress that when I changed professions I actually went backwards in status and also in pay, but I went backwards in status because I chose to come into this place. I do not believe that is right. I think this should be regarded as the highest calling. What higher calling could there be than to represent your own community and try to govern for their benefit? The way we conduct ourselves in this place will have a large bearing on how we are seen in the world.

The Speaker needs to have the powers to be able to control this house. He needs to (obviously) exercise those powers carefully. I think he has and we should support him in that by passing these sessional orders.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (16:31): I just want to add a couple of thoughts to this as well. If we were in the position where we got to the point where these sessional orders did not proceed, I would like to remind honourable members that would put us back in the position where, basically, the only remedy for misbehaviour was a naming exercise. I have been here sufficiently long now to remember what that used to be like when it was the only option. In other words, you had the admonishment or you would break the glass, press the big red button, get out the codes and away you would go and the person was named.

I also remember that there were occasions—and I am sure it would not happen with anybody in the chamber today because nobody here would behave in such a way—there were people, who I will not name and who are not here now, who thought the idea of being named addressed an attention deficit problem they perceived at the time and it actually became an encouragement for more outrageous behaviour because the more outrageous you got the more chance there was of being named and then you could really have a theatrical exit from this place and waste more time of the parliament in being told why you should not be here. So, the idea that we have a graded scale which is available to the parliament and at the lesser end of that scale the exercise of discretion is yours, I think, with the greatest of respect, Mr Speaker, is eminently sensible.

Let us think about what these things are used for, too. Invariably, whilst there are many things that might conceivably be the cause of a problem, in my experience there are two things that are the main cause of this. Cause number one: interjection. We all know interjection is disorderly. You have reminded us of that many times and I think those who have sat in that chair before you have told everybody back to the time of whenever it was that there was first a Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The year King Uzziah died.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Indeed. For a long time it has been disorderly. Everybody knows it is disorderly. For those of you who like to quote numbers as if you are reading out a Chinese restaurant menu, you know that the fact is that disorderly behaviour includes interjection. Interjection is completely within the control of members. If they are concerned about the inadequate or inappropriate exercise of the power to send people off to cool down, all they have to do is cool down by themselves or take themselves out to cool down without having to be removed to cool down.

The other use, of course, is insult. Again, insult is disorderly. Using unparliamentary terms is disorderly. We all know that. The point is, if you do not interject and you do not use unparliamentary language, the chance of falling foul of such a serene individual as you, Mr Speaker, is almost zero. I have to say that, again, during the period that these sessional orders have been in place, I have noticed you, Mr Speaker, being subjected to extreme provocation by the members for Kavel, Schubert, Hartley and Bragg and you have maintained equanimity almost entirely throughout all of that.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Serenity.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Serenity, indeed. I have absolute confidence that, in spite of the provocations that you have received and, no doubt, if we are pessimistic, may receive in the future, this is the best way forward for us and it means we do not have either nothing or the nuclear remedy. We have a graded response to misbehaviour in the parliament.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:35): There is little I can add to what has been said by my learned colleagues—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —so I will speak briefly. It is not my fault that the member for MacKillop went off the reservation and went off on his own, but nonetheless, I am happy to respond. I certainly take some umbrage at the suggestion from the member for MacKillop that somehow these

sessional orders have been used inappropriately or unfairly. They have been used very fairly. Members on both sides of the house have found themselves at the wrong end of these sessional orders including myself, and that is entirely appropriate.

I have to say, as a former Speaker, the old naming process was not only disruptive to the house but also almost never, ever—in fact, probably in the entire history of this parliament—

An honourable member: Well, hardly ever!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Thank you for Gilbert and Sullivan—would never have been used against a member on the Treasury bench. It is only because of the sessional orders and the scope it gives to the Speaker to provide a circuit-breaker that these standing orders can be applied as fairly as they can be. They have worked very well.

I should also say that the sessional orders also provide for time limits for answers to questions, which has also worked very well. I remember, when I first came into this house, the most number of questions the opposition could hope for was 10 and we almost never got 10. It was more likely to be seven and sometimes as low as three or four because the government of the day would ask government questions—Dorothy Dixers—and the minister would drag on their answer over the very large expanses of question time in order to provide protection to another minister who might have been under some scrutiny. I well remember those days.

These sessional orders prevent that from happening, and you only need to look at the number of opportunities the opposition has had over the last five years to have questions. It has been enormously more—

Mr Gardner: How about some answers?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Look, they whinge and say, 'What about the answers?' If you cannot ask some decent questions despite being given every opportunity to ask decent questions, you have no-one to blame but yourselves and your weak, weak leadership—absolutely weak leadership.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Listen to them. The cockatoos, the flock of galahs—here they go.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is the Minister for Health trying to garner support for these sessional orders?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I might keep on going, Mr Speaker. These sessional orders—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Coming from the Leader of the Opposition, that's a joke. These sessional orders work very well. If the opposition have any problems with question time, they should be looking at themselves and not trying to blame the sessional orders.

Motion carried.

Question Time

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:39): My question is to the Minister for Health. If Labor's commitment to never, ever close the Repat did not survive five years, how can the community of the north-east trust the minister when he says that the Modbury Hospital will be providing services for many years to come?

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:39): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the opportunity to respond to the quite malicious scaremongering that the opposition has been engaging upon about the future of the Modbury Hospital—absolutely reckless scaremongering to try and scare people about the future of the Modbury Hospital and the future of the emergency department at Modbury Hospital.

With regard to the Modbury Hospital emergency department, yes, people with urgent life-threatening conditions will be taken either to the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Lyell McEwin Hospital in an ambulance, but they won't be taken to the Modbury Hospital. How many presentations does that involve, at the moment, at Modbury Hospital? Less than half of 1 per cent—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —of current presentations to the Modbury Hospital will need to go to the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Lyell McEwin Hospital. And why is that; why is this change important? It is important because, particularly after hours, with those life-threatening conditions, we have poor patient outcomes.

Mr Marshall: You say it's the best public health system in the entire nation yet we've got poor health outcomes.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: That's exactly what I say. Well done! The Leader of the Opposition has finally worked it out—it has finally clicked! Yes, I've been saying it for the last nine months and suddenly it's dawned upon the Leader of the Opposition, as if some great revelation.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health will not taunt the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I'm sorry, sir—

Ms Digance interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will try and resist.

The SPEAKER: The member for Elder is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Particularly for presentations after hours and those life-threatening conditions we have poor outcomes compared to people presenting during the day. Why is that the case? That's the case because we don't have enough after-hours coverage of senior clinicians. We don't have good after-hours coverage for the diagnostics, the medical imaging, the other services that a good emergency department requires. Not just during office hours: it requires those presentations 24/7 because otherwise our health system becomes nothing more than potluck about when you have a stroke, potluck about when you have a heart attack, potluck about when you have a serious trauma—whether you survive and walk out of the hospital, or whether you have some lifelong disability, or even worse, death.

As Minister for Health, I cannot abide by such a system. I am determined to improve it. We will make the changes necessary to ensure better consistency of care to make sure that the system supports our hardworking doctors and nurses and allied health professionals who are doing their best every day to make South Australians' lives better.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:43): A supplementary question: how can the minister guarantee the safety and health of those people who now have to travel significantly longer distances to receive emergency treatment?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:43): Simply because, contrary to conventional wisdom, going to the closest hospital is not necessarily going to the best hospital. It is more important—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Leader of the Opposition thinks he knows more about the health system than the dozens of nurses and doctors and allied health professionals who have been looking at the system. But believe me, the Leader of the Opposition doesn't know anything about health; he had nothing to say about health at the last state election and was pulled up on it by the secretary of the nurses federation. But nonetheless—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will return to the substance of the question, which is not the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned a first time. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Mr Speaker, I am going on what the doctors and nurses and allied health people who have been looking at our health system and the way it is currently configured have been saying to me, and that is that going to the closest hospital is not necessarily going to the best hospital and it is more important to go to the correct hospital—the hospital that has the clinicians and the services to support those clinicians to ensure you get the proper and best treatment. What happens at the moment when someone goes to an emergency department that is not able to look after them is they get assessed—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —a decision is made and then they are transferred, and that means a delay in their care—a much longer delay in their care than they might have if they had stayed in an ambulance and been taken to the correct emergency department in the first place. It is far more important to go to the correct emergency department if you have a life-threatening illness than to go necessarily to the closest. We have to make sure we have some emergency departments that have the 24/7 cover so, regardless of what hour of the day or night you present, if you've got a life-threatening illness, they are going to be able to look after you.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:46): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given that the government is proposing to downgrade the emergency department of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital without increasing the capacity of the emergency department of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, can the minister explain how ramping will be avoided?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:46): Firstly, I reject any suggestion that any part of our health system is being downgraded. The simple fact is that—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the second and final time. He has asked his question, and he will be entitled to ask a series of questions, but he must not shout at the minister while the minister is attempting to answer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The simple fact is there is no part of our health system which is more important than any other part. Every part of our health system is important. There is no such thing as a downgrade in health. Our subacute facilities enable our acute facilities to do their job, an enrolled nurse enables a registered nurse and the highest qualified specialist in a subspecialty area of medicine. Every part works together, and the opposition, trapped in their view of health care that belongs to the last century or the century before, have got it completely muddleheaded.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: this series of insults is contrary to 98.

The SPEAKER: What was the insulting word?

Mr GARDNER: It was a series of insults but, regardless of which words in particular, the minister is debating by characterising the opposition's point of view on something as in any way relevant to the answer.

The SPEAKER: I don't think there's anything in standing orders or in Erskine May which would prevent someone saying that someone else or one other group of members has a mindset in another century but, if it is unparliamentary or it is debate, that's another matter.

Mr GARDNER: Sir, I drew your attention to debate and I used the example of the series of insults as why he was debating. I wasn't claiming that it was unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: I see. I will listen carefully. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Sir, I was responding to the suggestion that the Leader of the Opposition made in the course of asking his question that certain parts of the health system are being downgraded. That is what I was responding to and I am surprised the Leader of the Opposition, or any member of the opposition, would find offence in my responding to that. The important point is that there is no such thing as one part of our hospital system or health system being more important than the other. There is no such thing as downgrading, as the opposition would put it.

The second point I would make is this. With regard to additional patients having to go to some of our key emergency departments, firstly, one thing that we are going to do is up the resources at those key emergency departments, in particular to make sure they have the 24/7 cover that they need, so that people can get looked after effectively, regardless of what hour of the day or night that they present to the hospital. That is going to assist in those emergency departments where life-threatening presentations are going to go.

The next point I would make is we are talking about a relatively very small number of presentations across our health system. As I said, at the Modbury Hospital, half of 1 per cent of the presentations would fit into this category—half of 1 per cent; a tiny, tiny number. Now, the opposition can run around and say—

Mr Griffiths: They are real people.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: They are real people, and that's why they deserve the best possible care. The member for Goyder is exactly right. These are real people, and that's why they deserve the best possible care, not being used as political fodder by the opposition running around trying to mislead people.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:50): A supplementary: can the minister outline to the house what the government's plans are for the emergency department at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:51): It will continue pretty much as it is, but the relatively small number of presentations that are life threatening will, in time, go directly to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I don't think I would be breaching patient confidentiality in saying there was a very high-profile serious trauma in the last day that happened down at West Lakes. In that case, the patient wasn't taken to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital but was taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:51): So, for the 50 per cent of people—

The SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary?

Mr MARSHALL: A supplementary, sir. For the 50 per cent of people who arrive at the emergency department not in an ambulance, the patient themselves, or the person who is driving the patient, needs to determine the category of emergency and make a decision about where they are going to go. Do you envisage any confusion from this arrangement?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:51): No, of course not. Of course, people who bring themselves—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —into an emergency department will be given the care they need. If the emergency department is not able to look after them, an ambulance will be called and that person will be transferred to an emergency department, as happens now.

The SPEAKER: A further supplementary?

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:52): Yes. The minister has told us about the very small number of patients who won't be treated at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but can he tell us about what services will be removed from The Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Why is it that these people won't be able to be treated there? Is it because there won't be the same surgeons, doctors, nurses or ICU arrangement at that hospital? What time frame, also, will those services be removed?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:52): Well, the detail of these things is in the proposals paper that's been released, and I think I am more than happy to provide a personal briefing to the Leader of the Opposition to go through all of the detail. But yes, in principle, the highest acuity hospital in the state, as it currently is, will be the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and The Queen Elizabeth Hospital will perform services in the more subacute areas of care.

One of the things which we want to do is improve our elective surgery rates. At the moment, 25 per cent of patients who schedule for elective surgery have their surgery cancelled, and that's just not good enough. How can we resolve that? The answer, in the proposals paper, is by creating sites that specialise in elective surgery, of which The Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be one, to ensure that it is far less frequent than happens at the moment that patients are having their elective surgery cancelled.

So, it will also be making a significant additional investment into the rehab facilities at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, all of which the opposition would describe as a 'downgrade'. They don't think rehabilitation is very important, but rehabilitation—

Mr GARDNER: 98: clearly, it's debating.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to ensure that the Minister for Health does not debate the answer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Rehabilitation is a very, very important component of our health system because it's the work that's done by our rehabilitation clinicians that gets people out of hospital and back home more quickly. At the moment, we do not do it as well as we could, not through any fault of the clinicians, but simply because the rehabilitation is not done in the same location as where the patients are. The patients have to essentially recover before their rehabilitation can begin, and that means they spend longer in hospital, it takes a longer time for them to rehabilitate, and it takes a longer time for them to get home. This is something we need to fix, and that is why we want rehabilitation facilities co-located at our big hospital sites, such as The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

HEALTH REVIEW

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:55): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the government extend the time period for consultation on Transforming Health, given the calls by health professional organisations for an extension, and if not, why not?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:55): No, I don't expect to.

HEALTH REVIEW

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:55): Again my question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister detail why he believes a 3½-week consultation period is sufficient for a report into the state's entire health system, considering a report into SA Pathology alone was given seven weeks for public consultation?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:56): Because this is a culmination of a process that began in the middle of last year. It is a culmination of a process that is about nine months long, during which we had a health summit where over 600 people came, including the shadow minister for health, and it was very good to see him there taking an interest. There were over 600 participants at the health summit.

We have had thousands of people through the Transforming Health process provide feedback, and the summit unanimously endorsed the principles of care and the fact that there was an urgent need for change in our health system. We could not just keep going along as we were; change had to happen. So, this is the culmination of a process that has been going on for nine months, and we do need to get on with it.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:57): My question is also for the Minister for Health. Can the minister explain how regional health services will be affected by the Transforming Health process?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:57): They will be improved, because when I had a meeting with the Rural Doctors' Association, they said to me that the one big problem they have is getting acutely unwell patients in rural areas into a metropolitan hospital bed. The delays they had and the difficulties they sometimes encountered in being able to get a patient from rural South Australia into an acute metropolitan hospital bed was probably the most pressing difficulty they faced.

Any improvements we can make in our metropolitan hospital system are going to have a massive benefit for South Australians living in regional areas. About 30 per cent of patients in Adelaide metropolitan hospitals at any one time are from regional South Australia.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:57): Supplementary: the minister has told us how rural people will be affected when they attend metropolitan hospitals, but my question was: can the minister outline what changes will happen to rural hospitals and rural health care?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:58): At the moment, that is not within the scope of Transforming Health. Having said that, if we apply the standards that are being developed by the clinicians to regional South Australia, of course it is going to have to mean some reconfiguration of hospitals in regional South Australia. But, at the moment, that is not in the scope of Transforming Health. We have decided to concentrate on metropolitan hospitals for the reasons I said before.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:58): Further supplementary: can the minister then give an undertaking to the house that we will not see the same cuts to regional hospitals as we have seen in metropolitan hospitals?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:58): All I can guarantee are the improvements that South Australians will see from the Transforming Health process in Adelaide metropolitan hospitals. If there is opportunity to improve services in rural areas, then we will of course do them.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:59): My question is to the Minister for Health. What was the estimated cost of the proposal to redevelop Ward 17 at the Repat Hospital, as reported in the last annual report of the Veterans Health Advisory Council?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (16:59): Our estimated costs and the amount we have provided for a rebuild to Ward 17 is \$15 million.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:59): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Firstly, do pages 544 to 571 of the documents tabled by the Attorney today represent the final deed that was entered into between ACP and the Minister for Urban Development and Renewal SA?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:00): I thank the honourable member for her question. As I hope I explained in providing my ministerial statement, the documents that were produced today are a copy of the documents which were tendered in the Supreme Court in the context of the recent litigation which was heard by Mr Justice Blue.

There are some documents that were tendered in connection with that matter which were dealt with in confidence. There are some documents which were tendered either, as I understand it—I am not saying this is my own knowledge, but what I understand from what I have been told, there might have been excerpts from documents that were tendered, rather than the entire document.

I am not able to say with any certainty what the answer to the honourable member's question is because I would need to sit down with her and see those documents, communicate with the Crown and then find out exactly what we are dealing with. I am not going to have a guess at what the answer to that question is about those documents.

It is altogether possible that what was actually tendered in the court was something which was an excerpt rather than the whole document, but I think the only way I can give a definitive answer to the honourable member's question is for her to discuss this with me afterwards and show me what she has got, and I will attempt to ascertain exactly what the nature of that document is, relevant to the document she has asked about.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Bragg.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:02): Of the documents that have been tabled by the Attorney today, could the Attorney then confirm if this deed, signed by the parties as I have indicated, is the final deed, or whether it is a draft, accepting that there are portions which have been redacted which have previously been identified?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:02): Again, I will have to take that on advice. If I can just explain to the member for Bragg how we came to this point. I realised that the member for Bragg and others had said that they would like to have more access to material. What I have asked the Crown to do is to, in effect, reproduce the public element of the court file. Those were my instructions to the Crown.

I personally did not supervise the collection and photocopying of those materials, so I am relying on—and I have no reason to disbelieve that the Crown has done a faithful job of identifying each and every document which was publicly tendered in the context of that hearing, and has provided a reproduction of those for me to tender here today. Exactly what is in all of those documents, I myself have not physically been through the whole lot of them because I thought it was not necessarily a productive use of my time.

Certainly—and I make this very clear—the instruction that was given to Crown was, 'You find out whatever it was that was tendered in the court,' so, in other words, is already—for those intrepid enough to wander down there with enough money for photocopying expenses—a public document, and give me that material.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As the member for Hartley is observing, I am saving everyone quite a lot of money and costing the court something in the process, so that is pretty helpful, I guess, from parliament's point of view. That is the instruction I have, just so the member for Bragg understands. I personally did not do the photocopying and I did not personally retrieve the documents, but I have every confidence the Crown has done exactly what I asked them to do.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:04): Supplementary—or it can be a question, I am happy either way. So, Attorney, when you said recently on radio that you were going to get advice as to whether you could make public the subject contract and that there would be some consideration of perhaps the redaction of some of it, had you asked the Crown Solicitor's Office to give you advice on that?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:05): Yes, again, Mr Speaker, through you, I thank the honourable member for her question. Yes, I recall a couple of weeks back there was a bit of a flurry of conversation about this particular topic and I sought to ascertain from the Crown what aspects of the documentation associated with this particular contract was confidential or contained elements of intellectual property or something of that nature, and it is my understanding that officers of the Crown, including those who are responsible for advising the government in relation to commercial matters, had a look at the material, and gave consideration to the material.

I believe that they also, in the interests of acting in a transparent fashion, had some communication with the lawyers acting for ACP and asked them to say whatever they wished to say about their view about confidentiality of different provisions—not, in a sense, asking their permission but inviting them to make whatever comment they might like to make.

At the end of that process, I was provided with information which was that there were some elements of the arrangements existing with ACP which presently, because there are still contingent matters lying forward in the contemplative timeline which are yet to crystallise, would be a breach of the confidentiality arrangements and potentially prejudicial to ACP for that material to be publicly disclosed presently. And furthermore, that the public disclosure of material which is protected by confidentiality under the agreement might itself constitute a breach by the state of its contractual obligations to ACP, which in turn might ultimately provide an opportunity for ACP to have some form of legal dispute with the state.

So I am trying to steer the course between providing as much information as I can according to my advice to the member for Bragg and the parliament, and anyone else who wants to know about it, but on the other hand I am trying to make sure that in doing that I do not compromise the interests of the state by revealing something which would be in contravention of the provisions of the deed and, thereby, potentially open up the state of South Australia to some legal dispute with ACP, which we don't obviously wish to have.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:07): So, having sought that advice, Attorney, and having got that advice, why didn't you table today a copy of the redacted deed, as distinct from simply tabling a copy of part of all of the exhibits of the Supreme Court proceedings, and why do you continue to refuse to do so?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:08): Well, look, I have asked the

Crown to provide me with advice as to what can be provided safely in a public sense. The effect of their advice has been that, because these documents are already in the public domain, and that is acknowledged and understood by ACP, I am placing the government and the state at no risk by actually providing copies of those documents in the form of a tabled document. But I have not and, quite frankly, don't intend to, ask the Crown to spend a lot of time going through extensive contractual documentation, and then necessarily some form of interaction and debate with ACP as to which clause is in and which clause is out, where the risk of something ultimately being in breach will all be borne by the state, potentially.

So what I have done is I have done what I am advised is safe for me to do without putting the state at any risk at all of breaching the confidentiality requirements under the legislation, and that is what I have done.

I can say that if I were in a position to freely deal with other matters without being potentially in breach of the agreement and then potentially opening up the state to some form of legal action, I would be happy to do so as would my ministerial colleagues. That is where it stands. We are caught between what we know is safe to put in the public domain, because it is, de facto, already there, and what I am advised contains some risk because of the potential for those provisions, which are yet to be crystallised, giving rise to potential breaches of contract issues.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:10): Given the deed—yet to be determined and advised by you as to whether it is the final deed or whether it is a draft—that you have presented to the parliament today, can you point to the deed where it provides that it is a condition of the option that there be 6,000 jobs from this project?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:10): I thank the honourable member for that question. One thing that is very clear is that whatever we have got in those documents is not the whole box and dice. Even if there were a reference to a number of jobs, it would not necessarily be in whatever it is that is in those tender documents—point No. 1. Point No. 2 is that I don't think it has ever been represented by the government, anyway, that there is any provision explicitly about a number of jobs—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, no; I don't think, with respect, that's correct. I think what has been said is that various people who have looked at the employment potential of different projects have said—and these are not government people, these are sort of outside consultant-type people—given a development on the scale of whatever it is, if that occurs, then they have some formula for calculating approximately what the employment generating potential of that quantum of space, if applied to certain uses, might be. As I understand it, that is the generator of those numbers. I do not think anyone has ever suggested those numbers are immutable. They are indicative on the basis that if certain industrial activities were to take place in that area, then numbers of people would be employed, and given how much space is there and given what could be put in there, that is a realistic sort of number relating to that; but that is all that I think we are in a position to say.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The member for Mount Gambier briefly interjected then that it could be zero. I made it clear in my ministerial statement today, and I think we have made it clear all the way through this, that the capability of ACP to develop those lands to do any number of things is not entirely within the control of ACP even should they be sufficiently funded, as we anticipate they will be, because ACP's always made it clear that they were planning on providing opportunities for other businesses to come in and occupy some of the land that would be made available by ACP.

An honourable member: So they can make a fortune off of it by on-selling it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'm trying to explain something here. So—are you still awake?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I don't mean you in particular, I mean everybody.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: A nice hot cocoa would be good. ACP might find themselves in an environment where, let's say, everything goes very, very well and the minister for resources' fantasies all come true (or at least some of them) and BP or somebody winds up finding the Gulf of Mexico somewhere off South Australia. If that were to occur and this development was there I have every confidence that it would be an absolutely successful thing. Or, if the oil price goes back up and it changes, which it eventually has to, I imagine—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: At some point in time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: At some point in time, when our friends in Saudi Arabia stop pumping as much of it, when the oil price eventually goes up, that will again change the economics of the Cooper Basin, and that may result in—

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired, alas! The deputy leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:14): Supplementary: if the Attorney isn't able to identify it, and we are yet to identify whether this document that has been produced is the final deed or not, will he inquire as to who came up with the 6,000 jobs figure, which of course first featured in the now Treasurer's press release in December 2013, as to whether that had been prepared by these people you undefined, whether that was Renewal South Australia or ACP or some other persons or person unknown that has actually come up with the 6,000 jobs figure?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:15): I thank the honourable member for her question. I will try to ascertain a bit more information about that. I did ask that question myself because I thought, when I saw that number I thought: I bet the member for Bragg asks me about this. I thought: the member for Bragg is going to zero in on this.

An honourable member: Come on.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I did. Honestly, that's true: I did. I thought to myself: I'm going to find out a bit more about this, and I did ask that question and I've given you, to the best of my recollection, the response I got, which is that there are these people who sit out there, they are some sort of, like, gurus who cast their eyes over—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I beg your pardon?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I will try to ascertain some more detail about that. As I said, my recollection of this conversation was something to the effect that these people are like, I don't know, quantity surveyors—they aren't, but they are like that, or they are like—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Actuaries.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Actuaries, or somebody else. They look at a piece of land on a map and they ask you, 'How big is it?' You tell them how big it is and then they say, 'What are you going to put on there? How big are the roads going to be? What's the power supply going to be?' and then they do something quite marvellous with an abacus and they come out with a number. That's basically what happens, I think.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:17): Further supplementary, if I may: in relation to the 6,000 jobs, which is somewhere between, I think, the Treasurer's fantasies and some person who has come up with this, as undefined yet, I look forward

to hearing as to who gave this advice, but in relation to those 6,000 jobs, if the Attorney doesn't know will he inquire as to whether that included prospective jobs for filling of the land, that is, with dirt?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:17): I am very happy to make that inquiry, but can I say to the member for Bragg and other members here: this whole project is, in some respects, reasonably simple. It's a layered proposition. At the moment you've got quite a large expanse of land. It has no services to speak of. It is low lying land. It is subject to potential inundation, flooding, etc. There are environmental issues and various other things associated with the land. Before that land can be rendered commercially valuable it has to be serviced and—remediated is not so much the right word; actually, it's basically filled. So, there are two distinct elements to this sort of proposition. The fill element—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Pardon?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will make that inquiry but I suspect it is a bit of a 'how long is a piece of string' answer.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The member for Stuart makes the proposition that fill jobs are temporary jobs. That may be the case but I suspect, given the expanse there and the amount of fill required, they are about as temporary as jobs at Roxby Downs because it's a big piece of land.

Ms CHAPMAN: My question is to the Treasurer.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary?

Ms CHAPMAN: I am happy to make it just another question.

The SPEAKER: Another question? Okay.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:19): Now that the Attorney has read the contract and has had advice on it and advice on what he can release on it, but is yet to identify whether what he has given us today is the contract or a redacted final copy of the deed, can he tell the house whether there is a condition in the contract that requires the construction of an oil or gas hub?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:20): The member for Bragg asks a very interesting question, and one of the elements about it that is quite interesting is that she has added in a couple of little words that I have never actually said, which include, 'I've read and considered the whole contract'.

Ms Chapman: What, you've never read the contract? That would be good.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It has been said by wiser people than me that sometimes it is wise not to get yourself into that when you do not know what you are doing.

Ms Chapman: Are you seriously telling us you haven't read the contract?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Slow down. I am not warranting to you or anybody else—if I just let that bit go through and not comment on it, later on you will say, 'Yes, but you've read the contract.' I just want to make it clear, in answering that question, I am not saying I have sat down and read that contract from one end to the other. I make that perfectly clear.

Ms Chapman: It's only 10 pages according to what you've given us.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, I'm a slow reader.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Sorry, that was meant to be funny. The contract has a number of annexures to it or addenda (if that is the plural) that are quite significant in size and they have terms of art contained within them, terms which have a particular meaning in the context of that contract. I do not profess to be an expert on those things and I have asked crown law to advise me and the people who are actually experts in this commercial area to tell me. That is the overview of the thing, but I specifically did ask this question of them a while ago because it is a matter that was raised.

What I think I can say to the honourable member for Bragg and other members of the house is that there is, within the body of the full documentation, a reference to the establishment of an industrial precinct with focus on potential oil and gas development, but I am advised that I cannot get into any more particulars than that other than to say to you that I am assured that is in there. I have every belief that the officers of the Crown who told me that are telling me what they know to be the truth, and I have asked them, 'Am I able to go out and give any more detail about this?' Unfortunately—and frustratingly, from my point of view—they have told me, at this point in time, no.

They have told me that and the reason they have told me that is that at this point in time, because this contract has a number of elements to it and critical dates, some of which we have yet to reach, it is not possible at this point in time for us to release particulars in relation to that without bringing me back to the problem about us potentially breaching the terms of the agreement. I find that frustrating quite frankly, because—

Ms Chapman: Or convenient.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, it's not convenient in the sense that none of us here believe we have anything that is of concern about this matter and if that could be demonstrated with absolute proof for the purposes of the member for Bragg by simply giving her something, why wouldn't we just do that, if we could do it without being in trouble under the contract? It does not make sense. Of course we would give it over, but I am advised we cannot.

Ms CHAPMAN: Final supplementary if I may, sir, to the Attorney.

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:23): In respect of whether or not it is a condition or a term of this deed—or an option, as it has been described—that there is the obligation on ACP to construct an oil and gas hub, are you saying that you have received crown law advice that you cannot make any public statement on whether that is a condition of the deed? And if not, why won't you tell the parliament and the people of South Australia whether or not this is a condition? It has been presented—

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think we've got the idea, the nub of the question. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:24): Mr Speaker, I am sincerely trying to be of help to the parliament and the member for Bragg about this. I have been advised, but what I can say to the parliament and what I can say publicly about the matter is: there is reference in the documentation to the establishment of an industrial precinct with a focus on oil and gas as a hub.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I beg your pardon? You want to know what they have to do?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As much as I would like to help the member for Bragg, it is not going to be—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I would, I seriously would, because it would then put this—

Ms Chapman: What about the people of South Australia?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: And them too; I could help them through you. But it would not serve any useful purpose for the government to become in breach of its agreement with ACP and therefore just introduce yet more unnecessary clutter into this conversation. I think that the safest thing for me to do is to rely on what I have already said and to point you back to the ministerial statement and also to the response I gave to the member for Mount Gambier a while ago. That is self-evident truth, isn't it?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's right; we got cut short. There is a self-evident truth for any business which is trying to provide a service: you can provide the service but whether somebody wishes to take it up is a matter for the market. Nobody is able to warranty absolutely that, within a certain specific period of days, weeks, months or years, there will be X number of customers lined up at the door with their chequebook waiting to buy your product. All we can say with confidence—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, the member for Mount Gambier is still interested. What we can say with confidence is that the government has proceeded on the basis that the intention is to provide an opportunity for an industrial complex, ideally focused on mineral resources, oil and gas; that has always been part and parcel of this—and, if you go back as far as the very earliest statements made by the Premier and my predecessor in this role, you will find that even those very early statements make reference to this specific thing. So, it is not as if this is some subsequent invention by somebody; this predates all litigation and everything else.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, there's nothing in what you have; I agree with you. You had me at 'Hello'.

The SPEAKER: 'There is nothing in what the deputy leader has.'

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I beg your pardon: there is nothing in what the deputy leader has, I concede that point, but I have never actually said that there was anything in there. There are basically two bits to the deed, if I can explain it this way, Mr Speaker: there are the bits that the deputy leader has and there are the bits that the deputy leader does not have.

An honourable member: There are the known knowns.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There are the known knowns. The thing that the deputy leader is looking for, the information that she seeks, is contained in the piece that she does not have. All I am trying to explain is that bit the deputy leader does not have, I have sought advice about my capability to be able to produce that publicly without causing some disturbance in the force, and the answer is that I cannot do that.

The SPEAKER: I cannot let you complete the answer because your time has expired. Another question?

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a question, yes, to the Premier.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:28): Actually, I will ask my question of the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. What involvement did the Premier have with the assessment of the ACP proposal for land at Gillman?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:29): I think that there is plenty of information about this on the public record and, indeed, there is quite a bit contained in my statement.

But just to give you a quick bird's eye view of the thing from what is on the public record: at some point in time—I do not remember the dates without having a chronology sitting in front of me—the chair of the Economic Development Board, Mr Spencer, came to the Premier—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. I think we are at cross-purposes. I have asked not about the meeting: I have asked about the assessment of the project. What involvement did the Premier have in respect of the assessment of the project?

The SPEAKER: Maybe that's clearer now. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thank the honourable member for clarifying that point because she saved herself quite a lot of history because I would have gone through everything. I don't think the government's position on this has ever changed and that is that the ultimate decision in relation to the matter was a decision which was made at the cabinet level. As the honourable member would be aware, the blow-by-blow repetition of what occurs at a cabinet meeting doesn't get—

Ms Chapman: I haven't asked about that.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: But what I am saying is the Premier was a participant in the cabinet process, obviously, and we do know the outcome of the cabinet process and we even know bits of information objectively assessed by various people about some of the material that was before the cabinet. That's not because I'm giving it to you: it's because—

Ms Chapman: I'm not even asking about that, either. I am talking about the assessment.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think that's the only answer I can give. Ultimately, the decision-making body was the cabinet and the Premier was, obviously, a member of the cabinet.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:31): Supplementary: between the meeting of the Premier in June 2013 with Mr Spencer, which has been referred to, and the cabinet meeting to grant the approval, there was a period of assessment by Renewal SA of the proposal. I was specifically asking, in that period, what involvement there was of the Premier in that process?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (17:31): I suspect that, because the Premier at the relevant time was the treasurer, if I'm not mistaken, then it is clear from the material which has been publicly revealed that officers of the Treasury produced coordinating comments—additional comments, addenda—to a cabinet submission, so there was some Treasury perspective on this offered as part and parcel of the cabinet submission. I guess one could say that the Premier, wearing his hat as treasurer, had officers who provided information which supplemented the material before the cabinet. Aside from that, so far as I am aware, the situation is simply that the Premier participated, as the rest of us did, in the cabinet process.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:32): My final question is to the Premier. Leaving aside the meeting with Mr Spencer in June 2013 and what advice you may have had as the treasurer (as distinct from being the state development minister at the time) and the cabinet approval, did the Premier, as minister for state development or treasurer, have any involvement and, if so, what was it, in respect of the assessment of the ACP proposal by Renewal SA?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (17:33): I have nothing to add to the answer that was given by the Attorney.

EDUCATION SYSTEM

Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:33): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Congratulations, minister: I look forward to a long and productive professional relationship. Why is South Australia the only state that still teaches grade 7 in primary school?

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is called to order. Minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (17:34): Thank you, sir, and thank you for the assistance from just behind me. The question of where year 7 belongs is, of course, a vexed one and there has been a reasonable amount of debate across Australia, and I appreciate that other states have chosen to put it into high school. The challenge I have in agreeing with that is we know how much that would cost. We know not only the teaching costs associated but also the very significant capital costs that would be associated—and, no doubt, the closure of some very small schools where the fact that there are some year 7s there enables them to stay open.

So we can see the amount of expenditure that would be required to make that transition. What we don't see is any evidence that there is any great advantage to the students. We know that the Australian curriculum was designed for both primary school and high school grade 7.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: So we know that the capability of teaching at both levels is suitable. I have gone to a lot of school graduations in the last three years, being a member of parliament, and I know that year 7 is that year where children can vary I suspect more than at any other time. You see boys aged 12 who are still little kids and you see boys aged 12 who are like grown men. That is, I suspect, part of why there is such a challenging debate about where year 7 belongs—because it is a transition year.

The balance at this stage, in my view, is that you don't waste state expenditure that could be put into other and better purposes for education, and that you wait to see what kind of educational evidence there is that would be so overwhelming that it would challenge that decision.

Mr PISONI: I have a supplementary question, if I may.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert has fallen under a very bad influence since he has shifted. Yes, there is a supplementary question.

EDUCATION SYSTEM

Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:36): Will grade 7 continue to be taught in composite 6/7 classes in South Australia?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (17:36): I will take that under advisement because I don't want to answer such a detailed question without taking a briefing. I am aware that it has been, because I have a child who has gone through the six part of the 6/7 class, but I will confirm the current position of the system from this year on.

EDUCATION SYSTEM

Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:36): Can the minister advise if the government has any plans or intention to move grade 7 into high school?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (17:36): I feel that I have already canvassed the position of the government presently and some of the logic that sits behind that, sir.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE VOLUNTEERS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (17:37): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Why is the minister publicly claiming that he is not refusing to meet with the CFS Volunteers Association when, in a letter to the CFS Volunteers Association, he states that he will only meet with them at the first meeting of the reform committee on 23 February when only two of the CFSVA board will be present?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (17:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is just a disappointment he has had an interest in this matter in only recent times.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Sorry? No, to the reform process.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: He has only attended two meetings. Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett has a point of order.

Dr McFETRIDGE: The remarks by the minister I find personally insulting, as a life member of the CFS.

The SPEAKER: Could the member for Morphett tell me what the remarks were on which he relies?

Dr McFETRIDGE: The minister claimed that I had only taken a recent interest in matters concerning the CFS. As can be clearly seen by the house, I am wearing a 20-year medal and am a life member of the CFS. I know more about it—I've forgotten more about it than this lot will ever know.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Before the minister continues: it's not unparliamentary, it's political argy-bargy—

Mr TARZIA: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, I will deal with this one first—which this house deals with all the time. So, if the member for Morphett wishes to make a personal explanation, at the end of the minister's answer he may do so, but taking a point of order was highly disorderly, of the kind that the member for Mackillop was rightly expelled from the house for on 18 November, having reviewed the *Hansard* Minister.

Mr TARZIA: Sir, 127: it was a personal digression on the member for Morphett.

The SPEAKER: I will consider that point of order while the minister continues.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I acknowledge the member's contribution to the CFS as a volunteer over 20 years, you said, but I stand by the statement in terms of interest in this reform process, and that was the context in which I made the comment.

In the reform process, he has been, as far as I am aware—and I am happy to be corrected—at two meetings: one at Hahndorf, which he came along to and I appreciate his attendance. The other one was when the cameras turned up on the steps of Parliament House.

There have been a number of other meetings. I have had numerous meetings with the CFS Volunteers Association, as I have with the SES Volunteers' Association and a number of other parties. You have to remember that there are seven parties in this reform process. At the last meeting—during the process, we have had numerous discussions—we agreed on a process of how to advance the reform, so every party is in the picture. In fact, some members of the CFSVA have accused me of so-called 'other meetings' with others, and that was why we agreed as a group, and they were present, on the reform process.

The meeting on the 23rd, for your information, is being held on a Monday at a time for which the delegates from the CFSVA asked, as it would suit their delegates' travelling times. So, the

meeting is actually being held on a day, at a time, in a place to suit their delegates. You wouldn't know because you weren't at the last meeting; I was.

The SPEAKER: No, I wouldn't know, and I wasn't at the meeting.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Sorry, you are quite right, Mr Speaker. The member for Morphett wouldn't know this. As I have indicated to the member for Morphett, and have said publicly, the next meeting is on that date. I have also written to the CFS Volunteers Association to make it very clear that I am happy to meet them face to face to discuss any other issue, as we have done since the March election.

Whether it's the cancer legislation, the scheme to help farm fire units or any other matter, I am still happy to meet them face to face on every issue, but, in terms of the reform process, because there are seven parties involved, all should be around the table, particularly if they want me to change my opinion or hear something different. It's only fair to all the other six parties that we do that. Now, that's an open and transparent process, and I would adhere to it.

The SPEAKER: Before I go to grievances, I have looked at the member for Hartley's point of order; that is, a member may not digress from the subject matter of any question under discussion or make personal reflections on any other member. I uphold that point of order, and I call the minister to order.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.J. Snelling.

Grievance Debate

HEALTH REVIEW

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (17:43): Tempted as I am to respond to the Minister for Emergency Services' remarks, I will save that for another day. Considering what the Minister for Health said today in this place, I am just going to enlighten him on some of the effects of his so-called Transforming Health, by referring to an email that was sent to me during question time by somebody who I have personal knowledge of and who has vast experience in the South Australian health system. In particular, in this case, they are talking about the Noarlunga health system, and I read from the email:

I am writing this to express some very deep concerns re the closing of Noarlunga ED, and the negative impact this will have on the Southern Area, and also the functioning of [the Flinders Medical Centre]. There are many concerns (of which I will point out a few only)—

I am reading the email here, so I will read it as it is written—

and I feel that Jack Snelling and his department have only a very simplistic view of just what Noarlunga ED does, and are unaware of how much of a contribution Noarlunga makes to the health of the surrounding area, and indeed to the whole of the Fleurieu Peninsula (which is our current catchment area).

Historically, the proposed changes are just a step backwards in time, going back to Noarlunga EDs first origins—which was as a walk-in 'Drop In Centre'. As the area grew, so did the health needs of the area, and the centre evolved into a fully-fledged ED (with a beautiful, *still new*, purpose built ED which is remarked on by all who visit from other ED Depts to be the nicest in the state). It seems very strange that, as the Southern Area continues to expand massively, with huge new housing developments being built constantly, an ED treating 50,000 people a year is no longer needed...Even stranger given that we are all aware that FMC is not, and cannot cope (and nothing in the Transforming Health proposals looks to be going to change this)...FMC diverts Ambulances on a virtual daily basis to Noarlunga because of their failure to cope.

When Jack Snelling states that Noarlunga only needs to be a walk-in ED, because we discharge 87% of our patients, he shows absolutely no understanding whatsoever of the type of patients we are treating. We constantly take major pressure from FMC's Emergency Department. A huge number of those 87% of patients that Jack and his advisers have so casually dismissed, will not be able to be treated at a walk-in centre; If Noarlunga ED closes more than 20,000 extra patients a year will present to the Flinders ED. Flinders will not be able to cope with that load, as they are not coping with their current load. I am sure FMC staff are contacting you as I write this, to say that very same thing.

I give you some examples (a very tiny selection of the vast array of complex problems that we assess, treat, and are able to discharge—a lot of the time because we have learned to do it better—something we are about to pay for unfortunately).

1. Patients with renal colic and biliary colic—they present in agony, vomiting, require IV medications immediately, IV fluids, multiple tests, and observation for some hours. We then discharge them.
2. Patients who collapse or have a seizure—they require ECG, extensive history and examination, multiple tests and extended period of observation. We then discharge them.
3. Patients who present with bleeding or pain in pregnancy. We do extensive work, observation and consultation with FMC. For the most part we then discharge them.
4. Patients with chest pain present constantly to Noarlunga (approx 9 out of 10 people presenting with chest pain will have a non cardiac cause, but thoroughly ascertaining this, and the patient's safety to discharge, takes several hours). We then discharge them with a referral to a 'Low Risk Chest Pain Pathway' or to...their GP—if they meet carefully considered guidelines that have been set out by Cardiologists at FMC. Those patients who present with a definite heart attack (confirmed to be so at Noarlunga with an immediate ECG on arrival) are sent within a few minutes to FMC (as a 'CODE STEMI'); at FMC a theatre is prepped and awaiting them.
5. Patients with transient neurological symptoms (i.e. a few minutes of face or arm numbness which could be a sign of a Transient Ischaemic Attack...which is a stroke warning) also have an extensive workup at Noarlunga, before those deemed to be safe to discharge (via following a well developed FMC 'TIA pathway'), we then discharge, with followup planned by GP, neurology outpatients, or to an early TIA pathway review. Those who have signs of a stroke fitting certain criteria, are sent within a few minutes to FMC under a 'CODE STROKE' pathway, where definitive treatment awaits. The former group that can be safely discharged vastly outweigh the latter group that are needing admission.

Both examples 4 and 5 only occur when patients walk in, as ambulances already bypass Noarlunga if it is clear that a patient is indeed having a heart attack or stroke. These patients, and many others, with every possible emergency imaginable, are still going to walk in to a Walk in ED. When they do...we will only have limited facilities and staff to treat them (or does Mr Snelling think we are going to turn them away at the door and make them either wait on the footpath for an ambulance, or drive on/catch a bus...to the FMC). Because we will always have a duty of care to all patients, we will still be seeing and instituting emergency care—as much as we are rendered capable of.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (17:48): Today I want to congratulate Nat Cook on the outstanding campaign that she ran for the seat of Fisher, and from here on I will refer to her as the member for Fisher. The member for Fisher is an intelligent, decent and down-to-earth person—something I know the good people of Fisher recognised. She has the ingredients so important in politics: honesty and connectedness. She has the ability to speak with and relate to all people, which places her well in this particular occupation, and it does us a service by her being here. So well done, Nat. Congratulations and welcome to this place. You are a worthy addition.

Before leaving the Fisher election, I do want to note the intervention of a Family First MP into the fray during the crucial stages of the campaign.

Mr Picton: Which one?

The Hon. P. CAICA: It was Robert Brokenshire from another place.

Mr Knoll: Normally we have sore losers, but you are a sore winner.

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, I was surprised. I was surprised that this MP would use parliament to make allegations, allegations that could not be substantiated, and certainly could not or would not be repeated outside the cloak of the protection that parliamentary privilege provides. I was shocked, shocked that the party which purports to be the moral compass would stoop so low. I also do not expect that there will be an apology for his actions and that will not be forthcoming.

In my remarks, I just want to briefly touch on the woes that the federal government and its current leader find themselves in. It is easy for Mr Abbott to say that good government starts today; however, the people of Australia believe that it should have started 17 months ago. The events of yesterday did not simply build up over the last couple of weeks. It has been building since this so-called mature, grown-up government commenced some 17 months ago. The events from yesterday have been 17 months in the making. Why have the Australian people—indeed over one-third of the federal government's party room—lost confidence in Mr Abbott? Well, here are just a few issues and reasons to consider.

The Liberal pledge prior to the election that education funding through Gonski was a unity ticket with the Labor Party's position—that went out the door. It is 'gone-ski'. We heard the minister talk about the pledge that the new submarines will be built in Adelaide. That went out the door. The

backbenchers, of course, forced the PM to revisit this issue. I am not quite sure what the competitive evaluation process is about, but it is certainly, I think, not what the backbenchers believe the PM's commitment to be. It is now a 'competitive evaluation process', whatever that means.

Yet another contributing factor to yesterday's fiasco: Mr Abbott's Medicare co-payment, which was widely discredited and condemned by so many. That went down really well. And what about the bizarre PPL (paid parental leave)? There was \$100,000-plus for people to access maternity leave, thankfully now jettisoned, like the PM yesterday almost was.

The removal of Labor's 'big new tax', the price on carbon—admittedly, that was one of the few promises he kept, but what is Direct Action? I am not quite sure what Direct Action is. I do not think anyone else does. I do not know what money has been spent on Direct Action to date, or what it means, and the removal of this tax has not left anyone better off, I don't think, except maybe the big end of town. My constituents do not believe there has been any material benefit. Their electricity bills have not gone down.

I guess another contributing factor over the period of time has been the position to provide Phil with a gong. That also went down really well. The Coalition's first (and to date only) budget, a budget that did not impact anywhere near as much on those who are well-off but has severely impacted on those least able to afford the impost of the budget, again has been a contributing factor. It seems that we all have to contribute and we all need to pay our own way; it is simply that those who are most vulnerable and those who can least afford it have to pay more.

They are just a few examples, and Mr Abbott now finds himself in the position that he is in today: a position that will not go away and a position that is untenable. He is terminal, terminally ill, and how can the people of Australia believe him when he says he can change? He has broken so many promises; even his own can see through that. As much as I would like to see Mr Abbott lead his party to the next election, I do not think it is going to happen. He will soon be eaten by his own. To the federal Liberal MPs: stop sending out information that is not factual and not true about concessions and tell the truth.

PROROGATION

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (17:53): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I am very excited to see you sitting back in the chair. We all assume our places, although I have been sent to the naughty corner for remedial instruction. As I rise today, I cannot help but feel a sense of déjà vu. It seems to me that it was not that long ago that we were sitting in the other place listening to the Governor's speech—a different Governor—with all the Supreme Court judges there sitting in a row, and we were going through this process. In fact, it was only nine months ago. Only nine months ago did we have to go through this process.

Can I say that the proroguing of parliament which we have just gone through and the ceremony for opening of a new session of parliament which we have gone through today is an indulgence on behalf of the Premier, and it is an indulgence he has inflicted on the South Australian taxpayer, and the South Australian taxpayer will have to pay. The Labor Party went to the last election with a plan, or at least I remember at every press conference the Premier clutching that beautiful glossy document to his bosom at all times. I remember there were a lot of glossy photos in there.

Mr Gardner: Someone said they were going to close the Repat.

Mr KNOLL: No, I don't think the closure of the Repat was part of that plan. It is what Labor took to the election. I am sure it is what the South Australian people, after having seen the Labor government re-elected (and we can have the debate about that another day) could expect. Maybe that is what we were going to talk about in this 2014-18 term of parliament.

But, alas, not: we had a Governor's speech from last year. I assume now, after today's Governor's speech, that we sort of declare the last Governor's speech null and void—we just will not talk about it anymore. Instead the Premier is telling us that we should ignore that, that we should ignore the plan he took to the election, but, please, listen intently to what is being said today, and that is what you should now believe. It is incredulous for us to have to go through this process again. The Premier has so much opportunity, so many microphones in front of his face, that he could have

delivered this speech himself. In the process he could have saved the South Australian taxpayer a lot of money.

In recent days we have seen articles about a figure of \$5,000 being the cost of proroguing parliament. I do not think that this figure entails the broader costs, because it is not just the ceremony of the day, not just the beautiful lunch we had today in the dining room, but it is the next two weeks' sitting and everything that comes with the Address in Reply speeches.

We had today the full bench of the Supreme Court sitting in the other place, and the daily rate on salaries only of the Supreme Court judges is \$12,557—\$12,000—certainly more than the \$5,000 figure. Surely the better use of the Supreme Court bench's time would be considering matters before them and making judgements on behalf of people in South Australia. It is also the time of MPs and their staff who, instead of being able to delve into legislation (which is what we should be doing today), will be responding to the Governor's speech over the next couple of weeks. It is the ceremony that goes with it, the band going down the street, the high-ranking Army and Defence Force officials who were following us all today—this is the cost.

Mr Gardner: Closing the street.

Mr KNOLL: The closing of the street: I am told that it costs \$10,000 every time you want to close a street. Obviously it is not part of the \$5,000 cost. It is also the cost of running the parliament. For the next two weeks we will focus on responding to this speech, but this place does not run cheaply. Its unique function means that it does not run cheaply. There are 83 staff working in this building, and for the next two weeks we will be focusing on the Governor's speech and responding to it.

Mr Picton interjecting:

Mr KNOLL: Well, there is certainly no other legislation before us at the moment that we can talk about, member for Kaurana. There are 83 people whose jobs come at varying costs, and this is certainly more than the \$5,000 figure that is quoted.

I hark back to my university days, and for me they were still a reasonable time ago, sitting back in first year economics at Adelaide University. In those days we had Union Hall, hundreds of kids sitting in the lecture, and for me it was a bit difficult because I went to work at 6am on the factory floor, and would pack my hams and my salamis, and often then, going to class at 10 or 11, I would doze off in my economics lecture. The one economic theory that I took from my economics lecture was that of opportunity cost, the idea that the cost of doing something is all the other things we could have done with that time, and that is what we have wasted and will waste over these next two weeks. These are real problems that South Australians face, and legislation should and could be brought before this parliament, but instead we go through this ceremonial process to appease and indulge the Premier.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (17:58): After some 520 days in office, yesterday our Prime Minister said to the nation:

All of us are determined to lift our game and the fundamental point I make is that the solution to all these things is good government and good government starts today.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an extraordinary statement. This demonstrates that the Prime Minister knows what the Australian people all know: that this federal government has been a bad government from day one, with cuts and policies that have caused pain for my constituents and all South Australians. So, if day 1 of good government was yesterday, presumably it follows that day 2 of good government is today, but it has been anything but; it has been a complete disaster of submarine policy that we have seen today, and unfortunately South Australian workers at Osborne are caught in the crosshairs.

Members interjecting:

Mr PICTON: We have seen the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Stuart—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask members to listen to the grievance and remind the member for Finniss that, while he does not have any warnings yet, he could have. The member for Schubert has a warning and is on the precipice of having his second.

Mr PICTON: I thank you for your protection, Deputy Speaker. We have seen the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Stuart today down on site with the defence minister as he was unable to explain why they were not having an open tender and why they were not keeping their promise to build all 12 submarines in South Australia.

Now they are having a 'competitive evaluation process' but they cannot even explain what that means—nobody in the defence industry has ever heard that term before—and they cannot tell you the difference between that and a tender. This is something that they have just come up with to try to win votes in the leadership spill that the Prime Minister only narrowly won.

Then we have had Senator Edwards out there trying to backtrack on his explanation that he had secured an open tender, and he has been completely unable to do that all day. My favourite quote from him today in trying to explain this was, 'You never get a second chance to ask your uncle to a wedding.' I am no expert on asking uncles to weddings but I do not understand how that has anything to do with submarine policy at all.

The good news is all is not lost; there is still time. The commonwealth could very easily take a number of steps to implement good government at the federal level and benefit the people of South Australia and elsewhere, but they need to start immediately. So, I suggest some steps that they could take over the next week—days 3 to 10 of good government—to actually make that a reality. On day 3 of good government (tomorrow), they should announce that they will be keeping their promise to build submarines in Adelaide and release an open tender for international partners to work with ASC on the build of the 12 submarines.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PICTON: On day 4 of good government, they should restore the national health reform agreement—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

Mr PICTON: —and properly partner with state governments to grow and improve health services. On day 5 of good government, they should agree to implement the full recommendations of the Gonski school review, in partnership with state governments. On day 6 of good government, they should restore the \$30 million of seniors concessions every year that have been cut from seniors in South Australia and ensure that their bills will not go up.

On day 7 of good government, they should completely scrap the GP co-payment that will put families across South Australia under increased financial burden and will flood our emergency departments with patients that should be seeing general practitioners. On day 8 of good government, they should use the funding that they have saved by no longer supporting automobile manufacturing in Australia to reinvest that into transition for workers and manufacturers in South Australia and Victoria.

On day 9 of good government, they should restore national funding for public transport projects, such as the Seaford rail extension that was funded under the previous government, that will help improve our city of Adelaide and reduce pressure on our roads. On day 10 of good government, they should abolish the knights and dames system. The Minister for Local Government has suggested a day 11, where they should reimplement the \$18 million that they have cut from local councils in South Australia as supplementary road funding, which is an outrageous disgrace —

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is—

Mr PICTON: —and puts us behind all the other states in this country.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is called to order!

Mr PICTON: This is supplementary funding that is meant to be putting South Australia at an equal level with other states and the member for Finniss scoffs at that. But, if we do not see days like this—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Finniss!

Mr PICTON: —coming from the Prime Minister, then we will know that good government has not actually started, and that the mean and tricky federal government that we have seen for the past 520 days has unfortunately remained.

GRANITE ISLAND

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the member for Finniss speaks, he knows what is going to happen, doesn't he? During your grievance you will be spoken over, because you paid no respect to the other members who spoke this afternoon, so I do not know if I will be able to help you.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (18:03): I am perfectly happy if they want to interject; it does not worry me in the slightest, quite frankly. After that load of diatribe from the member for Kaurana, I recall the days of the Rudd/Gillard/Rudd absolutely chaotic government well. Thousands of people coming into Australia, blah blah blah—you will get yours, son; just wait, you will get yours.

I wanted to talk today about Granite Island opposite Victor Harbor. Granite Island has been an iconic visitor destination, along with Victor Harbor, for generations, and sadly at the moment things are in a bad way. About three million visitors a year go to the Fleurieu, about two million go down to Victor Harbor, and about 650,000 go or have gone to Granite Island during the year on visits by walking out there, or taking what is in fact the only horse tram in the world.

Over a series of years things have gone from bad to worse on Granite Island. This includes the huge reduction in penguin numbers. My view is that it is the New Zealand fur seals. There are other reasons as well, but that is being investigated. The penguin visitor centre is bereft of penguins, to say the least. DEWNR, in their infinite stupidity, do not want to allow a penguin breeding program to take place. If it were not for the volunteers who go out to Granite Island to try to keep the place neat and tidy and do some work, that would fall off the radar as well.

In addition, the kiosk out there, which has been the subject of a lease for a considerable number of years, is on the point of closing down or closed already I think. The lease has run out. The lessee was up for \$70,000 a year in lease payments to DEWNR. My understanding is that the lessee has not paid that rent for two years so they are \$140,000 out of pocket. The Victor Harbor council charges \$12,000 in rates for the Granite Island kiosk and commercial enterprise out there which is not operating. I am not quite sure whether they have been paid or not. It is a matter of great concern to the community of Victor Harbor. It is a matter of great concern to me that Granite Island looks like something that is fresh out of a war zone in the Middle East. It is simply not good enough.

The Times newspaper in Victor Harbor has picked up on this issue and talked about it regularly and, indeed, last week they called for a champion for Granite Island. I think they are quite justified in calling for that. We have a minister in another place responsible for the environment department who does not seem to want to get his hands dirty on anything much lately. I intend to try to speak to the minister this week sometime about Granite Island. I have heard rumblings that tourism may come in and try to assist. I say great if that is going to happen, however, knowing the way the mandarins in the department of environment work, I would think they will do anything to try and keep the department of tourism out of it—so we have a complete mess down there.

The Victor Harbor council is greatly concerned. The community thought that the City of Victor Harbor council still ran the island. That is not correct. They actually do have, as I am led to believe, a Granite Island committee, a section 41 committee under council, which is a good thing. However, this really needs something to happen in a hurry and it needs to be worked on rapidly. I guess it is almost too late for this year.

I have private enterprise operators down there who would like to take out a coffee cart or something so people when they can get out to Granite Island—if they go on the horse tram or if they walk—can at least get a drink or a coffee or something similar to that. Now, that seems to be taking an inordinately long time as well. As I have said, I have operators who would willingly do that.

My view is that there is no way known that any commercial operator should be asked to pay \$70,000 a year for a facility out there by way of rent. I do not know what the circumstances were. It was a very good facility at one stage. The toilets out there were a disgrace before Christmas. Fortunately, a couple of officers of DEWNR have been helpful and they have been painted and have been brought up to some semblance of decency to look at and whatnot but, as I said, if you want to encourage visitation people have to have good things. I have finished.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, you finished yourself. I was going to listen, but—

Mr PENGILLY: And I never got an interjection.

STATE TRANSITION PROGRAM

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (18:09): I rise today to speak about an incredibly effective education program supported by our state government—the State Transition Program. Late last year it was my great pleasure to attend their 2014 graduation ceremony on behalf of the then minister for education and child development.

The program is funded by our state government and is delivered by community organisation and disability employment service, Barkuma. The program assists students with a disability or learning difficulty to make a successful transition from secondary school to work or further study. It gives students a head start through employment skills training, accredited industry training, structured work placement and assistance with job seeking with the support of an employment service. The program plays an important role in assisting our government to deliver on a number of objectives set out in our State Strategic Plan, in particular the goal to double the number of people with disabilities employed.

The graduation function recognised the achievements of 51 students. It was emceed by the highly dedicated manager of personnel employment at Barkuma, David Coles, and attended by dedicated chairman, Chas Allen, and hundreds of family members and friends. Students were joined by an ambassador of the program, Kate Collins and, excitingly, by MC Suffa, frontman for internationally acclaimed rap artists, Hilltop Hoods, who were born and bred in our beautiful southern suburbs.

I was very happy to hear Kristen from Christies Beach High School give the student address and was inspired by her recount of her journey and the journey of her fellow students including Dylan, star player of the mighty O'Sullivan Beach-Lonsdale or 'Lonnie Lions' footy club and was happy to congratulate them both on their graduation.

During the evening I had the opportunity to speak and pay tribute to those who were graduating whose work, effort and commitment we celebrated. In doing so, I acknowledged Barkuma for their incredible work towards the transition program and for their vision, leadership and commitment to coordinating the program and bringing stakeholders together to achieve outcomes with and for young people.

There are many programs for young people but to successfully bring a program to life, a strong vision and wise and collaborative leadership is always needed. I thank Barkuma for this and their management partners, Catholic Education SA, Association of Independent Schools of SA and the Department of Education and Child Development who have similarly focused on ensuring this program is one that understands and meets the needs of our young people.

I also acknowledge parents and caregivers for their support of their children throughout their lives. There are many people who help children flourish but parents and caregivers, as children's first teachers, are the ones who are there for the big moments like graduation but also, for all of the highs and lows and every moment in between, year in, year out.

I thank all of the trainers, teachers and support workers who have worked alongside these wonderful young people and have shown their commitment to developing their skills and to

supporting them. Great teachers and trainers make such a difference in a young person's life and I am sure that the support received during this program will be remembered well and will continue to guide these young people.

In successfully participating in this transition program, the young people demonstrated skills and values that will serve them well now and into the future, and will no doubt be well valued by future employers—resilience, persistence, time management, communication skills as well as technical skills.

The young people benefited from individual and group careers sessions and developed their skills to be able to make informed decisions about their future pathways. The courses undertaken by students developed skills in the industry areas of animal studies, hospitality, horticulture, creative industries and multimedia, information technology and retail. Teachers, parents and caregivers also had the opportunity to have input into career direction so that all the strengths interests and capabilities of the young person were identified and sound decisions about possible pathways could be made.

The program offers a comprehensive preparation for life after school with career development and employability skills, credit towards the SACE as well as a national qualification, a semester of vocational education and training, work placement supported by the student's chosen disability employment service, and registration with the Disability Employment Service that will provide them with ongoing support after the transition from school.

I wish these young people well for their future, whether in further education and training or employment. I am very happy that our government has committed to provide a further \$80,000 per annum over 2015-16 to support future students.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (18:14): Without notice, I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion for the adoption of sessional orders relating to the time of meeting and adjournment of the house, right of reply, the delivery and receipt of messages, and private members' business.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as there is not an absolute majority present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (18:16): Pursuant to order, I move:

That for the remainder of the session, sessional orders be adopted so as to provide for the time of meeting and adjournment of the house, to provide a citizen's right of reply, the delivery and receipt of messages, and to vary the time for the consideration of private members' business detailed in the draft sessional orders circulated to members.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (18:17): I move:

That the Hon. T.R. Kenyon and Messrs Bell, Williams and Hughes be appointed to act with Mr Speaker as members of the Standing Orders Committee.

Motion carried.

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (18:17): I move:

That a publishing committee be appointed, consisting of the Hon. T.R. Kenyon, the Hon. J.M. Rankine and Messrs Pederick, Odenwalder and Treloar.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (18:18): I move:

That the Hon. J.M. Rankine be appointed to the committee in place of Ms Hildyard.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (18:18): I move:

That Ms Cook be appointed to the committee in place of Ms Hildyard.

Motion carried.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (18:18): I move:

That Ms Cook be appointed to the committee in place of Ms Hildyard.

Motion carried.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (18:18): I nominate the member for Fisher to move an Address in Reply to His Excellency's opening speech and move:

That consideration of the Address in Reply be made an order of the day for tomorrow.

Motion carried.

At 18:19 the house adjourned until Wednesday 11 February 2015 at 11:00.