

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 11 February 2015

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW (EXTENDED SUPERVISION ORDERS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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) (11:01): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the making of extended supervision orders in relation to certain serious offenders; to make a related amendment to the Correctional Services Act 1982; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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) (11:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Criminal Law (Extended Supervision Orders) Bill 2015 creates a new type of order, called an extended supervision order (or ESO, as it is referred to), designed to place restrictions on certain high-risk offenders and provide for their continued supervision beyond the expiry of any term of imprisonment or parole period. The intention of this legislation is to address future risk and to enhance community safety. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

ESOs are designed to apply to certain high risk offenders who have either:

- served their entire sentence in prison and are due to be released into community under no supervision; or
- been released on parole and their parole is expiring.

In both cases, under the current law, there is no option other than leaving the high risk offender to live in the community under no supervision. Under this Bill, the Attorney-General will have the power to apply to the Supreme Court for an ESO so that a high risk offender may be supervised and subject to conditions.

In summary:

- an ESO can only be made in respect of a supervised high risk offender, being one who is serving a term of imprisonment or is under supervision on parole;
- the application for the ESO needs to be made within the final 12 months of the offender's imprisonment or supervision; and
- the ESO only commences operation once the offender is no longer imprisoned or supervised.

This is important reform. If a high risk offender has elected to serve his or her entire sentence without applying for parole, so that on release he or she will be unsupervised and not subject to any conditions, then this provides an option for supervision and conditions to be applied.

This reform is firmly focussed on protecting the safety and well-being of the community.

Therefore, the paramount consideration of the Supreme Court in determining whether to make an ESO is the safety of the community. In addition, the Supreme Court is empowered to make an ESO against a high risk offender who poses an appreciable risk to the safety of the community if not supervised under the ESO.

Under the Bill, the Attorney-General may apply to the Supreme Court for an ESO with respect to certain high risk offenders.

A high risk offender is:

- a person who has been convicted (whether before or after the commencement of the new legislation) of 'serious sexual offence' (referred to as a 'serious sexual offender') and who was sentenced to a term of imprisonment in respect of the 'serious sexual offence'; or
- a 'serious sexual offender' who is serving a sentence of imprisonment in respect of any of the following offences;
 - an offence under section 58 or 63A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 (SA) (the 'CLC Act'), being acts of gross indecency or possession of child pornography;
 - an offence under section 44, 45, 65 or 66N(2) of the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006 (SA) (the 'CSOR Act'), being failure to comply with reporting obligations, furnishing false or misleading information when reporting, applying for or engaging in child-related work and breaching requirements with respect to wearing a tracking device;
 - an offence under section 99I of the Summary Procedure Act 1921 (SA) (the 'SP Act'), being a breach of a paedophile restraining order; or
 - an offence prescribed by the regulations;
- a person who has been convicted (whether before or after the commencement of the new legislation) of a 'serious offence of violence' (referred to as a 'serious violent offender') and who was sentenced to a term of imprisonment in respect of the 'serious offence of violence';
- a person who is serving a sentence of imprisonment in respect of an offence of contravening or failing to comply with an ESO or an interim ESO; or
- a person who is the subject of an ESO.

As noted above, a high risk offender is defined to include a person who has been convicted and imprisoned for a 'serious sexual offence'.

Under the Bill, the term 'serious sexual offence' has the same meaning as in section 33(1) of the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988* (SA) (the 'Sentencing Act').

These sections cover the offences of rape, unlawful sexual intercourse, indecent assault, acts of gross indecency, abduction, procuring sexual intercourse, production or dissemination of child pornography, procuring a child to commit indecent act, sexual servitude, deceptive recruitment for commercial sexual services, use of children in commercial sexual services and incest, but only where the maximum penalty prescribed for the offence is, or includes, imprisonment for at least 5 years.

The term 'serious sexual offence' also includes an offence against a corresponding previous enactment substantially similar to an offence referred to above and an attempt to commit or an assault with intent to commit any of the offences referred to above, as well as an offence against the law of another State or a Territory corresponding to an offence referred to above.

Therefore, any person sentenced to a term of imprisonment for one of these 'serious sexual offences' may be the subject of an ESO.

In addition, once a person fulfils this criteria of having, at any time, served a term of imprisonment for a 'serious sexual offence' they may be the subject of an ESO if they are later sentenced to imprisonment for a lesser sexual offence that may not otherwise attract an ESO.

This provision will ensure that an offender who has previously committed a 'serious sexual offence' cannot avoid being the subject of an ESO simply because their subsequent offence (for which they were imprisoned) is a less serious sexual offence (such as possession of child pornography).

As noted above, a high risk offender is defined to include a person who has been convicted and imprisoned for a 'serious offence of violence'.

The term 'serious offence of violence' is given the same meaning as in section 83D(1) of the CLC Act and means an indictable offence that is punishable by imprisonment for life or for a term of 5 years or more where the conduct constituting the offence involved:

- the death of, or serious harm to, a person or a risk of the death of, or serious harm to, a person; or
- serious damage to property in circumstances involving a risk of the death of, or harm to, a person; or
- perverting the course of justice in relation to any conduct that, if proved, would constitute a serious offence of violence as referred to above.

Once a person fulfil the criteria of being a high risk offender, the Attorney-General may make an application to the Supreme Court for an ESO to be made in respect of that person.

However, the application must be made whilst that high risk offender remains under supervision, for example, whilst the high risk offender is in prison or released into the community on parole.

In addition, the application can only be made within the last 12 months of the high risk offender's supervision.

Under the Bill, for a high risk offender who is serving a term of imprisonment (whether in prison or on release on home detention or parole) the application must be made within 12 months of:

- if the offender is not serving a sentence of life imprisonment—the date on which the term, or terms, of imprisonment to which the offender was sentenced expire; and
- if the offender is serving a sentence of life imprisonment—the date on which the sentence of imprisonment will be taken to have been wholly satisfied.

In relation to a high risk offender who is subject to an existing ESO, the application must be made within 12 months of the date on which the ESO is due to expire.

Under the Bill, an ESO, once made, would only commence operation once the offender is no longer imprisoned or supervised, for example:

- if a full sentence has been served, the ESO would commence on release from prison; or
- if an offender is granted release on parole, the ESO would commence on expiry of the parole period.

Under the Bill, the Supreme Court can make an interim ESO in cases where the offender's supervision or term of imprisonment would be due to expire prior to the determination of the ESO.

The Supreme Court, before making an ESO, must be satisfied that the offender is a high risk offender and poses an appreciable risk to the safety of the community if not supervised under the ESO.

Before making an ESO, the Supreme Court must direct that at least 1 legally qualified medical practitioner (to be nominated by a prescribed authority for the purpose) examine the high risk offender and report to the Court on the results, including:

- for a serious sexual offender, an assessment of the likelihood of the offender committing a further serious sexual offence; or
- for a serious violent offender, an assessment of the likelihood of the offender committing a further serious offence of violence.

The paramount consideration of the Supreme Court in determining whether to make an ESO is the safety of the community.

In determining whether or not to make an ESO, the Supreme Court must also have regard to the following matters in addition to any other matter it considers relevant:

- the likelihood of the offender committing a further 'serious sexual offence' or 'serious offence of violence' if not supervised under an ESO;
- the report of any medical practitioner furnished to the Court;
- any report prepared by the Parole Board;
- any report required by the Court (including the results of any statistical or other assessment furnished to the Court as to the likelihood of persons with histories and characteristics similar to those of the respondent committing a further relevant offence);
- any relevant evidence or representations that the offender may desire to put to the Court;
- any treatment or rehabilitation program in which the offender has had an opportunity to participate, including his or her willingness to so participate and the extent of such participation;
- in the case of an offender released on parole—the extent to which he or she has complied with the conditions of his or her release on parole;
- in the case of an offender subject to an existing ESO—the extent to which he or she has complied with the terms of that ESO;
- in the case of an offender who is a registrable offender (within the meaning of the CSOR Act)—the extent to which he or she has complied with any obligations under the CSOR Act;
- the circumstances and seriousness of any offence in respect of which the offender has been found guilty according to his or her criminal history, and any pattern of offending behaviour disclosed by that history; and
- any remarks made by the sentencing court in passing sentence.

Under the Bill, the following conditions apply in relation to an ESO once made by the Court:

- a condition that the person subject to the order not commit any offence;
- a condition that the person subject to the order is prohibited from possessing a firearm or ammunition (both within the meaning of the *Firearms Act 1977* (SA)) or any part of a firearm;
- a condition prohibiting the person subject to the order from possessing an offensive weapon unless the Supreme Court permits the person to possess such a weapon and the person complies with the terms and conditions of the permission;
- a condition that the person subject to the order:
 - be under the supervision of a community corrections officer;
 - obey the reasonable directions of the community corrections officer; and
 - submit to such tests (including testing without notice) for gunshot residue as the community corrections officer may reasonably require;
- any other condition that the Court thinks fit and specifies in the order; and
- any condition imposed by the Parole Board.

The Bill provides the following as examples of the types of conditions that the Parole Board may include in an ESO:

- requiring the person subject to the order to:
 - reside at a specified address;
 - undertake such activities and programs as determined from time to time by the Parole Board; or
 - be monitored by use of an electronic device;
- providing that a community corrections officer or a police officer may, at any time:
 - visit the person subject to the order at the person's residential address; and
 - access any computer or related equipment that is at the person's residential address or in the possession of the person; and
 - for these purposes, enter the premises at that address; or
- prohibiting or restricting the person subject to the order from:
 - associating or communicating with a specified person or persons of a specified class;
 - residing or being present at, or being in the vicinity of, a specified place or premises or a place or premises of a specified class;
 - possessing a specified article or weapon, or articles or weapons of a specified class;
 - engaging in specified conduct, or conduct of a specified kind;
 - undertaking specified employment or employment of a specified kind;
 - applying for a change of name; or
 - engaging in any other conduct of a kind specified by the Parole Board.

Under the Bill, an ESO can only remain in force for a maximum of 5 years or such lesser period as the Supreme Court determines. The Parole Board will be able to vary and revoke conditions of ESOs set by the Parole Board and, for that purpose, under the Bill, a member of the Parole Board will have the power to summon a person who is the subject of an ESO to appear before the Parole Board. If the presiding member of the Parole Board reasonably suspects that a person who is the subject of an ESO may have breached a condition of the ESO, the presiding member may summon the person to appear before the Parole Board.

The Parole Board will also have the power to issue a warrant for the apprehension and detention of person who is summoned and fails to appear.

Any breach of the ESO constitutes an offence with a maximum penalty of 5 years imprisonment.

The aim of this new legislation is to provide a mechanism for extended supervision of those high risk offenders who pose a high level of risk to the safety of the community. Rather than forming part of a punishment for past conduct, this regime of extended supervision is designed to address future conduct.

This policy intent is reflected clearly in the Bill.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Object of Act

This clause provides that the object of this measure is to provide the means to protect the community from being exposed to an appreciable risk of harm posed by serious sexual offenders and serious violent offenders.

4—Interpretation

This clause contains definitions for the purposes of this measure, including definitions of extended supervision order, interim supervision order and supervision order; and serious sexual offender and serious violent offender.

5—Meaning of high risk offender

This clause provides that, for the purposes of this measure, a *high risk offender* is—

- (a) a serious sexual offender who was sentenced to a period of imprisonment in respect of the serious sexual offence; or
- (b) a person referred to in paragraph (a) who is serving a sentence of imprisonment any part of which is in respect of any of the following offences:
 - (i) an offence under section 58 or 63A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935;
 - (ii) an offence under section 44, 45, 65 or 66N(2) of the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006;
 - (iii) an offence under section 99I of the Summary Procedure Act 1921;
 - (iv) an offence prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this paragraph; or
- (c) a serious violent offender who was sentenced to a period of imprisonment in respect of the serious offence of violence; or
- (d) a person who is serving a sentence of imprisonment any part of which is in respect of an offence of contravening or failure to comply with a supervision order (see clause 17); or
- (e) a person who is subject to an extended supervision order.

6—Application of Act

The effect of this clause is to exclude the application of this measure in relation to a youth.

Part 2—Extended supervision orders

7—Proceedings

This clause sets out the manner in which the Attorney-General may make an application to the Supreme Court for an extended supervision order to be made in respect of a person who falls within the definition of a high risk offender (the *respondent*). Any such application may only be made within 12 months of the relevant date of expiry for the respondent. Before determining whether to make an extended supervision order, the Court must direct that 1 or more legally qualified medical practitioners examine the respondent and report to the Court on the results of the examination. The paramount consideration of the Court in determining whether to make an extended supervision order must be the safety of the community, while other matters must also be taken into account. If the Court is satisfied that the respondent is a high risk offender and he or she poses an appreciable risk to the safety of the community if not supervised under the order, the Court may make such an order.

8—Parties

This clause provides that both the Attorney-General and the person to whom an application under this measure for an extended supervision order relates are parties to the application.

9—Interim supervision orders

Under this clause, the Supreme Court may make an interim supervision order if an application for an extended supervision order in relation to a high risk offender has been made and the Court is satisfied—

- that the relevant expiry date for the respondent is likely to occur before the application is determined; and
- that the matters alleged in the material supporting the application would, if proved, justify the making of an extended supervision order.

An interim supervision order takes effect on the making of the order until the application for the extended supervision order is determined.

10—Supervision orders—terms and conditions

This clause sets out the terms and conditions that apply in relation to each extended supervision order, including the following:

- a condition that the person subject to the order not commit any offence;
- a condition that the person subject to the order is prohibited from possessing a firearm or ammunition (both within the meaning of the *Firearms Act 1977*) or any part of a firearm;
- a condition prohibiting the person subject to the order from possessing an offensive weapon unless the Supreme Court permits the person to possess such a weapon and the person complies with the terms and conditions of the permission;
- a condition that the person subject to the order be under the supervision of a community corrections officer;
- any other condition that the Court thinks fit and specifies in the order;
- any condition imposed by the Parole Board under clause 11.

The conditions (other than any condition imposed by the Parole Board) apply in relation to an interim supervision order.

11—Conditions of extended supervision orders imposed by Parole Board

This clause sets out a non-exclusive list of examples of the sorts of conditions that the Parole Board may impose on an extended supervision order and provides a scheme whereby the Board can vary or revoke a condition imposed by the Board or impose further conditions on the order.

12—Duration of extended supervision order

This clause provides that an extended supervision order—

- takes effect on the making of the order or on the relevant expiry date for the person subject to the order (whichever is the later); and
- remains in force for a period of 5 years or such lesser period as is determined by the Supreme Court and specified in the order.

13—Variation and revocation of supervision order

This clause provides the Supreme Court with power, on application, to vary or revoke an extended supervision order or interim supervision order.

14—Consequential and ancillary orders

This clause allows the Supreme Court to make any order of a consequential or ancillary nature when making or varying an extended supervision order or interim supervision order.

Part 3—Miscellaneous

15—Court may obtain reports

This clause empowers the Supreme Court to seek assistance in determining an application under this measure by requiring the Parole Board, the chief executive of the Correctional Services Department, or any other body or person, to provide the Court with a report on any matter.

16—Inquiries by medical practitioners

This clause sets out the requirements to be followed by any medical practitioner examining the respondent to an application under this measure.

17—Offence to contravene or fail to comply with supervision order

This clause provides that a person subject to a supervision order who contravenes or fails to comply with a condition of the order is guilty of an offence, punishable by imprisonment for 5 years.

18—Apprehension etc of person subject to extended supervision order on Board warrant

This clause gives power to the Parole Board to bring a person subject to an extended supervision order before the Board if the Board suspects on reasonable grounds that the person may have breached a condition of the order. The clause makes further provision relating to proceedings before the Board for such a breach.

19—Appeals

This clause makes provision for appeals to the Full Court against a decision of the Supreme Court on an application for an extended supervision order under clause 7.

20—Regulations

The Governor may make such regulations as are contemplated by, or as are necessary or expedient for the purposes of, this measure.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

1—Amendment of section 64—Reports by Board

This proposed amendment relates to requirements under the measure that the Parole Board provide the Supreme Court with a report for the purpose of assisting the Court to determine whether or not to make an extended supervision order.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Williams.

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (PRESCRIBED DRUG OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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) (11:04): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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) (11:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The prosecution of activities of outlaw motorcycle gangs and their members is a high priority for government. Outlaw motorcycle gangs and their members are notoriously involved in drug trafficking. The government has pledged to attack them with all means at its disposal. Labor's 2010 serious crime election policy stated, and I quote:

This proposal will amend the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act...to target persistent or high-level drug offenders to provide for total confiscation of property of a declared drug trafficker.

The policy details were:

New powers will be given to the Director of Public Prosecutions to allow criminal drug dealers who commit three prescribed offences within a span of 10 years to be 'declared a drug trafficker'.

Under this proposal, which targets high-level and major drug trafficking offenders, all of an offender's property can be confiscated, whether or not it is established as lawfully acquired and whether or not there is any level of proof about any property at all. Property and assets could also be restrained pending prosecution of matters before the court.

The legislation will attack repeat drug offenders.

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

Leave granted.

The offences that will attract the declaration if committed 3 or more times within a span of 10 years include:

- Trafficking in controlled drugs;
- Manufacture of controlled drugs for sale;
- Sale of controlled precursor for the purpose of manufacture;
- Cultivation of controlled plants for sale;

- Sale of controlled plants; and
- Any offence involving children and school zones.

The Bill, with an exception based on legal advice, fulfilling this election pledge was introduced into Parliament on 18 May 2011. It was passed by the House of Assembly on 28 July 2011. Once in the Legislative Council, though, the opposition, with the support of a majority of the cross-benchers, effectively defeated all of the operative parts of the policy by amendments to the Bill. At the end of 2011, Parliament was prorogued.

The Bill was re-introduced on 14 February 2012. The same thing happened in the Legislative Council. The usual procedures were followed where the Houses disagree, and it appeared that the Bill was destined to go to deadlock conference.

At that point, the Bill was split into two parts—the first, a Bill containing the operative provisions of the policy as described above, the second, a Bill containing a group of unrelated miscellaneous amendments to the principal Act that were uncontroversial. The latter passed without controversy.

The prescribed drug offenders Bill was introduced into the House of Assembly on 16 October 2012, and passed that day. It reached the Legislative Council on 18 October 2012. And there it sat. On 18 October 2013, the opposition moved that the second reading be deferred for six months. That effectively killed the Bill, since six months took it past the election and another prorogation.

The Labor Election Policies for 2014 included a pledge to pursue this initiative and bankrupt the Mr Bigs of the drug trade.

Following this election promise, the Bill was again introduced into the House of Assembly on 7 May 2014. It passed the House on 18 June 2014. Again, the Bill was opposed by the opposition and some cross-benchers in the Legislative Council before being passed on 4 December 2014 with amendments. Again, Parliament was prorogued before the amendments could be the subject of formal negotiation.

Now the Government is reintroducing the Bill—yet again.

Opposition to this proposal in South Australia seems to be based on the idea that this is a new and unprincipled proposition that is unparalleled in the known universe. In fact, it is enacted and operating in a more drastic form (for some time) in Western Australia, the Northern Territory and Queensland. Arguably, a combination of provisions in New South Wales has similar effect. This is not a re-invention of the wheel.

The Liberal Opposition repeatedly opposed the introduction of this measure in part, so it said, because of doubts over its constitutional validity. It is true that, by majority, the Northern Territory Court of Criminal Appeal ruled against the validity of that jurisdiction's scheme: *Emmerson v DPP* (2013) 225 A Crim R 409. But that doubt is now gone. In April 2014, the High Court delivered judgment on an appeal from that decision and in *Attorney-General (NT) v Emmerson* [2014] HCA 13, a majority of 6/1 held the Act and scheme valid. There is no longer that excuse for opposing this policy.

The Government has taken this policy to two separate elections. The South Australian public has endorsed this policy. This government is serious about targeting high level drug offenders, and it is time the opposition got on board.

The idea that all of the property of certain drug traffickers (known as prescribed drug offenders) should be confiscated, whether or not it has any link to crime at all and whether or not legitimately earned or acquired, originated in the Western Australian *Criminal Property Forfeiture Act 2000*. If a person is taken to be a declared drug trafficker under either s 32A(1) of their *Drugs Misuse Act* or is declared under s 159(2) of the Confiscation Act, then, effectively, all of their property is confiscated without any exercise of discretion at all, whether or not it is lawfully acquired and whether or not there is any level of proof about any property at all.

The Bill reflects the Western Australian scheme, with minor modifications.

The two prescribed situations are a convicted drug trafficker of a certain kind and an absconding accused. The first category is the most general.

An absconding accused aside, there are two situations catered for. The first is the repeat offender. The second is the major offender (whether repeat or not).

- (a) The repeat offender is caught if he is convicted on a third (or more) offence for nominated offences within a period of 10 years.
- (b) The major offender is caught if he or she is convicted of a commercial drug offence. A commercial drug offence is one of certain extremely serious offences in the *Controlled Substances Act 1984*, or any of the serious drug offences that involves a commercial amount of the controlled drug.

The extremely serious offences nominated are: trafficking, manufacture for sale, selling or possession with intent to sell a large commercial quantity or a commercial quantity of controlled substances or controlled plants and cultivation of a large commercial quantity or a commercial quantity of controlled plants.

As a sidenote, the Northern Territory *Criminal Property Forfeiture Act* contains very similar provisions, obviously modelled on the Western Australian Act. However, the Northern Territory Act contains only the repeat offender version of the first category and the second category (death and absconding). It does not contain what is described above as the major offender category. The Queensland *Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002* contains a scheme that is similar in intent but different in complicated ways as to details.

Under the legislation in Western Australia and the Northern Territory, all of the declared drug trafficker's assets are subject to forfeiture. This would include such things as baby clothes, washing machines, garden hoses, children's toys—the lot.

In order to ameliorate the harshness of the scheme and possible forfeiture to the Crown of goods and chattels that are worthless, encumbrances or otherwise not worth the trouble, the Bill states that the prescribed trafficker forfeit everything except what a bankrupt would be allowed to keep. These are to be found in r 6.03 of the Commonwealth *Bankruptcy Regulations 1996*. The lists are extensive, but the general principle is stated in this way: section 116(1) of the Act does not extend to household property (including recreational and sports equipment) that is reasonably necessary for the domestic use of the bankrupt's household, having regard to current social standards.

The Queensland *Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002* adopts the same principle.

High Level or Major Traffickers

Whether or not a person can be presumed to be, in common usage, a high level or major trafficker will depend largely, but not wholly, on the amount of the drug with which he or she is associated. The table below illustrates various amounts for the more commonly prosecuted controlled substances. The S.A. amounts were prescribed as a result of a national consultative process fixing amounts and methods of calculation. The nationally agreed amounts were settled on the basis of research across Australia on the actual activities of the illicit drug markets informed by police expertise.

<i>Drug</i>	<i>SA Trafficking Amount</i>	<i>SA Commercial Amount</i>	<i>SA Large Commercial Amount</i>
Amphetamine	2 gms (mixed)	0.5 kgs (mixed)	1 kg (mixed)
Cannabis	250 gms (mixed)	2.5 kgs (mixed)	12.5 kgs (mixed)
Cannabis Resin	25 gms (mixed)	2 kgs (mixed)	10 kgs (mixed)
Heroin	2 gms (mixed)	0.2 kgs (mixed)	1 kg (mixed)
Cannabis Plants	10 plants	100 plants	500 plants

Repeat Offenders

The legislation also attacks repeat offenders. The key to this category is settling the offences to which it applies—that is, what offences will attract the declaration if committed 3 or more times within a span of 10 years. It is suggested that the offences to which it should apply are any serious drug offences that are indictable. These are those offences listed in that part of the *Controlled Substances Act 1984* under the headings 'Commercial offences' and 'Offences involving children and school zones'.

The Fund

The proceeds from the existing criminal assets confiscation scheme must be paid into the Victims of Crime Fund (after the costs of administering the scheme are deducted). It is proposed that funds raised by the application of this initiative be devoted to another fund, to be called the Justice Resources Fund. This Fund will be devoted to the provision of moneys for courts infrastructure, equipment and services, the provision of moneys for justice programs and facilities for dealing with drug and alcohol related crime and for the provision of funding for justice reform initiatives. Disbursements will not overlap with those made from or eligible for moneys from the existing Victims of Crime Fund.

Other Aspects of the Scheme

The Western Australian scheme has been modified so that a court has a discretion to ameliorate the harsh and inflexible application of this scheme if the offender has effectively co-operated with a law enforcement agency relating directly to the investigation or occurrence or possible occurrence of a serious and organised crime offence. For these purposes, a serious and organised crime offence is defined in a way that mirrors the definition in the *Australian Crime Commission (South Australia) Act 2004*. Every encouragement should be given to serious criminals to inform on their co-offenders and any criminal organisations to which they belong or are party.

As is the case with the WA and NT legislation, a person is a prescribed drug offender where there is sufficient evidence to conclude that a person would have been liable to be a prescribed drug offender and the person either absconds or dies.

The Bill also adopts the Northern Territory innovation that the time period of 10 years in relation to the repeat offender does not run if and while the offender is imprisoned.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005*

4—Amendment of long title

This clause amends the long title of the principal Act to reflect the changes made by this measure.

5—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 of the principal Act to include, or to consequentially amend, definitions of terms used in respect of the amendments made by this measure.

6—Insertion of section 6A

This clause inserts new section 6A into the principal Act. It sets out what is a prescribed drug offender, namely a person who is convicted of a commercial drug offence after the commencement of the proposed section, or who is convicted of another serious drug offence and has at least 2 other convictions for prescribed drug offences, those offences and the conviction offence all being committed on separate occasions within a period of 10 years. However, the 10 year period does not include any time spent in government custody. The proposed section makes procedural provision in respect of the convictions able to be used in determining whether a person is a prescribed drug offender. The proposed section also defines key terms used in respect of prescribed drug offenders, including setting out what are commercial and prescribed drug offences.

7—Amendment of section 10—Application of Act

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

8—Amendment of section 24—Restraining orders

This clause inserts new subsection (5a) into section 24 of the principal Act, which prevents a court from specifying protected property (the definition of which is inserted by this measure) in a restraining order unless there are reasonable grounds to suspect that the property is the proceeds of, or is an instrument of, a serious offence.

9—Amendment of section 34—Court may exclude property from restraining order

This clause amends section 34 of the principal Act by inserting new subparagraph (ia), adding to the list of matters a court must be satisfied of before it may exclude property from a restraining order. The subparagraph is divided into parts dealing with where the suspect has, and has not, been convicted of the serious offence to which the restraining order relates.

The first such matter is that the court can only exclude property where the suspect has not, or would not, become a prescribed drug offender on conviction of the serious offence. Alternatively, the property may be excluded if the court is satisfied it is not owned by, nor under the effective control of, the suspect in the circumstances spelt out in the provision (even if the suspect is, or will be upon conviction of the relevant offence, a prescribed drug offender).

The power to correct an error in respect of the inclusion of the relevant property when making the restraining order is given to the court because the property restrained in respect of prescribed drug offenders is not necessarily proceeds nor an instrument of crime.

10—Amendment of section 47—Forfeiture orders

This clause amends section 47(1)(a) of the principal Act to include the fact that a person is a prescribed drug offender as a ground for the making of a forfeiture order under that section (provided that the relevant property was owned by or subject to the effective control of the person on the conviction day for the conviction offence).

11—Amendment of section 57—Relieving certain dependants from hardship

This clause makes a consequential amendment due to the amendment of section 47(1)(a) by this measure.

12—Amendment of section 58—Making exclusion orders before forfeiture order is made

This clause amends section 58 of the principal Act to provide that property sought to be excluded from a forfeiture order must not, in the case of a forfeiture order to which section 47(1)(a)(ii) applies (ie a prescribed drug offender order), at the relevant time be owned by, or under the effective control of, the prescribed drug offender (unless it is protected property of the person).

13—Amendment of section 59—Making exclusion orders after forfeiture

This clause amends section 59, consistently with clause 15, to provide that property sought to be excluded from a forfeiture order must not, in the case of a forfeiture order to which section 47(1)(a)(ii) applies (ie a prescribed drug offender order), at the relevant time be owned by, or under the effective control of, the prescribed drug offender (unless it is protected property of the person).

14—Insertion of section 59A

This clause inserts new section 59A into the principal Act. That section allows a person to apply for property to be excluded from a restraining order because the person has cooperated with a law enforcement authority in relation to a serious and organised crime offence, be it one that has occurred or may occur in future.

The mechanisms and procedures in relation to an order excluding the property are similar to other such provisions in the principal Act.

15—Amendment of section 62A—No exclusion or compensation where forfeiture taken into account in sentencing

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 62A.

16—Amendment of section 76—Excluding property from forfeiture under this Division

This clause amends section 76 to prevent exclusion of property owned by or under the effective control of a prescribed drug offender (other than protected property).

17—Insertion of section 76AA

This clause inserts a provision similar to the provision in clause 14 allowing for exclusion from forfeiture based on cooperation with a law enforcement agency.

18—Amendment of section 76A—No exclusion where forfeiture taken into account in sentencing

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

19—Substitution of section 203

This clause amends the structure of section 203 of the principal Act to reflect the changes made by this measure.

20—Amendment of heading

This clause is consequential.

21—Amendment of section 209—Credits to Victims of Crime Fund

This clause is consequential.

22—Insertion of section 209A

This clause provides for the establishment of the Justice Resources Fund, to be administered by the Attorney-General, and for the proceeds of confiscated assets of prescribed drug offenders to be paid into the fund.

23—Amendment of section 224—Effect of confiscation scheme on sentencing

This clause amends section 224 to provide that a sentencing court must not have regard to any forfeiture or pecuniary penalty order that might result from the conviction if it results in the defendant becoming a serious drug offender (within the meaning of this measure) and the property to which the forfeiture or order relates was owned by, or subject to the effective control of, the defendant on the conviction day for the relevant offence.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

JURIES (PREJUDICIAL PUBLICITY) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

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) (11:06): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Juries Act 1927. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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) (11:07): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The law about seeking a stay on the grounds that there has been prejudicial publicity sufficient to threaten a fair trial and the course of jury deliberations is governed by the decision of the High Court in *Dupas v The Queen* (2010) 247 CLR 231. The applicant was charged with a particularly vicious and notorious murder. The circumstances of the murder and the identity of the applicant were the subject of widespread and inflammatory pre-trial publicity. The applicant applied to have the trial permanently stayed as an abuse of process of the court because, he alleged, it would be impossible for him to ever have a fair trial.

The High Court held that there should not be a stay. It decided that any unfair consequences of prejudice or prejudgement arising out of extensive adverse pre-trial publicity was capable of being relieved by the trial judge in the conduct of the trial, by thorough and appropriate directions to the jury. And, tantalisingly enough, Mr Speaker, I seek leave to have the remainder of my second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

But the court went further. It adopted as authoritative this statement of the law from *R v Glennon* (1992) 173 CLR 592 at 605-606:

[A] permanent stay will only be ordered in an extreme case and there must be a fundamental defect 'of such a nature that nothing that a trial judge can do in the conduct of the trial can relieve against its unfair consequences'. And a court of criminal appeal, before it will set aside a conviction on the ground of a miscarriage of justice, requires to be satisfied that there is a serious risk that the pre-trial publicity has deprived the accused of a fair trial. It will determine that question in the light of the evidence as it stands at the time of the trial and in the light of the way in which the trial was conducted, including the steps taken by the trial judge with a view to ensuring a fair trial.

The law on trial by judge alone is set out in s 7 of the *Juries Act 1927*. It was changed substantially by the Statutes Amendment (*Serious and Organised Crime*) Act 2012. That set of amendments dealt with the situation in which a charge of a serious and organised crime offence had been laid and there was a real and substantiated threat of a miscarriage of justice by reason of threats to the jury or other forms of intimidation. In such an event, the DPP was empowered to make an application to the trial judge for trial by judge alone and the trial judge was given an unfettered discretion to make that order if he or she found that the interests of justice required it.

The public's demand to know and the media's determination to sensationalise is ever present. The stay discretion lies in the inherent discretion of a court, as a court, to deal with an abuse of its process. Even if it was wise to examine that area of law, one could not do so without threatening the independence of the jury and making demands of the judicial system that would clearly be unconstitutional.

But the courts can be offered constitutional alternatives to manage a fair trial and counter threats to its process. That is what this proposal is designed to do. Its operation depends, not on an application by the DPP, nor upon the court of its own motion, but on an application for a stay by the defendant. (It may be noted that Queensland has a similar provision but it is activated by application of the DPP). The making of the order for trial by judge alone is entirely discretionary and would only be made if it was in the interests of justice to do so.

The following points should be noted:

- The Bill applies to an application for a stay whether the publicity alleged to be prejudicial occurs pre-trial or at any other stage in the trial, and whether or not it is submitted that the prejudice may occur or has occurred (or both);
- The Bill applies to an application whenever made and, in particular, whether or not a jury has been empanelled;
- The sole criterion for the making of the order is that the court (at the relevant time, be it the trial judge or a judge hearing an application pre-trial) thinks that the order is necessary in order to ensure a fair trial;
- If the accused in question is being jointly tried with another or others, the court retains an absolute discretion whether or not to order joint trial by judge alone for one or more of the co-accused. That decision will be influenced by the extent to which the prejudicial publicity will impact on those co-accused and the discretion of the court, in all the circumstances, to weigh the necessity for joint (or separate) trials in the interests of justice; and
- The Bill expressly preserves the powers of a court in relation to contempt of court as an explicit reminder to those who might be tempted to use this measure as a warrant to prejudice the trial of an accused.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Juries Act 1927*

4—Amendment of section 7—Trial without jury

This clause amends section 7 of the principal Act to allow a court to order trial by judge alone in the circumstances set out in new subsection (3ca) in order to ensure a fair trial.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (PROSECUTIONS UNDER REPEALED ACT) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

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) (11:08): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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) (11:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

On 3 December 2014, I informed the house of my intention to introduce a bill into the next parliament to amend the transitional provisions of the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. The Work Health and Safety Act (Prosecutions under Repealed Act) Amendment Bill 2015 seeks to insert a new transitional provision into the Work Health and Safety Act to allow the minister to extend the time to commence proceedings for an offence under the now repealed Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986. This amendment will allow two prosecutions under the repealed act to proceed. Both deal with serious workplace incidents which resulted in a fatality in one case and serious head injuries to a worker in the other.

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

Leave granted.

Last year I became aware of a technical error in the filing of the complaints for these two matters.

The nature of the error meant that it was not possible to correct it by simple amendment of the complaints. The only way to continue with these prosecutions is to file fresh complaints, making the same allegations, with the error corrected.

However, the statutory limit under the repealed act has since expired on each of these matters, which prevents the prosecution from proceeding under the existing complaint.

For these prosecutions not to proceed, due to a technicality, is unacceptable.

The only way of resolving this issue is to extend the statutory time limit.

The bill will achieve this by amending the Work Health and Safety Act to allow the minister, if he or she considers that it is in the interests of justice to do so, extend a time limit that applies under section 58(6)(b) of the repealed act in a particular case.

It is my view that it is in the interests of justice that these two matters have the opportunity to proceed to a judicial determination on the merits on the case.

I have received advice from SafeWork SA, that there are no other proceedings under the OHSW Act that have been impacted by this technical error.

I commend the bill to members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Work Health and Safety Act 2012*

3—Amendment of Schedule 6—Transitional provisions

This clause inserts a new clause into Schedule 6 of the act. The proposed clause authorises the minister to extend a time limit that applies under section 58(6)(b) of the *Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986* (the *repealed Act*) if he or she considers that it is in the interests of justice to do so. Section 58(6)(b) provides that proceedings for a summary offence against the act must be commenced within two years of the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed. A time limit may only be extended under the proposed clause for the purpose of allowing proceedings to be brought against a person for an offence against the repealed act where proceedings previously commenced against the person for the offence have been brought to an end because the person who purported to bring them was not authorised to do so.

An extension may be authorised by the minister even if the time limit for commencing proceedings under the repealed act has passed. The clause authorises the commencement of proceedings against a person who has already been the subject of proceedings (or purported proceedings) under the repealed act with respect to the same matter.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

REAL PROPERTY (PRIORITY NOTICES AND OTHER MEASURES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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) (11:10): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Real Property Act 1886. Read a first time.

The SPEAKER: Ah, a venerable piece of legislation!

Mr Gardner: An oldie but a goodie.

The SPEAKER: An oldie but a goodie. The Premier once tried to take its administration off me but failed.

Second Reading

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) (11:11): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The operation of the national electronic conveyancing system has already commenced in a number of states, with the system initially being used to lodge and discharge mortgages. The first electronic transfer transaction was recently completed in New South Wales. The system operates pursuant to the Electronic Conveyancing National Law in each participating jurisdiction.

The Electronic Conveyancing National Law (South Australia) Act 2013, which enacts the Electronic Conveyancing National Law in South Australia, was assented to by the Governor on 5 December 2013. It provides for the operation of the national electronic conveyancing system in South Australia.

Prior to the commencement of electronic conveyancing in South Australia, significant amendment of the Real Property Act 1886 and other state legislation is required. This bill provides for the first stage of amendments to the Real Property Act 1886.

The bill introduces the first two of four significant statutory reforms that will lay the foundation for the introduction of electronic conveyancing. These two reforms are the strengthening of the verification of identity regime, and the introduction of priority notices. These measures are being introduced now so that conveyancing practitioners can adapt to the changes prior the commencement of electronic conveyancing in South Australia.

The remaining reforms required for the introduction of electronic conveyancing will be the subject of a separate bill. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Verification of Identity

- Since 28 April 2014, parties to conveyancing instruments in South Australia have been required to verify their identity in accordance with the Registrar-General's Verification of Identity Requirements.
- The Verification of Identity Requirements are consistent with the nationally-agreed standard for verification of identity which will be mandatory for electronically lodged instruments when electronic conveyancing commences.
- The bill amends the *Real Property Act 1886* to ensure that the enforcement of the Verification of Identity Requirements in relation to paper conveyancing instruments also has a sound statutory basis, providing legislative consistency in both paper and electronic conveyancing transactions in South Australia.
- The bill also creates new offences in relation to verification of identity: making a false statement, producing a false document, and failing to retain a relevant document for the prescribed period of time.
- By providing a sound statutory basis for the enforcement of the Verification of Identity Requirements, this amendment to the *Real Property Act 1886* will:
 - (a) reduce the risk of land title fraud and other improper land title dealings; and
 - (b) strengthen the security, certainty and integrity of the Torrens land title system.

Priority notices

- A priority notice is a notice which is lodged against a certificate of title or Crown lease to reserve priority for a pending transaction that will affect that land.
- Priority notices will also:
 - (a) notify parties searching the title that the transaction is pending;
 - (b) increase the likelihood of fraudulent transactions being detected; and
 - (c) improve the accuracy of title searches – as currently no record of a conveyance appears on the certificate of title until the registry staff have updated the register book following settlement.
- A priority notice can be lodged by any person who intends to lodge an instrument (such as a transfer, mortgage, caveat or heritage agreement). The lodgement of priority notices will not be mandatory.
- Priority notices will be effective for 60 calendar days from the date of lodgement. This period of effect is consistent with other Australian jurisdictions. In South Australia, it will be possible to extend a priority notice (once only) for a further period of 30 calendar days. Unlike a caveat, a second or subsequent priority notice can be lodged in relation to the same matter—even if the first notice is still in force.
- A priority notice can be lodged for both paper and electronic instruments.
- If a priority notice lists more than one instrument, all of the listed instruments must be lodged at the same time in order to gain the benefit of the priority notice.
- A priority notice will operate by preventing the registration of any instrument not listed in the priority notice. However, the bill lists a number of instruments which will be registered despite a priority notice. This list includes caveats, statutory charges, court orders, land management agreements, transmission applications and instruments lodged by the Crown.
- The bill grants the Registrar-General the power to cancel a priority notice, if he is satisfied that the instruments listed in the notice are unlikely to be registered within 90 days.
- The bill includes a civil liability provision which states that if a person institutes proceedings for compensation for loss arising as a consequence of a priority notice, the person who lodged the priority notice bears the onus of proving that he or she was entitled to lodge it.

Crown Leases

- The bill also clarifies and modernises other provisions of the 1886 Act. Part 9 of the *Real Property Act 1886* deals with registration of Crown leases. The existing provisions in Part 9 are ambiguous in a number of respects and since an amendment in 1990, have not contained an express power to register or record dealings with Crown leases.
- The bill amends section 93 to clarify that Crown leases, and instruments dealing with Crown leases, can be (and always could be) registered or recorded in the Register of Crown Leases in the same way as dealings with other land are registered in the register book. This reflects the current and historical practice of the Registrar-General.
- The amendments to Part 9 also clarify that an instrument affecting a Crown lease cannot be registered if any consent under legislation governing Crown leases (for example, the *Crown Land Management Act 2009* and the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*) has not been obtained.
- The bill also contains an express provision clarifying the long held understanding that a registered Crown lease, or a registered interest in a Crown lease, is considered to be indefeasible in the same way as an estate or interest in land that is registered in the register book. However, indefeasibility of Crown leases and instruments affecting Crown leases is subject to consistency with the legislation governing Crown leases.

Other amendments

- The bill provides the Registrar-General with new powers to direct that documents relating to verification of identity, certification and execution of instruments be presented for inspection. The Registrar-General may also require a person to provide information to him in relation to these matters.
- The bill makes it an offence to fail to comply with a direction of the Registrar-General when he is exercising these powers.
- In order for the Registrar-General to effectively administer the new provisions relating to verification of identity, certification and execution, the Registrar-General may need to obtain documents or information, to which he would not otherwise have access, using these powers. For this reason, the bill provides that a person is not excused from providing information or a document on the ground that it might incriminate them. However, the bill clearly limits the use that may be made of such information or documents.
- The bill also clarifies that certifications given under section 273 of the *Real Property Act 1886* must be given by a natural person with personal knowledge of the matters being certified. These certifications are effectively statutory declarations, and a body corporate cannot possess the knowledge required to provide a certification—a lawyer or conveyancer acting for the body corporate must provide the certification. However, in the case of a certification by a body corporate mortgagee, the bill provides that the certification may be given by an employee of the body corporate, provided that the employee has the requisite personal knowledge.
- The bill makes it an offence to give a certification without the requisite personal knowledge. In the case of a certification by an employee of a body corporate mortgagee without personal knowledge, both the employee and the body corporate are guilty of an offence.
- Finally, the bill amends section 221 of the *Real Property Act 1886* by giving the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT) jurisdiction to review decisions of the Registrar-General. Currently the Supreme Court has jurisdiction to hear these appeals.

I commend the bill to members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Real Property Act 1886*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts new definitions of various terms. The *participation rules* are the participation rules determined by the Registrar-General under section 23 of the Electronic Conveyancing National Law (South Australia). The *verification of identity requirements* relate to the verification of the identity of a party to an instrument or other document. The term refers to the verification of identity requirements under section 273A.

5—Amendment of section 56—Priority of instruments

This clause amends section 56 to make it clear that provisions of the section dealing with the order of registration and priority of instruments operate subject to new Part 13A (to be inserted by clause 11).

6—Amendment of section 57—Effect of registration of instruments

This clause amends section 57 so that an instrument registered or recorded in the Register of Crown Leases is not deemed to be part of the Register Book.

7—Insertion of section 90G

Proposed section 90G provides a definition of designated Act for the purposes of Part 9. The following are designated Acts:

- the *Crown Land Management Act 2009*;
- the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*;
- an Act that is a relevant act for the purposes of Schedule 1 Part 7 of the *Crown Land Management Act 2009*;
- any other act under which a Crown lease may be granted or which regulates dealings with Crown leases.

8—Amendment of section 93—Execution and registration of Crown lease

Section 93(3) provides that a Crown lease is to be taken to be registered when the Register-General allots a volume and folio number in respect of the lease. New subsection (3a) will provide that a registered Crown lease is able to be transferred, mortgaged and dealt with for the purposes of the Act as if it were a lease registered in the Register Book. The new subsection will make it clear that it has always been the case that a registered Crown lease could be transferred, mortgaged and dealt with for the purposes of the act. Section 93 as amended by this clause will also provide that an instrument lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office that transfers, mortgages or otherwise deals with a Crown lease will be taken to be registered or recorded, as appropriate, on being entered in the Register of Crown Leases by the Registrar-General. The section as amended further provides, in relation to Crown leases, that if the Registrar-General is not satisfied that any consent required under a relevant designated act has been obtained, he or she may not register a Crown lease, or register or record an instrument that transfers, mortgages or otherwise deals with a Crown lease.

9—Amendment of section 94—Forfeiture etc. of Crown lease

This clause makes a minor correction so as to ensure consistency in terminology.

10—Substitution of section 95

This clause repeals section 95 and inserts 3 new sections relating to Crown leases.

95—Indefeasibility of title under Crown lease

This section provides that section 69, which provides for indefeasibility of title, applies in relation to the title of a person who appears by the Register of Crown Leases to be the proprietor of land subject to a Crown lease as if the person were the registered proprietor of the land and the Crown lease were the certificate of title. It is made clear in the section that section 69 is to be taken to have always applied in this way. The section does not operate to protect the interests of a party to an instrument if any consent required under a relevant designated act was not obtained before the instrument was registered or the instrument is in some way inconsistent with a relevant designated act.

95A—Evidentiary

Under this section, a document purportedly certified by the Registrar-General to be a correct copy of a Crown lease is to be accepted in legal proceedings as conclusive evidence of title to any estate or interest in land that it records and as rebuttable evidence of any other information that it records.

95B—Operation of Part in relation to Crown leases and other instruments subject to other acts

This section makes it clear that nothing in Part 9 of the act (Crown leases) overrides a designated act. To the extent of any inconsistency between the Part and a designated act, the designated act will prevail. The section also provides, for the avoidance of doubt, that registration or recording under section 93, and indefeasibility under section 95, do not prejudice or alter a right or remedy otherwise possessed by the Crown; nor do they have the effect of validating an instrument (or a provision of an instrument) that would not be valid under a designated act.

11—Insertion of Part 13A

This clause inserts a new part.

Part 13A—Priority notices

154—Interpretation

This section provides a definition of the term *instrument* that applies only for the purposes of Part 13A. An instrument (for the purposes of the Part) is any document capable of registration in the Lands Titles Registration Office, or in respect of which a record is under an act directed, required, or permitted to be made in the register book. The term includes a document that may be registered or recorded in the Register of Crown Leases under section 93.

154A—Person who intends to lodge instrument may lodge priority notice

This section provides for the lodgement of a priority notice in the Lands Titles Registration Office by a person who intends to lodge an instrument. The purpose of a priority notice is to give priority to 1 or more instruments relevant to a particular conveyancing transaction. Priority will only be given to the instruments specified in a priority notice if they are all lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office at the same time.

The section provides some detail in relation to the content of priority notices and authorises the Registrar-General to determine that a person is a vexatious lodger of priority notices.

154B—Effect of priority notice

Under this section, if an instrument affecting land is lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office while a priority notice is in force in relation to the land, the instrument may not be registered or recorded in the Register Book or the Register of Crown Leases until the priority notice ceases to have effect. Despite this general rule, the Registrar-General is not prevented by a priority notice from registering or recording an instrument identified in the priority notice if it is lodged in accordance with other requirements. The section does not prevent the Registrar-General from registering or recording certain specified instruments or registering or recording an instrument if necessary in order to give effect to an order, authorisation or event of a specified kind.

154C—Registration of instruments identified in priority notice

This section requires that instruments identified in a priority notice be registered in the order in which they are given priority in the notice. This requirement does not apply if the Registrar-General considers there is good reason for registering the instruments in a different order.

154D—Lodging party need not be informed that instrument cannot be registered or recorded

If a person lodges an instrument affecting land in relation to which a priority notice is in force, the Registrar-General is not required to inform the person that the instrument cannot be registered or recorded in the Register Book or the Register of Crown Leases.

154E—Withdrawal of priority notice

A priority notice may be withdrawn by the person who lodged the notice.

154F—Cancellation of priority notice by Registrar-General

This section provides for the cancellation of priority notices where the Registrar-General is satisfied (on application) that the notice purports to protect the priority of an instrument that is not likely to be registered or recorded within 90 days of the day on which the notice was lodged. The person who lodged the priority notice must be given written notice of the application for cancellation of the notice and is entitled to provide written submissions in response to the application.

154G—Cessation of priority notice

If a priority notice has not been cancelled or withdrawn, it ceases to have effect when all of the instruments specified in the notice have been lodged (though they must all be lodged at the same time) and either registered, recorded, withdrawn or rejected by the Registrar-General. A priority notice may cease to have effect before any of those events occurs if the applicable period following the day on which the notice was lodged comes to an end first. The applicable period is 60 days or, if the Registrar-General has granted an extension of time, 90 days.

154H—Registration of instruments after priority notice is no longer in force

An instrument lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office that cannot be registered or recorded because it affects land in relation to which a priority notice is in force is to be dealt with when the priority notice ceases to have effect.

154I—Civil liability

This section provides for compensation where a person suffers loss or damage as a consequence of the lodgement by another person of a priority notice where the person was not entitled to lodge the notice or unreasonably refused or failed to withdraw it.

12—Amendment of section 191—Caveats

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 191. For consistency with other provisions, the section as amended will state that a caveat is to be lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office rather than with the Registrar-General.

13—Insertion of section 220A

New section 220A provides the Registrar-General with powers to require—

- the production of instruments, documents or other items;
- the provision of information;
- the verification of the execution of an instrument or document.

The Registrar-General may only exercise a power under the section for a purpose connected to the administration or enforcement of the *Real Property Act 1886* or the *Electronic Conveyancing National Law (South Australia) Act 2013* or to protect the integrity of the Register Book or the Register of Crown Leases.

14—Substitution of sections 221 and 222

This clause repeals sections 221 and 222, which provide a person dissatisfied with a decision or direction of the Registrar-General with a power to summon the Registrar-General to appear before the Supreme Court, and substitutes a new section that provides for review of decisions of the Registrar-General by the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

15—Substitution of section 232

This clause repeals section 232 and substitutes 2 new sections.

232—Certifying incorrect documents

This section makes it an offence for a person to falsely or negligently provide a certification under section 273(1). It is also an offence under this section for a person who is an employee of a body corporate that is a mortgagee to provide a required certification on behalf of the body corporate if the person does not have personal knowledge of the matters to which he or she is certifying. In that case, the person and the body corporate are each guilty of an offence.

232A—Offences relating to verification of identity

This section includes a number of offences relating to the verification of identity requirements and the participation rules. It is an offence for a person to falsely state that another person's identity has been verified in compliance with the verification of identity requirements or the participation rules. A higher penalty applies if the person makes the statement knowing that it is false. There are also offences relating to making false statements in connection with verifying a person's identity for the purposes of the verification of identity requirements or the participation rules, production of false or misleading records and retention of documents or records.

16—Amendment of section 267—Witnessing of instruments

This clause amends section 267 by repealing subsection (4), which provides the Registrar-General with a power to require the execution of an instrument to be verified.

17—Amendment of section 273—Authority to register

Under section 273, an application for bringing land under the act, and an instrument purporting to deal with or affect land, must be certified as being correct for the purposes of the act. This clause amends the section so that the certification must be provided by a natural person who has personal knowledge as to the matters to which he or she is certifying. If the party required to provide the certification is a body corporate that is a mortgagee, the certification may be given by an employee of the body corporate who has personal knowledge as to the matters to which he or she is certifying.

18—Insertion of section 273A

New section 273A, inserted by this clause, makes it a requirement for the identity of a party to an instrument, or a person executing a document, to be verified in accordance with any prescribed requirements. A regulation prescribing verification of identity requirements may adopt or apply requirements determined by the Registrar-General as in force at a particular time or from time to time. The Registrar-General is required under the section to make the current verification of identity requirements, and all superseded versions of the verification of identity requirements, publicly available.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

THE UNITING CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA (MEMBERSHIP OF TRUST) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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) (11:14): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Uniting Church in Australia Act 1977. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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) (11:14): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends the Uniting Church in Australia Act 1977 at the request of the Uniting Church to remove the age restriction in section 11(4) on the appointment of members of the Uniting Church in Australia Property Trust (South Australia).

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

Leave granted.

The Act facilitated the formation of the Uniting Church via union of the Methodist, Congregational and Presbyterian Churches. It established the Trust and provided for the vesting of property in the Uniting Church.

Part III of the Act provides for the constitution of the Trust, to consist of eight members, being persons holding specified positions in the Church and others appointed by the Church.

Section 11(4) of the Act states: 'No person who has attained the age of seventy years shall be eligible for appointment as a member of the Trust'.

This age restriction is outdated and no longer reflects the values of the Uniting Church or society's expectations regarding age and volunteering.

The Bill deletes section 11(4) from the Act.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *The Uniting Church in Australia Act 1977*

3—Amendment of section 11—Constitution of Trust

This clause deletes section 11(4) of the Act which provides that a person who has attained the age of 70 years will not be eligible for appointment as a member of the Trust, and makes a consequential amendment to section 11(3).

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (ELECTORAL LAWS AND PRACTICES COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

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) (11:16): I move:

That the bill be restored to the *Notice Paper* as a lapsed bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

*Address in Reply***ADDRESS IN REPLY**

The SPEAKER: I draw members' attention to this being the member for Fisher's maiden speech, and I ask members to extend the customary courtesies to the member. The Chair will, as is also customary, give much latitude to the relevance of her comments to the motion. The member for Fisher.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (11:19): I move:

That the following Address in Reply to His Excellency's opening speech be adopted:

May it please Your Excellency—

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's desire for our deliberations to serve the advancement of the welfare of South Australia and all its people.

I am honoured to have the opportunity today to move this adoption of the Address in Reply. I begin by thanking Your Excellency for attending parliament yesterday and for the address to which we all listened in the other place. I also thank the distinguished Kurna elder and friend of many Lewis O'Brien for his Welcome to Country yesterday. I acknowledge that we meet here today on the traditional lands of the Kurna people and I acknowledge and respect their relationship with this land. I also acknowledge my fellow members on both sides of the house.

I feel so privileged to be given the opportunity to deliver this opening Address in Reply and I deliver it on behalf of all ordinary Australians who have an extraordinary story. I am only one of many ordinary Australians who live every day with positivity and commitment to their community despite circumstances that could have pushed them to lie passive and give in.

During the by-election campaign there was a story in *The Advertiser* which described Fisher as 'middle South Australia'. The first paragraph reads:

If Fisher were a person, she would be married with two children and live in a three-bedroom house with two cars parked in the driveway.

Yes, that's me. This article goes on to say that latest census data shows a distinct resemblance between Fisher and the state population as a whole. Fisher's work patterns are consistent with many experiences of many South Australians, with 56 per cent of people working full time and one-third part time, mostly in white-collar professions. The community is largely less engaged in political rhetoric and more interested in getting to Saturday's junior sport's match on time and finding a way to meet the mortgage payment. This is something I relate to.

We are a migrant family, and I am a first generation Aussie. My mum and dad came to Australia in the mid-1960s as English migrants. My dad always had a fascination with Australia as a country and he knew it would be a place of wide open spaces, fresh air and quarter-acre blocks. Everyone would have a job and there would be growth and excitement. While Mum was not entirely happy about moving to a completely new and unknown country—that is an understatement—and reminded Dad of this regularly, she was a loving and committed wife and mother and brought her kids on this journey. She knew her children would have a better future in this country and grow up to be happy and healthy. She also wanted another child and saw this as a great opportunity.

When they arrived in 1966, Dad fell in love with a brand new three-bedroom, double-brick home on a large block of land in Morphett Vale. He saw this as a much better option than the foreshore at Brighton which would have cost him the same price as the Morphett Vale home but it would have seen his cars rust. You could argue that this may not have been a sound financial investment but, having lived in that same postcode of 5162 all my life, it is a decision that has profoundly shaped me, I believe, in a good way.

My family settled in to their new home. My dad got a job and in 1969 I was the very lucky child chosen to join that family. It was a great childhood. My siblings, Julie and Martin, being nine

and 12 years older than me, and my parents being a little older and very patient, saw me with plenty of love and lots of opportunities. I am very lucky. My father passed away two years ago, but something he taught me and my siblings from a very young age was that if you commit to something, you are in it for the long haul. We are a very committed family. My mother still lives in that same family home that we grew up in.

During my younger years, I attended Flaxmill Primary School and later went on to secondary school at Mitcham Girls High School. My brother and sister attended local state high schools and might have tested the rules a bit before I became a teenager. Mum and Dad decided an all girls school would be best for me. I travelled a long way out of my local area for high school which allowed me to be exposed to a whole range of activities and meet a diverse group of people and teachers who instilled in me a desire to reach for the stars. While I did not initially get the academic results I wanted, learning the value of dedication and hard work is a good result, I would argue.

In high school I was always very active on school committees, I tried and played every sport possible, and I drove my teachers wild because I tended to get involved in other people's issues. One particularly passionate school counsellor, Mrs Kutcher, saw the value of putting those who did not always focus into roles of leadership.

My friend and I were given the opportunity to submit a written piece to attend a United Nations Youth Conference, which was being held in Perth that year. Our piece focused on the use of beautiful Australian quotes. Mine was about Australia being the lucky country. My feelings about this wonderful country have not changed since I was in high school, and one very special thing that I learnt from that conference was: 'it's only a small drop but it's all the little drops that fill the bucket'—translated to much later in life with the Sammy D Foundation, when we used that phrase on our collection boxes. It shows that a small effort can translate into so much more.

Flaxmill Primary School in Morphett Vale sits in an area of high disadvantage, according to the Socio-Economic Index for Areas. It also has a large number of extremely vulnerable children, according to the Australian Early Development Census. I believe I may be the first member of parliament to have attended either Flaxmill Primary School or Mitcham Girls High School. If that is the case, I feel extremely honoured, and I will wear that badge proudly and publicly with the hope that students from those schools will see that anything is possible if you believe in yourself.

My nursing career really started as a volunteer with St John Cadets when I was 11. I had many role models in the St John's brigade who helped me to decide that nursing and working in health care was something that I needed to do, because I really cared for other people. I got enormous satisfaction out of volunteering every weekend, sometimes in multiple locations on any one day. This early volunteering has really stuck with me, and it has given me great empathy and understanding for our volunteers, especially those in the emergency services. Our volunteers do not want to be nor should their roles be politicised. Our volunteers are what makes our country what it is. We have one of the highest levels of volunteering in the world, and I will do everything I can to support them.

I trained as a registered nurse at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital in our wonderful public health system. I also went on to both study and teach nursing at Flinders University. My father again taught me the value of union culture, and I proudly became a union member, joining the ANF (now ANMF) on my first day of work as a nurse. I became a worksite representative at a young age during a time of change and uncertainty in brain injury services, which was at that time based at Julia Farr Services. I was active and vocal, with a determination to make sure staff had a voice and opportunity to participate in the change process. Melissa Bailey and Lee Thomas are two women whose industrial tenacity, consistency and determination to ensure a fair go and a voice for all has left their mark on my life.

Following a meeting with the then minister for health, Dean Brown, I was asked to participate in a project as a project officer in a nursing services review being undertaken by the then known health department. This project became part of the move from the Fullarton site to the Hampstead Centre for brain injury services. Things have changed since that time. Now we see an incredible opportunity again to align rehabilitation services in a new way, to our acute care centres as part of Transforming Health.

In October last year, the Minister for Health (Hon. Jack Snelling) released a discussion paper detailing the need to transform the South Australian healthcare system. That paper has certainly generated some robust discussion amongst many of my former colleagues in health, as well as community members. Since then, a summit was held and attended by health professionals, consumers and other stakeholders who play a role in our health system, and subsequently a proposals paper was released last week.

The world around us is constantly changing, evolving as new discoveries are made and technology becomes more advanced. Our health system needs to move in step with this change, otherwise we will be left behind and the burden on our health system will become even greater.

While services may move and sites may be decommissioned, it is important to remember that it is the staff and their skills on which the culture of our health system is built. I would strongly encourage anyone who has something to say on the proposals made in the paper to submit their feedback through the Transforming Health consultation process, which ends on 27 February. I would also urge anyone who is making public comment from a position of influence to think very carefully about how they frame their argument. There is nothing to be gained by creating unnecessary panic among our most vulnerable citizens, if for political gain.

I have been fortunate to do many different things in my nursing career, and if I have learnt anything from nursing and what happened to my beautiful son Sam it is that life really is too short to compromise your integrity for short-term gain. Life is too short for regrets and far too short to not take advantage of opportunities and challenges that present.

Sam was born in 1990. Neil and I were just really a couple of crazy young adults who knew how to have fun and we made it our mission to enjoy life. We had a great connection to our community through sport, a fabulous family growing around us, with young nephews and nieces, as well as Neil's beautiful five-year-old daughter, Sheree. We gave everything we could to our children and shared their dreams. Sam, like us, loved sport. He was cheeky and loyal and perfect.

On 3 May 2008, Sam played a fantastic game of football for his beloved South Adelaide Panthers. I am so glad I arranged to leave work early that day and saw him play. They won for the first time in over six months. Sam went out that night. He was 17½, 194 centimetres tall and 95 kilograms. He and three other friends shared the cost of a carton of beer and were dropped off at a friend's birthday party. This was the home of a good family. They loved their children. They cared about our children. They did not deserve this to happen at their home. Young people need guidance. What seems obvious to us as adults is not always clear to young people. Alcohol, drugs and other influences lead to bad decisions.

A group of uninvited youths, known to most at the party but not part of the same friendship group, arrived and managed to get in to the party. Alcohol, drugs and other influences lead to arguments, to fights, to conflict. Sam did not talk to these people. Sam did not know these people. After the party was shut down, Sam was swept up in a fight out in the street. He did not know what happened. He did not see it coming. He could not defend himself. One punch killed our son.

On 4 May 2008, our family and our community learnt that bad things happen to good people. Sam was our world and was loved by everyone who knew him. He was fiercely loyal to his friends and family and would stick up for the underdog—don't know where he got that from—and this is why 1,700 people attended his funeral. We knew we could not let his death be for nothing and that there was a serious problem in the community that needed attention. This is how the Sammy D Foundation was born.

My journey since losing my son has been almost impossible to endure. It is a daily battle where your feet are too heavy to lift and your heart is too empty to go on. The constant reminders of what you no longer have and the thought that to look forward would mean to leave our son behind makes even the most mundane tasks sometimes seem impossible. Neil, Sheree and I have never had the opportunity to deliver a victim impact statement. We were left without anyone to blame and without anyone to pay for what had happened. What we realised was that no amount of anger, no amount of blame and no punishment would ever bring back our Sam.

The Sammy D Foundation stems from the most traumatic and heartbreaking event in mine and Neil's life, and in the lives of our family and friends. The journey with the foundation has shown us what strength, resilience and a positive community can achieve. Over the past six years, the foundation has shared Sam's story with 40,000 primary and secondary school students across South Australia and the Northern Territory, empowering young people with the skills they need to make safe and informed life choices and developing a culture where young people are inspired to reach their potential. While the foundation will always hold a special place in my heart, I now embark on this new adventure in which I will bring the same enthusiasm, passion and dedication to the people of Fisher.

If I could briefly touch on our roles with regard to the budget and economy, we all understand the budget is not a bottomless pit and we all understand the need to tighten the belt, but I think we also need to recognise that although we need tough economic change, we also cannot starve our communities of opportunity by pulling our belts too tightly. We need to be investing in our communities, creating jobs, growth and excitement in our city. Life exists outside the economy.

We should be equally determined to improve our society. This parliament should also be concerned with the development of good citizens, instead of a narrow pursuit of profit and productivity. My vision of community is built from the ground up, through sound policy that ensures world-class education, health care, social supports, access to employment, all wrapped up in sound environmental policy. This is a strong community which attracts investment and grows.

By holding all the hands that I have held through nursing and seeing many terrible things since we started the foundation, many concerning child protection, I have realised that there are so many disadvantaged people, the underdogs and battlers, who need a voice. That is where nurses, teachers and community workers do an amazing job. They help those people find their voice. Our job as politicians is to be the best advocates for those people who are helping and being helped, and to do that in a professional and responsible way, with integrity and honesty.

We have to set an example to the public. I am going to look people in the eye and say, 'This is what I'll do,' and know that I will follow through on that commitment. I stand here today as the member for Fisher, a community I am honoured, grateful and proud to be a part of and especially proud to represent in parliament.

I would like to pay tribute to the efforts of my predecessor, Bob Such. Bob was a hardworking, honourable and courageous man. He showed compassion and empathy to the people of Fisher and fought hard for them in this house over many years. He was respected and loved by the community because he was willing to listen. He was willing to be their voice and he was truly connected to them. This legacy is an inspiration to me and I will stop at nothing to be a local member who is as connected and committed as Bob was to the Fisher community.

Community connection is so important in this world of leadership and advocacy in which I now find myself. Truly connected and committed community people, who make sense to the rest of their community by speaking their language and also have lived experiences that contribute so much, can help to shape policy and legislation and formulate direction for government. It is the participation of these community members that is essential. Connected community people must be encouraged to participate in parliament. They must not be scared of or put off by others who have lost their connection or their relevance.

It should never be that someone is too scared to put themselves forward as a community advocate because of their journey which inspired them to commit to public life and their connection with things that they love so much. It must not be that they then feel those things which they must leave behind are at risk because of their desire to put up their hand and expose themselves to the community and to the scrutiny of people who oppose them.

This is why today, before my fellow members and on the record, I am announcing that I have stood down from my role as a board member of the Sammy D Foundation, something that is forever close to my heart and that I will always have a spiritual connection with. The foundation is my son. The foundation is our son. It will always be this and I will not allow it to ever be used as political ammunition against me. The good that it has done for tens of thousands of South Australians must never be threatened in any way. This work will continue under the guidance of an amazing team of

volunteers who dedicate thousands of hours to ensure that South Australia is a strong and safe place to raise our families.

My past has been a journey to where I am now. I have taken the elevator to the bigger picture, to this privileged role I now hold. I have often been frustrated watching the to-ing and fro-ing of politics. The behaviour often witnessed by the public in this house does nothing for the reputation of people in public office. The public wants leaders, the public elects people they believe will represent them in a true and respectful manner. To paraphrase the Premier, 'Civility is not a quaint notion.'

There is no higher honour than representing your community in this house. I will be a proud and honest representative. I will not go backwards in my standing when I step onto this stage. Politics needs to progress ideas through the debate of great minds. Politics is a collective opportunity to move forward.

We cannot give up the fight, either, for gender equality. While we have come a long way since Muriel Matters, we still find terrible inequities in pay and conditions for women in the workplace. I have recently spent time with many groundbreakers who have paved the way for women in politics, and I would like to pay tribute to just some of them: Molly Byrne, member for Barossa, the first Labor woman elected to the House of Assembly; Anne Levy, the first and only woman to be President of the Legislative Council; Carolyn Pickles, who was elected to the South Australian Legislative Council in 1985, the first woman elected to a major political party in any chamber; and Rosemary Crowley, a South Australian senator who held a range of portfolios in the federal government during the 1990s, the first Labor woman from South Australia to be elected to the Senate. Thank you.

I had hundreds of volunteers supporting the campaign for Fisher. I could not have done this without every one of you; you are all an inspiration. When I felt the pain of hundreds of hours of walking—and showed it as well—there was always someone beside me, just doing it because they believed in me, just doing it because they wanted Fisher to be in safe hands. While I am reticent to name individuals for fear of forgetting a name, I really must single out just a few.

The amazing Young Labor team. You are, without doubt, one of the most dedicated groups of young people I have ever met. You are a campaigning machine. From this group I am so lucky to have Sam and Emily, combined with the incredible Poor Charles, now to be my right hand. You are all incredible.

Rhiannon, you worked almost 24 hours a day in pulling together all the volunteers to make sure that no stone was left unturned. You are an amazing young woman who is destined for greatness in your career.

My parliamentary colleagues, who gave up time, endured blisters and pain while doorknocking (some not in this house), messaging, talking and supporting. Your collective political wisdom has helped to get me to this point, and my determination and positivity is intact. Together we can continue to drive this state and achieve great outcomes.

My campaign team, you are all amazing. Your belief, and the trust you showed in me, assisting me to deliver myself to Fisher in a way that is truly reflective of me. Cameron, Jesse, Amy, Emmanuel, Reggie and Steve, you have all got me to this point. We connected.

Labor's heart, the leaders of our union movement: Peter Malinauskas, Dave Grey, Cheyne Rich, Joe Szakacs and David DiTroia. Your belief in me will be rewarded over and over again.

Bronwyn, Sarah and Jane, our message to the community was strong. The positivity and thought was always there. Thank you for being there for me.

My community. You told that you wanted honesty. You backed me based on my commitment to work tirelessly for you and always put you first. Your letters of support were humbling. Thank you.

The amazing Penny Wong and Amanda Rishworth, who have been great sources of advice and a wealth of knowledge. I aspire to your incredible standards.

Katrine. You have an unwavering determination to make sure that life is as fair as it possibly can be. Your story is one that talks to this, and is one that I am so absolutely inspired by. You are my friend and my mentor. 'No words, lady; just wine.'

Sheree, Ty and Sid, my children. Sheree, you are a mother to the boys when I cannot be there. You are the most beautiful soul and I love you. Since you were two you have been the pink in my world. Ty, you are so brave and so very special. You have been through so much. I hope you now feel that you are home with us. You do not know yet, but your story is your power, and your journey will be an inspiration. You are a very big part of why I feel strong enough to do this. I am so proud to call you my son. Sid is our joy. He has made me lift my feet again, and he is the beat in my heart.

Poor Neil. You put up with me when others would sprint out the door. You sit and listen while a million world-changing plans come pouring out of my mouth at a rate of knots, and you gently question if I am overdoing it—usually to be ignored. You are my calming influence, and I do listen to you even if I say that I am ignoring you. You are more than my husband, you are my best friend.

Politics is now, it is immediate, and we in this house have the power to truly affect people's lives. To stand in this house with you all is a great honour, and I am looking forward to being part of some robust discussions and decision-making. Thank you.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:47): I have forgotten how many of these I have taken part in now. I congratulate the member for Fisher on her maiden speech. I can think of nothing worse than having lost a child. I look forward to her contributions in this place. As people know, I had a veterinary practice in Chandlers Hill at Happy Valley for 20-odd years. I know Fisher very well, and I will be watching very carefully what happens there. I certainly look forward to the maiden speech of the new member for Davenport. The new member for Davenport, I know, will be, like our new team, the 2014 crew, an exceptionally good member for this place.

On the Address in Reply, it is always an interesting experience for us to have the Black Rod come over and invite us across to the other place. We all march over there, sit down with their honours the Supreme Court judges and listen to a speech which we know is written by the government for the Governor.

In this case, it was the maiden speech for our Governor, His Excellency Hieu Van Le. I have known Hieu and Lan for many, many years, and I do not think I am being too familiar by using their Christian names because they are really decent people in the same way as Liz and Kevin Scarce were. I look forward to watching Hieu and Lan develop in the job as Kevin and Liz did. When Hieu delivered his speech yesterday, he did so with the usual high levels of decorum and respect for this institution, and that is what we all should continue to recognise.

I think, though, that this—and it is the government's speech, not the Governor's speech—is probably one of the most lightweight speeches I have heard in this place, and I will have a lot more to say to that over the next 12 months. There is no mention of emergency services, no mention of Aborigines and a very small mention of disabilities. There is a lot about plans for plans and we have a bit about time changes and nuclear waste—some things which, in this case, I actually agree there is a real need for discussion on. Whether or not we will end up with atomic clocks, I am not sure.

The people of this place need to take note of the words of the former governor, Kevin Scarce. When addressing Youth Parliament in Government House and also in my own electorate of Morphett on Proclamation Day, he said that there are three things wrong with Australian governments and he was including the South Australian government in that. This is from a serving governor: 'The Executive ignores the parliament, there is no ministerial accountability and the Public Service has been highly politicised.' For a serving governor to say that shows what a disgrace we have in South Australia.

Once again, we have seen it with 'announce and defend', the health review and the emergency services restructure which I will say a bit more about. So many times we see 'announce and defend'. We were promised that there would be a discussion, that there would be involvement of the people of South Australia. We have talks about citizens' juries. I think South Australians have

been judged and delivered upon by this government too many times without any evidence that those decisions that have been made have been worthwhile decisions.

The need for South Australians to get quality government—quality members of parliament—will be something that may be reflected in the reviews of the remuneration of members of parliament. As people know, I was just a humble veterinarian before I came into this place. It was actually 13 years ago on Monday; it was the ninth. I was actually earning more than I am now. I worked very hard. My wife and I built up a very good practice. We were earning more than I am now, but I did not do it for the money. Nobody does it for the money but, to attract people from some positions, sometimes there has to be some decent remuneration. We see the extraordinary levels of remuneration outside of this place that executives get, yet in this place, we make the laws, we make the rules, we make the regulations and we decide how people's lives are being lived.

There is a lot more to say about the taxation reviews and the nuclear debate, and certainly there will be some more said about the time. As for driverless cars, we have a rudderless government; we have a plan without a plan; we have a plan without rationale, as the nurses' union said about the health review. We heard the Supreme Court judges say that there were unlawful and irrational decisions being made in the Gillman issue. That extends to so many other areas, but I will move on.

I will move on to the main areas that I want to speak about today and those are veterans and volunteers. I will just give the Premier, the Minister for Health and the Minister for Emergency Services a bit of a heads-up about veterans and volunteers because they just do not get it. They just do not understand veterans and volunteers. I can say that my dad was a Royal Marine, mum was a Wren and my brother was in the Royal Navy. I have had a lot to do with veterans and volunteers through the CFS, the SES and St Johns over many years.

I think I have an appreciation of the passion that veterans and volunteers have for their causes and that is the big difference between what this Premier, this Minister for Health and this Minister for Emergency Services think of veterans and volunteers. They think it is about politics. They think it is about getting paid. They think it is about big government and Big Brother telling them what to do. For veterans and volunteers, it is from the ground up. It is about passion, it is about pride, and it is about being valued for what they do. The veterans in South Australia deserve much better than we are getting from this government.

A senior military figure said to me, 'South Australian Veterans' Affairs is really window-dressing.' I could not disagree more. The Veterans Advisory Council with my good friend Sir Eric Neal at its head is doing an excellent job and I congratulate them on the work they are doing and the new people who have just come on. Veterans are an iconic part of the South Australian culture and this year, above all—1915 to 2015, 100 years since Gallipoli—I look forward, with my colleagues on both sides, to attending as many remembrance functions as we possibly can to value our veterans.

The Repat is the spiritual home of the veterans. We all know that the facilities there are getting older; I think some of them were first built in 1945. They are getting older and they are getting tired, but like everything, there has been a lot of renewal, a lot of replacement and a lot of refurbishment. Just recently, we saw the opening of the rehabilitation centre. Also, there are the aged care facilities, and I heard about a new \$200,000 ultrasound machine which has just been bought for the Repat. A lot of equipment and facilities there are state of the art and the best in South Australia, yet what have we got from this government?

They are talking about a plan without rationale, according to the nursing federation, and a lot of that involves their closing of the Repat. We saw former premier Rann say the Repat would never close under a Labor government. We are seeing weasel words and all sorts of rhetoric being used to give the impression that they are not really closing it, but we know. We know what this government is all about, we know what their agenda is, we know how broke the state is thanks to them, and we know what they are going to do with the Repat.

But, the veterans will not give up. This is about pride, this is about passion, this is about perseverance, and this is about place—their place: the Repatriation General Hospital. Let me remind the house of the brochures which were, until recently—as I understand, they have all been removed—in the Repatriation General Hospital: the veterans' service guarantee for veterans and

war widows. Let us not forget that this is not a hospital that just treats veterans. Now, probably only around 10 per cent of the patients are veterans; when you add in the war widows and all those who are there to use the Repat, it is a very important hospital.

Just before I get on to the veterans' service guarantee, I will remind the house about how important the Repat is. It is the site for a large number, about three and a half thousand, of urology and orthopaedic procedures every year. It is without doubt the place with some of the best facilities for both orthopaedic and urological surgical procedures to take place. If the changes are made, and if these departments are shut down and shunted off somewhere else, waiting times will increase significantly. There are 750 arthroplasties (joint replacements) done at the Repat every year. Where are they going to go? Into already overcrowded surgical suites where we know surgery times are blown out?

There are 400 new referrals to the orthopaedics department at the Repat every month. Where are they going to go? There are 700 outpatient appointments at the orthopaedics department at the Repat every month. Where are they going to go? I have spoken with the clinicians down there, and I have had a lot to do with them over many years; there was no consultation. There was no input into the clinical decisions by the clinicians down there. Certainly, the EPAS trial that has been going on has been an unmitigated disaster. I think there has been \$430-odd million spent on EPAS so far. I know the government is beside themselves over getting EPAS into the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, but at the Repat, it has been an unmitigated disaster.

The Repat is a vital part of the health services in South Australia. Let me just go back to the veterans' service guarantee. According to the brochure that is put out by the South Australian government (SA Health), there are 15 different opportunities that are guaranteed. On the inside of the brochure, it states:

We guarantee that veterans can be provided with:

- Priority access to services
- Specialist care 24 hours a day
- Access to arranged admissions 24 hours a day
- A 'Repat Card' for entitled patients to make access easier
- Reduced waiting times for appointments in clinics
- Reduced waiting times for elective surgery
- Reserved parking for ex-service organisation representatives
- Veteran advocacy and patient information services
- Forums for veterans and ex-service organisations to discuss their needs
- Complimentary meals and office accommodation for ex-service organisation visitors
- Low cost, furnished accommodation near the hospital for use under special circumstances
- Free hospital ambulance transfers from another hospital to Repat, or from Repat to appointments at other hospitals
- A choice of specialists, where appropriate
- Department of Veterans Affairs transport, for those entitled to it, booked by staff
- A complimentary coffee in the coffee shop near the Repat clinics.

There are 15 different things there, 15 different things that were guaranteed by this government in a veterans' service guarantee. Unfortunately, this guarantee is not worth the paper it is written on. We have seen veterans being deceived by this government. We are seeing them abandoned by this government. They are not being listened to, but I know last Monday was just the start. The passion and the pride of the veterans will not go away. They are the ones who have faced real bullets, so this political onslaught is nothing to them. That is not stress and that is not pressure after what they have been through. They will fight to have their service recognised—as we should be doing.

We should be valuing veterans in this place, valuing this guarantee and making sure that the Repat does continue to provide the services they have expected and wanted for many years and, in many cases, have had delivered. We need to make sure that the changes now are done in ways that veterans can guide. Those special places—whether it is the chapel, the memorial garden or Ward 17—are spiritual homes, not just places for sanctuary, thought or treatment. It is much more than that. This government just does not get it. I suggest they actually go and talk to veterans and the veterans' organisations and ask them what it is that drives this passion, because they just do not get it.

The other area that I have, and this government, once again, just does not understand, is volunteers. The Liberal government, under the former member for Davenport, started the Office for Volunteers. We have the highest level of volunteering in South Australia, and I heard the member for Fisher say that in her maiden speech. I think the latest estimate of financial input of volunteers in South Australia is about \$5 billion. We need to value our volunteers for their in-kind input but, more particularly, we need to understand our volunteers and, once again, like the veterans, they are not doing it for reward.

If you give them Clipsal tickets—and I think the government should be giving the CFS volunteers Clipsal tickets again this year and I hope they do—and tickets to the cricket and that sort of thing, that is nice. If you live in the country it is hard to do, because you have to come down and have accommodation. It is a small token. They are not after that. What they are after is to be valued and, when it comes to emergency services volunteers, they want to be respected, they want to have their values listened to, they want to be able to contribute to any changes and they want to do it in a methodical, thorough and consultative fashion.

What we are seeing, again, is the Minister for Emergency Services and the Premier not having any understanding at all of that passion that the volunteers have in the emergency services. I am a life member of the CFS and I am very proud, very privileged and honoured to have been given the opportunity to become a life member. I can tell this house that volunteers will not abandon their communities. They might make noises about not fighting fires on government land but they will not abandon their communities, and this government should never, ever, play on that passion and loyalty to the communities. What they do need to take notice of is that volunteers in the emergency services will not be taken for granted, will not be bullied, will not be lied to and will not have the wool pulled over their eyes in any way, shape or form.

We have this restructuring of the emergency services here in South Australia and we have seen report after report, right back to the Bruce report in, I think, 1993 or 1996. I think the member for Colton, when he was with the UFU, was on that committee. It goes right back to then. There has been report after report into reshaping and restructuring emergency services. What we have now is the latest version of this. It was based on the Holloway review. There were 38 recommendations in the Holloway review of the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005. Only two of those 38 recommendations talked about restructuring, and that was more about independent heads and chairs of SAFECOM boards or a commission if you wanted to go down that path. However, what we have is far more than that. The other 36 recommendations were more nuts and bolts stuff about equipment and structuring the operational side of things.

What we have now, though, is the latest iteration and there is a real fear out there that it is being driven by the United Firefighters Union. May I just say that I am not the enemy of the UFU. I want them to talk to me. They have not responded to my letters; they have not acknowledged my letters. I am trying to talk to them now. I spoke to one of the UFU moderates, shall I say, the other day to try to get some dialogue going. The UFU in South Australia has given the impression that it is a winner takes all attitude and they have also scared the hell out of volunteers by some of their members not showing the respect to CFS volunteers that they should.

I grew up in a MFS—or, as it was then, the South Australian Fire Brigade—household. My father was in the MFS for 30 years. I remember the days of the South Australian Fire Brigade (SAFB) and the EFS. I remember the animosity and the angst. I remember being in a car with my father and stopping on the Philip Highway at Elizabeth and seeing the Elizabeth fire appliance stopping at the intersection of Commercial Road and Philip Highway when there was a fire across the road in a CFS area, but the MFS truck would not go across the road into the CFS area. That is ridiculous.

Nobody ever wants that to happen again; nobody ever wants the angst and the animosity to come back again.

What we all want—and I say 'we' as a member of the CFS and having many friends and relatives in the MFS and good friends in the SES—is change for the better. Nobody is against change. What we do not want is a predetermined path. We do not want the union going out there, as they did in their edition of *Word Back* in November last year, stating:

...the UFU supports the proposal to introduce a one service model for fire and rescue services in South Australia.

We do not want that; we cannot have that. What we have are three services that are working exceptionally well at the moment. The minister and the Premier had briefings at Sampson Flat on how well the Australasian Inter-Service Incident Management System (AIIMS) is working. They have started to realise that there is something more than just the chiefs and the baggy pants in these emergency services. They have realised that the structures are there already to make sure that the services do work and do work well now.

We have had SAFECOM for a number of years. The Ernst & Young review that was done by this government into SAFECOM was scathing of this government and the way it has defunded SAFECOM and the way it took away the staff in SAFECOM, so that a lot of the jobs that SAFECOM was doing are now being triplicated across the emergency services, the SES, CFS and MFS. Of course we do not want that: we do not want triplication of services; we do not want duplication of services.

There is a real opportunity for change but that change has to be managed. It has to be consultative. We do not want the minister going out there and talking to people and then coming back with preconceived ideas. We have a minister who said he had met with over 2,000 people. He has—he has met with over 2,000 people but has he listened to them? I do not think so. I do not think he really has.

There are so many areas in this proposed restructure that we just do not know about, and it is the level of detail that is scaring everybody. Even my friends in the MFS—and there are many of them—are saying to me that they are sick to death of being treated like mushrooms by both the UFU and this government. It is not just the CFS Volunteers Association and the SES Volunteers Association, SES and CFS volunteers and community members are saying, 'Look, show us the detail on this. Don't go rushing headlong into what you're proposing with a commissioner, six assistant commissioners and a whole bureaucracy under each of those. Don't do that. Let's talk about this.'

The minister says, 'Look there's a lot more to be done and it's going to take 12 to 18 months to work out the details of what has to be done.' Then why, minister, are you sacking the three chiefs now? They are all going to be gone by June—all three chiefs: Grant Lupton, an exceptionally fine leader of the MFS; Greg Nettleton, an exceptionally fine leader of the CFS; and Chris Beattie, an exceptionally fine leader of the SES. They will be lost to South Australia; that will be our loss. Why? Because this minister has decided that there is no room for them. He said that in *Hansard* when I asked him a question about it last year—I do not have the date here.

He said, 'I have four chief executives in the emergency services sector'—he was including Mr Place then—and if the proposed model goes ahead there will be one. Four into one will not go, and we know that the chiefs are getting sacked. It is just not the way to do this. You said there was going to be 12 to 18 months of discussion and you are sacking the chiefs now, so what have you predetermined already? You have already advertised for a commissioner. The commissioner's role is going to be one to manage this restructure. The statement for the commissioner for emergency services role that is out there states that the commissioner will provide critical and complex advice, establishing the new department for emergency services, championing and leading the reform agenda and change management process.

Why are you getting a commissioner on now, ignoring the Ernst & Young review, ignoring the advice from the three chief officers, ignoring the advice from the volunteer associations, and ignoring the advice from people who know far more about it than the minister, the Premier and I do? Why is he ignoring that advice and going headlong down this path and then saying, 'Trust me, it will all be okay. It is still open for changes; we have 12 to 18 months'? But we have a new commissioner

coming in, we are going to sack the three people who know the most about it, we have ignored the Ernst & Young review that said you should be providing more money for SAFECOM and an independent chair. You could be looking at amalgamations of three areas: procurement, human resources and training, and there may be opportunities there. That is what we should be doing. We should be going down that path, not down the path that this minister is driving this restructure.

I can guarantee this, minister: it will be just like the veterans turning up here every Monday morning on the steps of Parliament House until the government starts to listen. We saw 54 fire appliances turn up out the front of this place with about 300 volunteers on a Wednesday morning. That is how strong the feeling is amongst volunteers about this proposed restructure. That is just the start. This government is very lucky that it is summer and it is going to be 41° this Saturday, because I can guarantee that there would have been 200 trucks and 2,000 volunteers out there this Saturday were it not predicted to be such a horrendous day.

I just hope that the people of South Australia do recognise that, no matter how many volunteers and how big our emergency services are, if we do have a tragic day in South Australia, nothing will save us other than acts of God. On days like the day the Sampson Flat fire started and this coming Saturday, I value our volunteers and I respect their ability to do the job they want to do, but let us make sure we look after ourselves as well and look after this state. Were it not for that predicted day, our volunteers would have been back here with the pride, the passion and the perseverance that they are showing to make sure that this government understands they are going down the wrong path with this proposed review.

I have been to the minister's meetings. Yesterday he had a bit of a crack about me only coming out when there were photo opportunities, and one meeting. Well, it is not about going to your meetings, minister, it is about actually meeting with the people who really matter and who really know what they are talking about—talking to people who are both paid and volunteer firefighters. I have been to Melbourne, Brisbane, Sydney and Perth to talk to the ministers and the chief officers. I do not believe some of them wanted to speak to the minister when he went, but they spoke to me. They gave me the truth. They knew my background. They knew what I was after and, I tell you what, I was very surprised at some of their attitudes to what we are doing in South Australia. They said that it is the wrong thing to do.

We need to make sure that we are getting the truth out there, and the direction we are going to take in emergency services needs to be well and truly understood, and that is not happening. We saw the minister put out a press release entitled 'The myths and facts behind the Emergency Service reform'. I have a response to that, the CFS Volunteers Association have a response to that and the SES Volunteers Association are constructing their response to that. Let me tell you that my version of the minister's document with the real facts, not the spin doctor presentation and the glossing over of the real facts, is quite different. I will be making sure that that is a publicly available document so that the real facts are out there.

My facts are backed up by the opinions and the factual evidence being presented by both the SES Volunteers Association and the CFS Volunteers Association. I do not know what is driving the minister, I do not know whether his position on the front bench is at risk—I understand it is—but I said at the CFS rally that it should be the minister being sacked, not the chiefs, with his current attitude. I need to see a significant change before I will change that attitude. I appeal to this minister: take a breath, Tony, and sit back and listen to the people who know what they are talking about, you do not need to rush in on this. Your job will be safe if you show this government, show the Premier, that you are capable of being a statesman and not just some politician hell bent on serving your own political purposes.

I hope the United Firefighters Union starts to talk to me; I hope that Greg Northcott has the courage to listen to his members, because I know that they are cross with him for not responding to me. There are about 150 in the MFS, most of whom are UFU members who are in the CFS as well. They are starting to understand the ramifications of the current proposal. They are starting to understand that. This is not an anti-union thing. Certainly anybody who dares say to me that this an anti-MFS thing will have me to answer to. Certainly it is not just a pro-CFS or SES volunteers thing.

This is about getting long-term solutions for long-term issues in South Australia. We have issues with training, we have issues with resourcing, we have issues with response times and issues right across emergency services. Those issues need to be sorted out calmly, responsibly and in a fashion that will be inclusive. I do not want to go back to the old SAFB/EFS days; I do not want to go back to the days of the boards being completely separate and not talking to each other. I want a central body where we can organise, cooperate and collaborate within emergency services. We have that with SAFECOM.

So, just do what Ernst & Young says: restore SAFECOM, put in an independent chair, talk to the chiefs, talk to the volunteer associations, and I guarantee, minister, that you will get the support of the opposition, you will get the support of the MFS firefighters, you will get the support of the SES, the CFS firefighters, Volunteer Marine Rescue and Surf Life Saving, which gets \$12 million a year out of the emergency services levy. They might even start talking about swift water rescue, inland rescue and the work they are doing as well, because they have been left out of this.

This is not a complete restructure, not a complete review, but rather a perverse way of trying to go forward with emergency service delivery in South Australia. It will not work; it will destroy the cultures of the CFS and MFS as they are now. You will go back to the old days of the SAFB and the EFS. You will cause a lot of angst and, unfortunately, a lot of volunteers will walk. They will turn in their pagers, because they do not want to be part of a system where they have not been part of coming up with a solution. They will not abandon the communities because our volunteers will never abandon our communities.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, member for Morphett. Member for Kaurna.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:18): First, I begin by paying tribute to the Governor for his fantastic speech in opening this session of parliament yesterday. I have heard a few governor's speeches over the years, and I have to say that this was by far the most interesting and contained the most number of new policy proposals that I have ever heard in a governor's speech. I also congratulate the new Governor on taking up his role. I have known the Hon. Mr Hieu Van Le for a number of years, and I was particularly delighted to see his ascension to this high office. He is somebody of immense credibility, honesty and commitment to the people of South Australia.

I have been very pleased to see the large number of people from all across the state to whom I have spoken who have commented on what a great job he has been doing in the short time he has been in the role as Governor, and the huge number of commitments that being the Governor takes on, whether you are Chief Scout or patron of any number of organisations. It is quite a busy job, and our new Governor is doing a fantastic job in taking on that role.

I also congratulate our new member for Fisher, who gave her first speech some one hour ago; I think that it was one of the best first speeches I have ever heard in this parliament or in other parliaments. I think that you would be hard pressed to find a first speech given by a member which showed more commitment and more passion and which gave us more insight into her life story and what drives her to serve the people of her electorate than the speech we have just heard from the member for Fisher. Having known her for the past few years, I am very confident that she will not only make a tremendous impact upon this state but also in helping the people in the area of Fisher, which is near my electorate. I am very happy to have her in the south as well as a fellow member there. Of course, she also takes over from the Hon. Bob Such, who did a tremendous job in Fisher. I think that that electorate is going to be very well served.

I would like to talk a bit about some of the things that have happened in my electorate over the past year, since we started this parliament, and then go on to some of the broader issues that were dealt with by the Governor in his speech. Of course, in my electorate, which is the southern most tip of Adelaide's metropolitan area, transport is a massive issue and has always been a massive issue and will likely always be a massive issue. This year has seen some amazingly good news for the people of Kaurna and associated electorates down south with the opening of the Southern Expressway, which is now a dual carriageway expressway. There has been huge happiness expressed by people all around the south that this project has been delivered and is finally open.

We have also seen the opening of the Seaford rail line extension and the electrification of the Noarlunga line, which is now the Seaford line. Both of those projects have meant that, over the

past couple of years, there have been a lot of delays and disruptions to people's lives as those transport projects have been implemented. The Southern Expressway was closed for large parts of the day and, when it was open, it had reduced speed limits and, of course, for a long time, the whole Noarlunga line was shut down while the track was relaid and the electric lines were installed.

So, people are delighted to see both those services back up in operation, but also I thank people for their patience in dealing with their daily commutes or businesses in their getting back and forth around the area. We now have a truly world-class transport link between the southern suburbs and the city, which will only be improved by the government's commitment to upgrade the Darlington interchange over the coming years. This will be yet another improved transport link, which will remove one of Adelaide's worst bottlenecks, which is, I understand the busiest section of road in all of South Australia—the Darlington interchange.

The other fantastic thing that has happened since the rail line was reopened is that express services have been reinstated on the Seaford line. There are now two services in the morning and two in the evening, both to and from the city, which take people very quickly to their office or their place of work in the city. People are very happy to see those services reinstated, and I pay tribute to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure for his hard work, not only with the department but also with the commuters who use the Seaford line, in finding a solution to address those issues. As we see more and more electric trains being delivered on the Seaford line, we know that the timetable is going to improve over the coming year. There will be a chance to look at improving it even further and ensuring that we can remove any of the delays that are happening at the moment on that line.

As with all members of this house, a lot of my work has been in the electorate working with community groups—of course, mine in the southern suburbs. I really want to pay tribute to some of those fantastic community groups that I have had the privilege of working with over the past year. There is a huge number of sporting groups, whether they be brand new sporting groups, such as the Aldinga Soccer Club, which had its first season last year and had a tremendous record of success with just one season in the league in which it is participating, or more established clubs, for example, some of our football clubs, such as Christies Beach, Port Noarlunga and Aldinga.

Of course, Aldinga Football Club shot to national prominence last year when they hosted the Shane Crawford comeback game, in conjunction with *The Footy Show*, which helped put Aldinga Sharks on the map and has helped their resurgence as a footy club in inspiring more juniors to participate. I certainly thank *The Footy Show* and Channel Nine for their help, but also all the members of the community for putting on that great event that saw some 5,000 people turn up to Shark Park or Aldinga Oval to see that game. They were very privileged to be the joint winners of the City of Onkaparinga's best community event award for 2014 and I think that was very well deserved.

But there is a whole range of non-sporting clubs as well, whether they be the Rotary Club of Noarlunga, which I have been honoured to be an honorary member, or the RSL club of Port Noarlunga and Christies Beach which I have had a lot to do with as well as the member for Reynell. There is a huge number of community groups doing fantastic work in the south.

As well as that, I know all of our communities rely a lot on the work of schools. I have been very privileged to go around and visit all the schools in the electorate and have hosted a number of morning teas for teachers which has been very well received, I have to say, giving them an opportunity to talk to me about issues they are seeing in the education system, to talk about what is happening in the school, and how the government can better support the important work that they are doing. I am really excited when I see lots of school leaders and lots of teachers who have great ambitions for their students who do not want to see their students just ticking the grade, but want to see them striving to do the best that they possibly can.

I particularly would like to note Seaford Secondary College in my electorate, which is the high school right in the heart of the seat of Kaurna, and their principal Cez Green. She is a fantastic advocate for the students in her school and wants to make sure that they have every opportunity to succeed as much as if they were going to any other school in South Australia, even in much richer areas of our city. I have been very happy to work with them and look forward to doing so in the future.

Also it has been great to meet lots of emergency service workers in the south, whether they be people who work in police or ambulance, but also our CFS workers at the Aldinga and Seaford stations. I particularly pay tribute to them for their hard work on the Sampson Flat fires that we saw a couple of months ago. I think this was one of those fantastic moments where we saw people from all across the state drop everything to try and contribute what they could to serve other South Australians in need. No better example can you see of all of South Australia being brought together as a community, but particularly those firefighters who put themselves in harm's way from my electorate. I pay tribute to them.

We saw an amazing picture go viral on Facebook from the Aldinga CFS station where they arrived back late one night at 4am to see somebody had got out there and printed a massive sign on their garage doors of the station saying thank you from all of us. I think that just summed up what tremendous heroes they are and what gratitude we have for all of the CFS workers in this state.

In terms of other events that we have been doing in the community, I have been very happy to host the Premier, Jay Weatherill. We had a forum on a lot of the issues that we are seeing coming out of Canberra, particularly cuts to our hospitals and schools from the commonwealth government and their not honouring signed agreements that we have seen.

We have also hosted two seniors forums in the electorate that were very well attended and I thank the Minister for Health and the Minister for Ageing for attending them and discussing issues that our seniors in the southern suburbs have faced, but I also thank all of the not-for-profit and government groups that came out and held stalls at those seniors groups that really made them such a success.

I think broadly for our state we have fantastic years of growth ahead. There are some fantastic developments on the horizon, whether they be the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, further upgrades to our north-south corridor or discussions about how we can best place our health and education systems for the future.

In the Governor's speech, I was very delighted to see his discussion of reforms to the education system in South Australia, particularly how we can improve our schools. I think first and foremost the reforms included getting some of our head office staff of the Department of Education and Child Development out from the middle of the city and into the regions. I hope that we will be able to see some of those staff members out at Noarlunga, as well as, I am sure, Elizabeth and Port Adelaide, and in country regions of the state as well, where they can be more in touch with what is going on with the schools—

Mr Griffiths: Someone said it—country regions. Beautifully worked.

Mr PICTON: Yes, absolutely—where they could be more in touch with what is happening in the schools and can also help boost the economies in those areas. Say, in Noarlunga, if we can get more department of education staff working there, then that will help other businesses which provide food or services for people in that area. I am sure the same is true for everywhere else in the state.

We have seen other states do this quite a lot, in terms of decanting a lot of their public servants out from the city centres into regional or suburban areas. Particularly New South Wales and Victoria have done quite a lot of this over the past couple of decades. I know Victoria now has a number of government departments in areas such as Geelong and Bendigo. I think that that is a fantastic thing that we should be looking at in South Australia. I know that the government has made a commitment to move more government staff out to Port Adelaide, which I wholeheartedly support. I think that is something we should see more and more of.

The other things that were talked about in education included the development of more super schools, as they were known a few years ago, amalgamations of schools, where we can bring together schools which were created when there were boom times of children in a particular area and schools had to be brought up to a high capacity. Many of them are now at much lower capacities than what they were designed for. If we can bring together those schools, there can be more subjects taught, there can be better resources, and the savings can be pumped back into those schools and the education system.

I am very delighted to see that that is going to be a continued part of the government's agenda, but I also think that it is important that we also provide more resources for growing areas of the state, such as the peri-urban areas of Adelaide, whether they be the southern suburbs, the northern suburbs or some of the Hills areas that are seeing quite large growth in student numbers. I hope that that is going to be a continued part of the government's plan, to provide enough classrooms and teachers to make sure that those schools meet the requirements that we have for our children.

I think that the other fantastic thing we are seeing is a renewed emphasis on improving standards for schools, bringing back what was originally brought in many years ago in the Bannon government. Minister Crafter, I think in fact, when he was the education minister, brought in the ability for schools to be reviewed when standards were slipping to find out the reasons that that is happening and what can be done to remediate those schools and to try to improve them. I think when that government lost and the new government came in and looked for savings that was one thing that was cut, unfortunately, but this government—and I pay tribute to the previous minister, minister Rankine—is now bringing back the ability to review schools and to see where we have standards slipping in particular schools and to try to remedy them with good actions. I pay tribute to that.

There are a number of other reviews that the government has started that I think are really important. They are probably not front page exciting material, but they are very important to our state. First and foremost of them is the paper that the Attorney-General released a couple of months ago on justice reform. This is probably one of the first times that we have seen a top to bottom review of our justice system to see how we can improve the outcomes that we are getting, right the way through from when somebody is arrested to when they are incarcerated, and to try and work out where the blockages are in the system and how they can be fixed.

A lot of the time you look at the blockages in a particular area, say, Corrections, and the blockages have been caused by another part of the system, whether they be when someone is arrested or how they have been granted bail or how a trial is proceeding; so you really need to look at the whole system. I think it is fantastic that that is now happening, and I look forward to further papers that, I understand, the Attorney will release in coming months with detailed reforms in those areas.

The other area of reform that the Treasurer has just released a paper on today is about our tax system in South Australia. I know everybody is very interested in that. I think that that paper is really about how we create an efficient system of taxation in South Australia that can provide the revenue that we need to provide the services in schools and hospitals that all of us in this chamber, I am sure, agree should be provided, but how those taxes can be provided in a way that is efficient and fair. We as state governments have a bit of a random assortment of taxes that are available to us with the commonwealth/state break-up of taxation powers.

There is a bit of a limited scope in what is available, but working with what is constitutionally available, how we can best allocate them across the state so that not only are they efficient, encourage growth and investment but also fair to all citizens. I look forward to seeing that. As I said in my first speech, the issue of vertical fiscal imbalance is very important for South Australia. We are very reliant on grants from the commonwealth government, particularly as states such as Western Australia continually claim that they should be getting more funding and we should be getting less funding. That is a real risk for our state.

One last area that I would like to talk about is the area of concessions. Unfortunately, we saw in the federal government's budget last year not just a cut but a complete tearing up of the agreement that has been between the states and the commonwealth for I think well over 20 years of how concession payments should be made and what concessions should be covered, and funding from the commonwealth to the states to enable that to happen. In its budget last year the state government was able to cover one year of the council concession cut, but we said, 'We are hoping to get the federal government to reverse that. We will not be able to cover it in the future. If they do not reverse it, then of course we will have to review that in due course.'

We are now seeing local councils agitating about that. I think some councils have said that they will support seniors' concessions in their areas, which is fantastic, but I know a lot of councils have said that they are not interested in doing that at all, and they are pushing the buck back to the

state government now, as well as the federal government, and saying that we should be covering them. We are left with this problem where the federal government has cut funding of some \$30 million, which is equal to the cut of \$30 million that the council concessions cost, but local government is saying that the state government should fund it. Of course, we are saying that the federal government should meet their requirements under the agreement and fund it.

One thing that I found very disappointing in the campaigning, though, is that, while all councils, as I understand, have sent out letters to their residents pointing out the issues and directing them to various federal and state MPs, in my area the City of Onkaparinga and its mayor Lorraine Rosenberg sent a letter to residents, including me, that was completely inaccurate. It said that the council concessions were some \$61 million a year and the state government funded over half of those concessions and that we had cut our funding of those concessions to the tune of well over \$30 million, in addition to the commonwealth \$30 million cut.

Now that is completely incorrect. All the other council letters that have gone out to people across the state have not said that. As I understand it, the website of the Local Government Association is now correct, but there has been no retraction issued to people in the City of Onkaparinga by its mayor, which I think is disappointing because she has really misled residents as to the state of affairs of funding. The cut is almost exactly equal to the cost of the council concession. There is not some extra \$30 million cut that has been found from the state government. There was a \$30 million cut from Canberra and the cost of the concessions to councils was \$30 million.

I hope that that can be corrected. I know that this is a very important issue for people in my area and all across the state, and I hope that the federal government is going to be able to reverse that and provide funding for people and give people the peace of mind that they will be able to pay their council bills in the future.

To sum up, I think we saw a fantastic speech from the Governor yesterday. I think it has outlined some amazing areas of reform that have really put this government at the forefront of trying to think about and develop policies as to how we can improve and grow and create a fairer and better state, and I think that that will benefit not only the people in Kaurna but also people across the entire state.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:40): I also rise in support of the motion to acknowledge the Governor's speech and the Address in Reply which is to become the vision for the government over the next 12 months. I do also acknowledge the contribution of the new member for Fisher and commend her on her fine words and recognise the challenge that that would have presented in delivering that full message because of the conflicts and tragedies that the Cook family and the Davis family have faced—it is a very emotional one.

Indeed, on the day on which the now Sammy D passed away, my son, also playing football that day, tore his ACL cruciate and has never played football again. So we all deal with things but mine is a very minor one in comparison to the tragedy that occurred to them but, as a parent whose son was one year older at that stage, I cannot even begin to imagine the challenges that they have gone through.

I did pick up on a few things, though. Because we are elected to this place and we become politicians, we are not different, we are still people. That is why I think there has to be a level of humility attached to what we try to do while we are in here, and the forcefulness of the argument that we put, the beliefs that we hold and the principles that we hold true that have directed us in life to be seen to be good enough either by a significant size political party or by community members as an independent candidate to be elected in the first place. It is a challenge to hold true to those beliefs but we all have to. We all have to say what our heart tells us to say. I believe I do that most of the time. You pay the consequences for it sometimes, but it allows you to sleep easier at night.

The words that I say while reflecting upon some of the things said by the Governor in his speech are a critique of the words, not of the Governor himself. I do congratulate the Hon. Hieu Van Le and Mrs Le on the role, and the way in which they have undertaken the role over this short period. I congratulate them on the appointment, recognise the significance of it and the commitment that they as a couple will make to the role and the importance of it to South Australia. I wish them sincere good luck in retaining that enthusiasm which defines them, I believe, and the worthiness of the

position that they take on. It is a very important role to the people of South Australia and I have no doubt that they will undertake it exceptionally well.

The speech itself was a good collection of words. As a person who believes in the significance of individual words, I have not only listened to the speech but I have read it three times since because I actually want to pick up on some of the nuances of the things that are included in it. It was not until listening to the radio this morning that I have come to respect the fact that apparently there are 18 ideas attached to it but I am not sure what all those 18 ideas are. It made me think a little about the need for words to inspire us, and although I am not from the same political thought bubble on things, I do respect Barack Obama when first elected and the saying 'Yes we can' and how that captured an imagination.

I am a believer that words are there to inspire us, they have to capture us, they have to make us believe in opportunity and they have to give us some direction on how that opportunity is going to be realised. That is where my concern actually lays. In that time frame you cannot deliver the absolute detail on everything, but there has to be some information about how some things are to be done and an assurance that previous commitments are actually upheld and followed through.

I note that the member for Kurna talked about—and he did so with pride, I respect that—'my electorate'. I never actually use that term. I do not believe that I own Goyder, and I do not believe that it is my right to represent Goyder. It is my absolute honour to do so but I am very much dependent upon the level of support from people. So, I do not use the term 'it's my electorate' and things like that; I believe I talk about 'the Goyder electorate'. It is just a bit of a difference in attitude, and it is important for all of us because it brings about a level of humility.

Having read the Governor's speech, I am concerned with the very scant recognition of regional South Australia—and I have tried to identify it. It frustrates the life out of me, and it is perpetuated by other members in this chamber: when the member for Kurna talked about regions, he talked about what I define as suburbs. I talk about regions as being beyond the boundaries that we acknowledge the city area to occupy, and it is such an important part of the state.

There were references to mining and the regulations, and the world's best practice that apparently is adhered to in South Australia. It concerns the life out of me that in such a land mass, such a significant part of the state—we are not a city state, we are actually a whole state—my frustration is that, depending on how you measure it, the population can range between 18 per cent—that is in the Strategic Plan—and 24 per cent of the total population of a bit over 1.6 million people. It is such an important part of not just who we are, but what our future opportunities are going to be. The intention of the government about what it is to deliver for regional South Australia should have been mentioned in great detail, and that is an accountability issue.

The minister is in the chamber, and I am pleased by that, because it concerns me that with the importance of the position he holds, there was not an assurance given to him in the uniqueness of the way in which he holds a position—

The Hon. G.G. Brock interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Okay, but for me—

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is important that members are heard in silence, but before I ask you to continue, member for Goyder, I would like to acknowledge that we have in the gallery today the Redeemer Lutheran School as guests of the member for Schubert. We hope they enjoy their time here this afternoon, and I know they will be listening to the member for Goyder now, so you have a special audience.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I have broken out in perspiration, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue.

Mr GRIFFITHS: It is rather unnerving to see our future in the hands of such obviously outstanding young people who are here to cast an eye over what we say in this building. Aspire to

it—I hope to see one of you guys in parliament in the future. I think there needs to be more skills like that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: One of the girls, yes.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My apologies.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Go girl power!

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Debate resumed.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:47): So, that is an important one for me. I think there will probably be a lot of members from the opposition who will reflect upon the fact that the speech did not include the references to regional South Australia that we would have liked. I note it talked about the regions only in connection to the four significant hospitals in regional South Australia in which effort has gone into their rebuild. It talked about regions, in further defining it, such as East Asia and India, and regional South Australia was presumably part of the group that provides fine wine and food to that part of the world. But there should have been a far greater emphasis upon it.

I cannot remember reading any words about cost-of-living pressures. I am sure that I am not unique when it comes to members of this house having people in the community talk to them about the challenges that individuals, families and businesses face when it comes to paying the bills for consumables—and the most basic of necessities: food, water, electricity, cost of living—all of those sorts of things—housing, accommodation. That should have been of greater emphasis too, because that is part of our charter, part of the reason we are in here, to try to provide the services, to ensure the infrastructure is there to support that, and give the people as much as we humanly can, but also to ensure that the cost associated with it, which is borne by the taxpayer at the end of the day, on every occasion, is at its best and at its most efficient. I hoped that would have received greater emphasis, but unfortunately it did not.

I did read with interest the reference to the fact that traditional industries are in decline, and I respect that. We are in a very challenging time, indeed, for South Australia. The initiatives that were brought to our state post-World War II and were vibrant for the economy of South Australia are suffering because of the worldwide economy that we operate in. We are in a transitional period, but that is where government, and opposition, need to espouse what the opportunities are going to be for the community so they can move from what is seen as traditional to what the future chances are to ensure that training opportunities are there; to ensure that support via policy for business growth to provide job opportunities is there; and to ensure that through our educational institutions people are graduating with the skill set they require.

So I would have loved to have seen that, and I am sure that many members from the government side within those areas that are suffering some of those unique and very far reaching challenges will be demanding from their ministerial representatives, in the next decade in particular, the delivery of services to do that. I think this would have been an opportunity in the Governor's speech to talk about some of those initiatives.

There were a couple of references to portfolio areas for which I have responsibility. Quite an important one was the review of the Development Act 1993, which has been undertaken by an expert panel appointed by minister Rau nearly two years ago, which gave its final report to the minister in early December last year. Public consultation is ongoing until Friday of this week. The Governor's speech has flagged that legislation will be brought into the parliament later in the year for serious debate. I am not sure if that is before the budget or post-budget time.

I think there is a spirit of a change to occur. From my point of view there is also the need to ensure that not only is it legislation that is appropriate but the authority provided to those who make the decision as best as it can be and that it is used when it needs to be to ensure that we get outcomes. I do not want to see anything that stifles development opportunity but I do want to see that the legislation enshrines a very strong principle that community voices be heard when it comes to developing or creating what the development vision is for a community.

I think that individual development plans for council areas are important, but an absolutely critical one for me is to ensure that recommendation three from the expert panel on the Charter for Community Participation is one of the main focuses. By engagement with the community very early on you hear the voices about what they would like to see happen, what they are prepared to see happen—and there is often a very significant difference—what the development side of things might want to see happen, what local government believes it will need to try to support growth in particular ways. It is only through that really serious work in the very early stages that you get something that can be accepted by all and, therefore, reduces a lot of the angst that exists.

Development can be an exciting one or it can be a trigger mechanism for a debate and an argument to occur in a community that sometimes communities do not recover from. I know that there are other members in this chamber who have seen initiatives opposed by a community which have been exceptionally divisive, and long-term friendships have been ruined because of it. Different positions are held, and then it might not even occur, but you never recover from it. Development is an exceptionally important issue for the state to get right.

Minister Rau has been rather engaging, and I appreciate the fact that he and his staff are providing briefings to me on that, but there has to be an ongoing level of discussion to ensure that the legislation the parliament finishes up with has to be enacted within local government. I will be interested when the debate occurs on this about the Minister for Local Government actually having involvement in it because it is a key issue for his portfolio area, too, about the practical indications of what level of responsibility rests with local government for decision-making, what has to be taken over by a body such as the Development Assessment Commission and other bodies that make decisions based on what the development vision of a community is.

It will be a long debate. I think it is quite likely that this chamber will be occupied for several days talking about the nuances of it. As I understand it, it is intended not to amend the current act but to propose a completely new one, which is probably an easier way of doing it, but there will be a lot of comparisons between the 1993 act, which was amended probably 45 times via different bills that came into this place, and what the implications of that will be. There will be a lot of people from both sides who give examples predominantly of the bad issues or the frustrations of the time delay or the seemingly bureaucratic red tape issues that have driven people crazy through it, and they are the ones that are talked about on talkback radio all the time. Probably there is not as much credence given to those where the system has worked well and an outcome has been achieved, where it represents a compromise and also a win for all sides.

This is not my area of expertise, and there will be others in this chamber who will probably talk about it more, but time zones were noted. I confirm that I have received feedback, but not in this last instance, though. I expected a lot of Goyder community to contact me about it—that has been based upon previous times it has been brought up—but there is a high level of support for not doing it, because they are concerned about the impact on the people who live on Eyre Peninsula and what that will do to them. That is all I can offer at this stage, but that will be an interesting debate also, led by the Minister for Investment and Trade, the member for Waite, and we will see what happens.

I did also note that included in the Governor's speech is the suggestion, which has been floated by minister Rau in recent months, about the potential for the urban growth boundary to be put in place by legislation. I found this one interesting. As I understand it, minister Laidlaw as the then minister for planning in the mid-1990s put it in place via regulation, so therefore it is able to be amended by the minister via regulation and is therefore also presumably subject to disallowance motions from any member in any house, subject to it being within 15 days of being enacted or sitting in the parliament to do that.

It is fair to say that I had been contacted by groups, rather quickly, about the position held on that gazettal of the urban growth boundary. I will take the opportunity to put on the record one example of contact made with me. It is rather interesting; it is from the Urban Development Institute of Australia. On the bottom of the letterhead for their Executive Director Terry Walsh, it actually has a photo of the Premier, and indeed they have people booked to attend a major luncheon today that the Premier is speaking at. So, I find the timing rather interesting of a significant announcement, the Premier being the guest speaker, and the UDIA holding a very different position to that proposed in

the Governor's speech. So I will just put it on the record. Mr Walsh, in providing me with comment this morning via email, says:

We are not happy with the statement relating to the Urban Growth Boundary. It is unnecessary; it creates an IN and OUT location factor with implication for skyrocketing prices inside the line. It will be a cumbersome arrangement where any potential change must be arranged via Parliament—

Now, that has to occur anyway via the regulation. It continues:

This planning decision is a decision for the Minister for Planning, who should need to defend it based on policy.

The statement must not be a precursor to changing the rules on current developments being planned within the scope of existing government plans [within the boundary that currently exists] for future growth.

The Urban Development Institute of Australia will not bend on its stance that 'an urban growth boundary is unnecessary; it will affect the affordability of land for people seeking their homes in outer suburban areas, often they are the most price-sensitive buyers in the market'.

I certainly do respect that last comment: that people, particularly where they do not have the resources or assets behind them to afford a high-valued property for the purchase of a home, which is a great Australian dream, will do it hopefully in regional South Australia but also in the fringe boundary areas of the suburbs of Adelaide, where land is that little bit less in price and allows them to achieve that dream of owning a home.

I have been contacted by others also. As I understand it, the minister intends I think to include this as part of the reforms proposed to the Development Act 1993—legislation that will come in later—but it is likely that this will be a continuing discussion that is held in a variety of forums, too.

I have not had a chance to review it in full yet, but I have been provided with 74 pages, or 77 pages, of the State Tax Review Discussion Paper that was released this morning. I note on page 24 some information regarding the member for Kaurua's contribution about pensions and the concessions payable on council rates. I think I will take this opportunity just to correct some of the information that the member might have provided.

My understanding is that the National Partnership Agreement, which was \$27.7 million, was from the early 1990s, so that is true that it has been in place for 20 years. It was intended to expire, as I understand it, at the end of this financial year. The federal government, as part of a budget decision announced in May of last year, decided to stop that. Am I frustrated by that? Absolutely. I do not support the federal government's decision to have done that. But it is also important for people to understand that the \$27.7 million was not specifically targeted to council rates and pension concessions on that. It was part of the overall cost, as I understand it. On page 24 of this taxation discussion paper, it highlights that the implications in the 2014-15 financial year on concession costs in all areas were \$269 million. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Ministerial Statement

TAXATION REFORM

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:04): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The government is committed to ensuring that South Australia remains a place where people and business thrive. Yesterday, in opening parliament, the Governor announced that the government will be undertaking a review of state taxes to ensure our taxation system supports this goal.

The review builds upon our commitment as part of the government's economic priorities to launch an agenda for tax reform. Nothing is out of bounds in the review, but meaningful reform will only be possible if it is a product of robust and informed discussions within the community. The

Governor announced that the government would be releasing a discussion paper on options to reform our taxation system, and I am pleased to be able to release the paper today and table a copy here.

The discussion paper provides a summary of the state's current taxation system and summarises tax reform ideas that have been suggested in the past through various tax reviews. The paper includes a range of information not normally available to encourage an informed debate on tax reform and provide a useful resource for those in the community who wish to contribute to this process.

It is important to note that the discussion paper does not propose any particular reforms; it is the first key step in engaging with the community on tax reform matters. The discussion paper does, however, pose a range of questions which we will seek the community's views on during the consultation process. The discussion paper includes a range of interstate comparisons of our taxes and the broader costs of doing business in the state.

South Australia's business environment boasts the most competitive payroll tax regime in the nation as ranked by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. Other reports show that we have the lowest total taxes and charges for big business and the second lowest for small businesses establishing operations in the state.

As a state that is encouraging the development of its mineral resources, South Australia also has competitive mining royalties. We compare favourably on broader business cost comparisons. KPMG's 2014 Competitive Alternatives Report ranks South Australia as being the second most competitive business environment for the four Australian cities surveyed.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The government's recent reforms to the WorkCover system should further improve our business cost competitiveness. It is clear, however, that our business stamp duty rates are relatively high when compared with other jurisdictions. The Governor confirmed yesterday that the government is open to radical reform of our taxation system.

Mr Pengilly: How about the Repat?

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: However, it is important that the community understands that this review is about competitive, sustainable and fair tax reform, not simply tax cuts.

Ms Redmond: You are joking—it's not simply tax cuts.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Heysen to order. The opposition gave leave for the Treasurer to give that ministerial statement. Uncharacteristically, not once did he beat the opposition over the head, yet the opposition interjected on him throughout.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

State Tax Review Discussion Paper—February 2015

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:07): I bring up the first report of the committee concerning subordinate legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time***HEALTH REVIEW**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Minister for Health. How does the minister respond to statements made by the former head of the Noarlunga emergency department that the proposal to downgrade Noarlunga and transfer patients to Flinders may well cost lives?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:08): I have confidence in the advice I get from the clinicians who work in our emergency departments at the moment. I am aware that the former head of the ED at Noarlunga has written a letter, and I think it is appropriate that I quote from a letter that has been written by a clinician to the Leader of the Opposition. The letter is from Dr Philip Tideman, who is a very senior clinician in the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network and he writes—

Mr Tarzia: Did you write it?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: He writes—

The SPEAKER: Minister! The member for Hartley will not interject to the minister, 'Did you write it?' and is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Dr Tideman writes:

Dear Steven

Please do all of us a service and start to apply some intellectual rigour to opposition policy. Please do not insult the intelligence of hard working clinicians and other health workers and the public with rote opposition to everything the Government puts forward.

I don't think anyone could say I was a traditional Labour supporter, in fact the opposite is probably true, and I certainly do not agree with everything the Government does or proposes. However as a senior clinician I know we must make changes to ensure the sustainability and continued improvement in the quality of services that my colleagues and I—

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Heysen.

Ms REDMOND: On the relevance of this statement by the minister to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Yes; entirely germane, because of course the question is the criticism of government policy by a former clinician, and the minister is supplying information from a current clinician.

Ms REDMOND: But, sir, the question was: how does the minister respond to that criticism about the changes?

The SPEAKER: He is responding with the views of other clinicians; entirely in order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Thank you, sir. I continue:

Rather than lazily resist any change in this intellectually bankrupt rote way please ensure that you and your colleagues spend time understanding the challenges that have to be addressed and put some effort into making some positive alternative policy proposals like those of us actually providing the services continually try to do—I am sure there are potential alternative additional strategies that could usefully contribute to better outcomes for SA people, I just don't see you or your colleagues making any effort to contributing in this way.

You and your party's—

this is Dr Tideman talking about the Leader of the Opposition and those on the opposition benches—completely inadequate response to the Transforming Healthcare proposals as reflected in the email below—

he is referring to an email that he received from the Leader of the Opposition—

is an example of why the Liberal Party in SA is so embarrassingly ineffectual in day to day public debate and at the polls despite having been in opposition for 13 years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, are you quoting, or are these your words?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am quoting, sir.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am quoting. These are not my words, sir; these are the words of Dr Philip Tideman, a very senior clinician in the Southern Area Local Health Network—a very well-known cardiologist and respected right across this state. Dr Tideman continues:

Please step up and take responsibility for lifting the performance of the Opposition to acceptable levels or all resign and get Liberal politicians into Parliament who can actually do the job rather than waste our time and public money (yes the tax payers fund your salary) on useless political stunts.

Mr Speaker, I cannot put it any better.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Health. Now that the Noarlunga emergency clinicians have revealed that 20,000 current presentations at the Noarlunga emergency department could not be handled by a walk-in clinic and would have to go to the Flinders Medical Centre, can the minister assure the house that the Flinders Medical Centre could handle a 30 per cent increase in its emergency department presentations?

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Minister for Health, reading *Hansard* yesterday I noticed that he referred to the opposition as 'galahs' and I would ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:14): I withdraw and apologise, sir, to the opposition. The presentations to the Noarlunga emergency department are quite clear. Of the presentations to the Noarlunga emergency department, only 13 per cent are admitted to hospital. So, 87 per cent of all the presentations—all the people who come into the Noarlunga emergency department at the moment—do not need to be admitted to hospital. They are not admitted, they are discharged. They are treated and they are discharged. That is not to say that they are not important presentations, they are just not presentations that require an admission into hospital.

Of the 13 per cent who are admitted to hospital, 7 per cent—seven of the 13, so over half of the people who are admitted to hospital—are not admitted to the Noarlunga Hospital, they are admitted to the Flinders Medical Centre, so we are talking about a very, very small number. What happens to those people—what happens to that 7 per cent—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Double-handled.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: As the Treasurer said, they get double-handled. They present to the Noarlunga emergency department, they are assessed, a clinician makes a decision that they need to be transferred, they go up to Flinders emergency department and they go through it all over again, and that is not acceptable treatment. That is a completely unnecessary delay in that person's treatment. Far better for those people, rather than being double-handled and rather than being delayed in the Noarlunga emergency department, that they go straight to the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department where they are going to be treated already.

Of the patients who are admitted from Noarlunga, more than half are admitted into the Flinders Medical Centre and are transferred. The other 6 per cent will be a relatively small number. I think, if I recall, the director of emergency medicine in southern Adelaide estimated about six extra ambulances a day he would expect from patients who would be going straight to Flinders Medical Centre. So about six extra ambulances a day. I am very confident that Flinders Medical Centre is going to be able to deal with those six extra ambulances a day. That is not to say that we still do not have a lot of work to do. Of course we need to make sure that patients are flowing better through all of our emergency departments, and that will be done and that is what we are addressing in these reforms.

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before you ask the supplementary, I call the member for Heysen and the deputy leader to order. The leader.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): Where will the additional ambulances be taking patients? If only six, or up to six, ambulances will be going to the Flinders Medical Centre, what are they going to do with the other ambulances that are currently attending the Noarlunga emergency centre because it does not take ambulances after the reforms have gone through?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:17): I don't think the Leader of the Opposition understood what I was saying. Of the presentations currently to the emergency department, only 13 per cent are admitted to hospital. Of those 13 per cent, more than half—about 7 per cent—are in fact admitted not to the Noarlunga Hospital but to the Flinders Medical Centre. So, in terms of the additional ambulances that will need to go straight to the Flinders Medical Centre, it is a relatively small number.

Last week, the director of emergency medicine for the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Professor Alan O'Connor, estimated that it would amount to about six ambulances a day. As a result of these reforms, we would expect Flinders Medical Centre to be having an extra six ambulances a day of ambulances that are going straight to Flinders Medical Centre as opposed to going to Noarlunga.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): The former head of the Noarlunga emergency department, who was on the ground, said that they were receiving 12 to 20 ambulances per day and this would add another almost 7,000 ambulance presentations at the Flinders Medical Centre each year. Does the minister believe that the Flinders Medical Centre can cope with an additional 7,000 vehicle movements per year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:18): I don't dispute the number—12 to 20 sounds about right—but at the moment what is happening is, of the 12 to 20, half of those, having gone to Noarlunga then have to get in another ambulance and go to Flinders Medical Centre. That is what is happening at the moment. Patients are turning up to the Noarlunga emergency department, the Noarlunga emergency department is not able to look after them and they have to be transferred from Noarlunga to Flinders Medical Centre by ambulance. So of those 12 to 20—the number he quoted sounds about right—who are turning up, half of those at the moment cannot be looked after at the Noarlunga emergency department and have to be transferred by ambulance to the Flinders Medical Centre.

Members interjecting:

Mr Marshall: Nevertheless, you did not answer my question. Does the Flinders Medical Centre—

The SPEAKER: Before we go to what will presumably be a supplementary, and there is no provision for the leader to rise and to assert that the minister did not answer his question before asking a supplementary, that is not part of the standing orders, I warn the member for Heysen for the first time and I call to order the members for Chaffey and Morphett.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Can the minister advise the house whether he is confident that the Flinders Medical Centre will be able to cope with any increase in emergency vehicle presentations given the fact that there is ramping currently now outside of the flu epidemic season which he often refers to in this house?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:20): Yes, I am.

POLITICAL DONATIONS

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about what he considers are the reasons to reform rules around political donations and limiting the influence of sectional interests?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for his question. As part of his speech to the parliament yesterday, His Excellency spoke about the need to introduce new measures to improve the quality and integrity of our system of government. It envisaged improvement in transparency would be achieved through a number of measures.

It is my view that such reforms are vital if we are to ensure the community has faith in our systems of government. This is obviously a present concern for people about the political process and there is a degree of cynicism about it. They must feel that when a decision is made it is being taken for the right reasons, that is, the best interests of the state, the best interests of the broader community and through an appropriate process. The government should be encouraged to make decisions to drive that activity in our community and our economy that have that effect.

However, the decisions made should not be based on the undue influence of sectional interests. These interests, of course, need to be balanced, but they nevertheless cannot have undue influence. So, for instance, those interests should not have the capacity to buy political influence, and I have been very clear about the fact that this government will not be scared to make significant decisions based on what we believe is necessary in the state's interests even if it might upset from time to time sectional interests.

We need to safeguard against political parties basing their policies on positions that might be influenced by the financial support of sectional interests. Take, for instance, the reform of liquor licensing and small bars. That should not be influenced by the effect of an AHA donation, because if that were to happen that would be a bad thing. Or the position on marine parks—that, for instance, should not be influenced by million dollar donations from the tuna industry.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Or even garden party fundraisers that might influence planning policy, especially if the planning policy was in one direction and then suddenly changed in another direction, or perhaps influencing the transport development levy on the basis that a group of car park owners might come to you and say, 'Have we got a deal for you. We would like to run some advertisements.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think it is a dangerous matter when policy positions are not determined through hard work and through analysis and weighing up interests, but rather a political party becomes effectively a lobby group for hire. That would be a very bad thing and we certainly need to guard against that in this place.

The SPEAKER: Arising out of that intemperance by the house, the Minister for Health is called to order, the member for Hartley is warned a first time, the member for Morialta is called to order, warned a first and a second time, the member for Davenport receives his maiden call to order, the member for Mount Gambier is called to order and warned a first time, the member for Hammond is called to order, the member for Chaffey is warned a first time, and the member for Mitchell is called to order.

HEALTH REVIEW

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister detail how many treatment places the government intends to add to the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department and the total cost of the upgrade?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:24): These issues are still being worked through, but I am happy to provide a report back to the house.

HEALTH REVIEW

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:24): Supplementary, Mr Speaker: will the upgrade enable Flinders emergency department to handle the estimated 22,000 extra patients, with 7,300 presenting by ambulances, including 1,680 mental health patients, to cope with the extra number?

The SPEAKER: Before the minister answers, that's not a supplementary question. It didn't arise from the previous question or answer. Moreover, the member for Morphett just merely read it off a sheet, so it couldn't have been spontaneous.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir. I may have misheard, but I don't recall the member for Morphett saying 'supplementary', and you called him without asking for a supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Oh, no; he did say it was a supplementary, yes. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:25): Mr Speaker, it would be good if the member for Morphett and the Leader of the Opposition talked to each other about their questions, because then the questions might actually agree with each other, because, of course, the member for Morphett I think just said there's going to be 22,000 extra presentations to the Flinders Medical Centre, which is completely false—completely and utterly false. The Leader of the Opposition had a quite different number at the beginning of question time. Maybe if the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Morphett talk to each other about their questions at least there might be—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: I shall uphold the member for Stuart's point of order if I anticipate that the Minister for Health is digressing from the—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: And debating.

The SPEAKER: —and debating. I uphold both those points of order. To your text, Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Firstly, there will not be 22,000 extra presentations to the Flinders Medical Centre. As I have said before—and maybe the member for Morphett wasn't paying attention, maybe he was asleep—I went through this. The number of extra presentations to the Flinders Medical Centre—

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health will not insult members of the opposition by saying that perhaps they were asleep. I warn him for the first time.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Sorry, sir. The total number of all the presentations to the Noarlunga emergency department—the overwhelming majority of them—do not require admission to hospital and will be able to continue to be seen at the Noarlunga emergency department in the vicinity of 90 per cent. So, for 90 per cent of all the presentations at the Noarlunga emergency department at the moment nothing will change. They will continue to go to Noarlunga emergency department and they will be seen quicker and more effectively than they will under the current arrangements. So, it is completely false to suggest that every presentation at the Noarlunga emergency department will have to go up to the Flinders Medical Centre, and the member for Morphett knows it.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:27): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Now that the minister has revealed plans to accelerate the co-location of the Women's and Children's Hospital with the new RAH, can he detail when the new hospital will be operational, the estimated costs for the redevelopment, and whether this has been factored into the forward estimates?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:28): No, it hasn't been factored into the forward estimates. We are investigating whether it is possible to bring forward the relocation of the Women's and Children's Hospital. At the moment—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: No, it says we are investigating bringing it forward. It is certainly my desire, if it is possible, funds and everything else being available, to do it. There are several problems we have with the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Women's and Children's Hospital being separate. One is, of course, the children who are medically evacuated by helicopter. At the moment, the helicopter needs to land at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. They then need to be transferred by ambulance from the Royal Adelaide Hospital to the Women's and Children's Hospital. Far better to have them co-located so the helicopter can land. They can be taken straight into hospital and given effective treatment.

The other issue is for women, who need intensive care, who have babies that are born prematurely. At the moment, the only neonatal unit in the state that has adult intensive care co-located with it is at the Flinders Medical Centre. It is far more desirable for women who are giving birth to prem babies, that you don't have to separate the two—that they are kept together. They are very good reasons why the Women's and Children's Hospital should be co-located. We are looking at options to be able to bring that forward, and I would be very happy to come back to the house as soon as we've made progress on that.

The SPEAKER: Before the next question, I ask the member for Chaffey did he interject that the Minister for Health has suffered one blow too many, or words like it? Because I will have reference to the tape after question time. Could the member for Chaffey make a decision about whether he uttered words like that?

Mr WHETSTONE: I asked the Minister for Health if he'd had one punch too many.

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey will withdraw and apologise for the use of words such as that.

Mr WHETSTONE: I withdraw and apologise for asking the minister if he'd had one punch too many.

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey, instead of being smart and repeating the insult, will merely rise and withdraw and apologise.

Mr WHETSTONE: I withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The leader.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): A supplementary question: as part of that investigation, has the minister determined whether his initial estimate given to the people of South Australia in the lead-up to the state general election of \$600 million being the estimated cost for this 314-bed hospital remains accurate?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31): Certainly, nothing has been presented to me to suggest that it's not accurate.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, leader.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): How can the state government think that the cost of a new 314-bed hospital, to be delivered in 2023, will be \$600 million when the Victorian children's hospital, for 330 beds, was delivered two years ago at the cost of \$1 billion?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31): There are considerable benefits from having it co-located and it means there are things we are not going to have to do that would have happened with the other hospitals that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. So, there are services that can be shared, we don't need to build a new set of services, there is considerable extra capacity at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. It has been designed on the premise that the services be in there to provide for future expansion of the hospital—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: So, yes, I am quite confident in \$600 million. As I have always said, it is a preliminary figure, but I would certainly not expect it to be as expensive as a stand-alone build of the type that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Before that supplementary is asked, the member for Hartley is warned for the second and final time, the member for Heysen is warned for the second and final time, and the member for Unley is called to order. Leader—a supplementary?

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, sir.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Previously in question time, the minister has indicated to the house that the government, if it does proceed with the relocation of the Women's and Children's Hospital, would look carefully at the planned upgrades for the existing hospital in North Adelaide. Can the minister outline to the house whether all of those planned upgrades are going to continue, and what the total amount is going to be spent at that hospital given that the government has a plan to stick the wrecking ball through it by 2023?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:33): No, they are not all going forward. We've had a good look and there was certain planned work that was going to happen that's now no longer going to proceed given we now have a use-by date on that hospital. I haven't got the exact figures, but I'm happy to get back to the house an answer.

The SPEAKER: A further supplementary?

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, thank you, sir.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Can we just get some clarification on that, because certainly in the budget that was handed down in June there was no diminution of the capital works on that site and there was no update in the Mid-Year Budget Review. Has the government made a decision and failed to inform 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) (14:34): I'll need to check about whether it was in the budget or Mid-Year Budget Review, but it is the case that there were certain works that were to progress there—it's not a significant amount, but it would make no sense to continue with those investments at the hospital given that we were going to vacate the hospital on a 10-year time frame. I now have to say that money has not been just returned to budget—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —it's been put into the capital reconfiguration fund as part of the normal process. So, it hasn't been returned to the budget bottom line as such; it will be invested in other areas within our health system.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for the first time. The member for Florey.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Health. What are the plans and timelines for Modbury Hospital services under the Transforming Health proposals?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:35): I thank the member for Florey for her question. The Modbury Hospital and its excellent clinical teams have been an important part of our public hospital system for many years. The government showed its commitment to the Modbury Hospital when it returned it to public hands in 2007 following its privatisation by the former Liberal government.

Since 2002, we have invested \$30 million in Modbury to ensure that our doctors, nurses and allied health professionals can best meet the needs of the local community. The important reforms proposed by Transforming Health seem to have sparked some almost hysterical and ill-informed comments about the future of Modbury from members opposite. Even this morning—

The SPEAKER: I caution the Minister for Health about attributing hysteria to the opposition.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Certainly, sir. Even this morning a federal Liberal Party colleague added to this malicious scaremongering. I would like to take—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It was the member for Sturt, Christopher Pyne, in an interview that did not go particularly well for him, if I recall. I would like to take the opportunity to restate that Modbury Hospital is here to stay. We are not closing Modbury Hospital; in fact, Transforming Health—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: They don't like to hear it. They try to shut me down—

Ms BEDFORD: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Ms BEDFORD: I cannot hear the answer, and if no-one else has an interest in Modbury Hospital, I do.

The SPEAKER: When I have ceased consulting the Opposition Whip, there will be a number of opposition members shown the yellow card. The minister—who will stop taunting Her Majesty's opposition.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: In fact, Transforming Health proposes to invest \$32 million to upgrade its facilities. The Modbury Hospital will continue to provide emergency care for the local community, with the emergency department open 24 hours a day, seven days a week. People with urgent, life-threatening conditions will be taken directly by ambulance to either the new major emergency departments at the Lyell McEwin Hospital or the Royal Adelaide Hospital instead of Modbury Hospital. This, however, is expected to only involve around half of 1 per cent of the presentations that currently go to Modbury Hospital. This will mean that people with a life-threatening condition will receive 24/7 specialist care and allow Modbury to focus on reducing wait times for less complex, non life-threatening presentations.

It is proposed that a new dedicated eye centre will make the Modbury Hospital a statewide centre for eye care, offering elective procedures, including cataract removal. The new specialty centre will provide a statewide service that will share expert knowledge and develop consistent quality standards of care in eye treatment across all of our hospitals.

In 2016 we want to start work on further expanding Modbury Hospital's role as the rehabilitation and subacute services centre for the north. This will include expanding the existing rehabilitation ward by 22 beds and building a new rehabilitation gym and pool by 2017. Modbury Hospital will retain its current mental health services.

I want to emphasise that it is the systems that need to change to better support the excellent work that is done every day by the people providing our health care. If any of the proposals do not contribute to meeting the quality standards developed by our clinicians, they will not be adopted. Staff will be fully involved in the planning for these service moves and they can have their say about the proposals by providing feedback on the Transforming Health website.

The SPEAKER: Arising out of that answer, I call the member for Schubert to order. He has suffered for the sins of the whole opposition on that matter, and the deputy leader is warned a second and therefore final time. The member for Morphett.

HEALTH REVIEW

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:39): My question is again to the Minister for Health. What modelling has the government done to assess the impacts of the proposed emergency department restructure on presentation numbers, and how many additional ED presentations does it estimate will present at each of the so-called super sites for major emergencies: the Flinders, the RAH and the Lyell Mac?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:40): We've done extensive modelling, and it amounts to many hundreds of pages of modelling, right across our health system and how the system will work in terms of presentation numbers right across our state. I am more than happy to—in fact I have written, and hopefully the letter has been received by the Leader of the Opposition, I have written to him inviting him to a briefing to go through all of these issues. I am more than happy to extend an offer to the member for Morphett. I think there's a briefing being provided tomorrow that all members of parliament have been invited to, and happy to go through questions in that sort of detail, but there is an extensive piece of work that has been done to support these proposals. I'm very confident in them.

HEALTH REVIEW

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:41): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Can the minister tell us: why did the minister ignore the submission of the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine that stated our emergency departments could not cope with the proposed changes?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:41): I think the member for Morphett is somewhat verballing the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine, or the South Australian branch of it, because it's not quite what they have said. They have made quite clear that, of course, if you just closed emergency departments down and expected all the patients that currently go to those emergency departments to go to one of the three, of course they wouldn't be able to cope, but no-one is suggesting that happen, apart from the opposition of course, but certainly that is not coming from me or anyone else in health.

We are talking about relatively small numbers of patients. As I talked about with the Noarlunga Hospital, it is a very, very small increase in presentations, about 7 per cent of the total presentations that currently go to Noarlunga. As I said, the director of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network emergency, Professor Alan O'Connor, estimated about six ambulances a day. With regard to the Modbury Hospital, a half of 1 per cent of presentations that go currently to the Modbury emergency department would need to go straight to the Lyell McEwin or the Royal Adelaide Hospital. There are good reasons to do this, very, very good reasons to do this, and that is because we have a particular problem in our emergency departments with after-hours cover by senior clinicians and the services around those clinicians.

We don't have, at all of our sites, 24-hour access to medical imaging or various diagnostic services. We don't have senior clinicians on after midnight across all of our sites. We need to make sure that at least at a certain number of our emergency departments they do have appropriate access 24/7 to senior clinicians and to medical imaging and the other diagnostic services so that people don't have their treatment delayed, which is currently what happens. That's why, in something like presentations such as stroke, we have completely unacceptable outcomes. As Minister for Health, I can't stand by and allow us to continue to have a system where we have three times the number of

people dying from stroke between midnight and 8am than during other times of the day. I'm putting forward a plan to change it to make our system work better, so that we get more consistency of care. What do we get from the opposition? Nothing but harping and grumbling and scaremongering.

The SPEAKER: The minister is not responsible for the opposition. The member for Newland.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Supplementary, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: No, we will come back to you. Member for Newland.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house about the state government's continued investment in our public transport network?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:44): Can I thank the member for Newland for his keen interest in this matter. Indeed, I had the pleasure of—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That's right, it's three strikes, isn't it?

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is here by a gossamer thread, but thank you to the member for Unley for giving me the opportunity of warning the first time. The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and, as I was saying, thank you to the member for Newland for asking me this question and for his keen interest in public transport. I had the pleasure of riding the O-Bahn with him and the member for Florey—of course, one of our most important, if not the most important public transport routes we have in our city.

I have spoken in this place before about this government's investment in the public transport network. Members present, at least on this side, are well aware of the economic, environmental and community benefits of a functioning and efficient public transport network. Whether it's reports from the Tourism and Transport Forum, the Productivity Commission or the Australasian Railway Association, the research and evidence is clear that investment in public transport is essential for economic, social and community development.

Over the last 13 years, this government has invested over \$2 billion into our system, and commuters are experiencing the benefits of this investment. Commuters are taking advantage of our new electric trains, our additional buses, our successful rollout of the Metrocard technology and our new trams and tram extensions. We have built over 5,300 park-and-ride spaces since 2002—an 87 per cent increase on what was left to us by the previous government—and there is still strong demand for more spaces.

As we have heard from the member for Fisher earlier today, the importance of investing in our communities is paramount. I am pleased to say that this government went to the last election promising to continue our investment in transport infrastructure. We promised to act and work to change the habits and mindset of South Australian commuters towards using public transport. We promised to continue the necessary investment to move cars off our roads, to reduce congestion and to improve travel times for commuters.

The transport development levy, proposed prior to the last election, sought to raise funds to contribute to these works and upgrades to reduce congestion in our city. In doing so, it would move commuters out of their cars, out of this congestion, and onto our improving public transport network. The levy sought to raise over \$120 million over four years—funds which would be available for such transport improvements. Foreshadowing these revenues, the government committed over

\$20 million for park-and-ride projects, and we know such projects are changing commuter habits and providing an alternative to people driving into the city.

As transport minister, I am regularly speaking with community groups, local members of parliament from both sides of this chamber and city stakeholders, providing me with proposals to improve our network and reduce congestion in our city. Regardless of these proposals, particularly those which I received from members on the other side of the chamber, those opposite still chose to vote against this important levy which would raise funds for public transport improvements in our city.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Yes, point of order.

Mr GARDNER: 119: reflecting on a vote.

The SPEAKER: No, it's not reflecting on a vote: it's just recording who voted for or against it. It would be quite different if the minister rose and criticised or praised the vote.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: He is allowed to note something that's on the *Hansard* record, namely, how people voted. He is not criticising the decision.

Mr TARZIA: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: 127(1): the member is digressing from the subject matter of the question under discussion. He is digressing—

The SPEAKER: I don't think he is doing that either.

Mr TARZIA: —digressing from the—

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold that point of order. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and thank you to the opposition. Who knows what improvements could be delivered should this funding have been available. Surely the \$120 million over the four-year period would contribute to another tram extension in the city, or the \$1.1 billion—

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: I have been listening with intent, sir, and from the start of the minister's answer, right up to the last words he has uttered, he has been doing nothing but debating.

The SPEAKER: No, I don't uphold the point of order. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Surely the \$120 million over four years would have contributed to another tram extension in the city, or the \$1.1 billion—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: If the member for MacKillop makes the same point of order, or a similar one, it will be a bogus point of order that I have already ruled on and he will be leaving the house.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, sir, for your advice. When the minister says, 'Surely if this had happened, something else would have progressed or proceeded,' can you explain to me how that is not debate?

The SPEAKER: He is offering us information.

Mr WILLIAMS: He is offering us information?

The SPEAKER: Information that you as a member of the opposition find tedious and inconvenient, but he is offering it. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Surely such funds would have been used for future tram extensions—

Mr WILLIAMS: Don't I have to leave, sir? Do I have to stay?

The SPEAKER: I am going to be merciful today.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —more park-and-rides, better cycling infrastructure and other improvements to reduce congestion in our city. It is a shame that we continue to have an opposition that refuses to engage in the transport policy debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Now that is debate, and the minister's leave to answer is withdrawn. Meanwhile, however, the member for Kavel is called to order for blaspheming, the member for Schubert is warned a first time and the Treasurer is called to order for gesturing and then remarking on the relationship between the member for Schubert and the member for the federal division of Sturt. The member for Stuart.

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:51): My question is for the Minister for Health. Is the minister aware that a large proportion of SA Pathology's workload and revenue is generated from the regions and that the Ernst & Young review does not fully recognise this fact and therefore undervalues the impact on SA Pathology's ongoing viability if regional services are privatised as recommended?

The SPEAKER: A very debating question, but I will allow it.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:51): I will resist because the member for Stuart actually does raise a good point, but I do point out that the Ernst & Young report does not advocate necessarily privatising or opening it up to contestability. It says that it's—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: No, it's not. It says it is something that should be investigated and we are investigating it at the moment and I will come back to the house with what we propose to do.

The SPEAKER: You're still here. The deputy leader.

Ms CHAPMAN: By a gossamer thread.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): My question is to the Premier. Why was the Premier involved in discussions with Renewal SA staff regarding their assessment of the ACP proposal to purchase 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) (14:52): I think the fact of the matter is we have already answered infinite numbers of questions, really. We provided a ministerial statement to the parliament and we also provided a number of documents which were provided on the advice of the Crown. That is really the best exposition we can give in relation to this matter.

Can I say, as has been said many times here and I think it is important to say it again and say it very clearly: the Premier, the current Treasurer, myself and other members of the government have always maintained that ultimately the decision about this matter was a decision for the cabinet and the cabinet had to come to its own view about what was in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

It is not appropriate for any of us as members of the cabinet to be going into detail about the nature of those conversations and the progress that was made along that path. All of us have said several times that it was a decision made by the cabinet. We stand by that: it was a cabinet decision.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Does the Premier deny that he had a meeting with a senior member of Renewal SA in the presence of the Deputy Premier and the now Treasurer during the assessment 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) (14:54): In relation to this one, I did see today that InDaily had a piece about this. I did read it with some interest because it was basically new material from my point of view.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

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

Ms Chapman: Check the big pile of documents you gave to—

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I understand that.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I have to tell all members, including the deputy leader, that it is quite frequent for ministers to meet with public servants. Sometimes those public servants are public servants who respond directly to one as a minister, sometimes they are not. As to any particular meeting referred to in those documents with, I think it was Mr Buchan, I can say that as at that date, I was not the relevant minister to whom Mr Buchan reported. I can also say that from time to time, the Premier, the now Treasurer and I meet and have a talk about things.

I have no recollection of any particular meeting with Mr Buchan, but that is not surprising, because one has many meetings which are not memorable—and that is no reflection on Mr Buchan, I might say—and it may or may not have been that there was such a meeting. I do not know; but, I do know that any assessment of the matter, as I was trying to say before, ultimately comes back to this: the decision-making body in this matter was the cabinet, and the cabinet made a decision, from which nobody is seeking to hide.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): Further supplementary, sir: in the circumstances where the Attorney cannot recall whether he was at the meeting, the subject of which he has outlined, will he check his records to identify if he did attend, and also advise the house, if he was there, why he was there at the time dealing with the assessment of the ACP deal?

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) (14:57): Mr Speaker, I came into parliament this session hoping that I would never, ever again quote Donald Rumsfeld, and I am going to stick to it today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am going to stick to it today, but I can say this to the member for Bragg: again, I anticipated the member for Bragg might ask me something about this when I saw—

Ms Chapman: But you didn't check your diary.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Hang on, you are going to like this. I like to be ahead of the member for Bragg as much as I can be, and so I said to my office this morning, 'Look, I suspect it is possible the member for Bragg, having read this, might ask me this question. Can you just check if there is anything in my thing—'

Ms Chapman: Diary.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Diary thing, yes—it is in one of those machines in the office. It is not actually a diary, it is more like a machine, I think. Anyway, I asked them to check, and the advice that I was given late this morning or early this afternoon was that there was no record of me being at such a meeting on that day—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and that lack of a record accords with my lack of recollection, because the two of them coming together in such a way—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —suggests that even if there was such an event, about which I have no recollection, it was obviously not sufficiently relevant to be entered into the diary, and it does not surprise me that I do not have any particular recollection of it. But, that is not to say that it did not happen, because it could have happened. Who can say? I make the point that I did ask my office to check, and the result of the check was—

Mr Marshall: Why wasn't it in the diary?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, there is a number of potential—the honourable Leader of the Opposition asks, 'Why wasn't it in the diary?' There are, as a matter of logic, a multitude of answers to that: one might have been because it did not happen; one might have been because it happened on another day; one might have been because I was walking down the street that day thinking that I was going to get a bowl of soup from the shop across the road and somebody said to me, 'Hey, I'm going to visit the Premier and the Treasurer; do you want to come for a walk with me?' I do not remember. I am just saying there is a multiplicity of possible reasons and yet at the end of it—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: We supported this.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As the Premier says, we are not running away from the fact that cabinet said yes to this thing. One of the problems with the way this is proceeding is, every time there is a question like this asked, the default position is to go to the conspiracy theory version of what might have happened.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Area 51.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is Area 51, it is Roswell, it is Neil Armstrong in Universal Studios.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Kaurana and Taylor are called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The government has never ever said that the government did not make this decision. The cabinet made the decision.

Mr Marshall: You said it was Renewal SA and the Premier said it was his decision.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is warned a first time. The Deputy Premier has lost his train of thought and he is out of time. Final supplementary, member for Bragg.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): My question is to the Treasurer, who was then the housing and urban development minister. Can you remember going to this meeting?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is there any chance the Deputy Premier might consult the Treasurer on the answer?

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) (15:01): I may, but can I say this, that according to my recollection neither of us were there, to the best of my recollection, because I do not have any recollection of the meeting. But, as I also said before, it is not like, if any of us were having a meeting to talk about this, we were going to be having it in some clandestine fashion, hidden away from everybody, because in the end we have said to everybody, 'Yes, this proposal came up, cabinet said, "Yes, we like it and we are going for it."' That fact is inconsistent with us putting on disguises and hiding in places to have a talk in secret.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader promised that that would be her last supplementary.

Ms CHAPMAN: It was the last supplementary, but I am now going to ask another question, if I may, sir.

The SPEAKER: You are not, because I am calling the member for Taylor.

REGIONAL PROMOTION GRANTS

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Can the minister inform the house about the new funding the state government will be providing to help promote South Australia's regions?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:02): I thank the member for Taylor for the question. I am pleased to announce to the house today \$400,000 of funding to help regions promote the food, wine and tourism offerings that they have. It is a grant program that will be open until 13 March and I encourage all members who come from the regions to talk to people in their local areas about how they may work together to promote their regions. Grants of up \$40,000 are available. It follows on from the work that we have done with the Barossa brand mark and also the Eyre Peninsula seafood—

Mr Knoll: Trust mark.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Sorry, trust mark—thank you, member for Schubert—and also for the Eyre Peninsula's Australia's Seafood Frontier, also brand Kangaroo Island and brand McLaren Vale. Last week we conducted a forum with about 70 people attending from Adelaide Hills, Langhorne Creek, Barossa, Fleurieu Peninsula, McLaren Vale, Kangaroo Island, Limestone Coast, Murraylands, Riverland, Yorke Peninsula, Mid North, Far North, Clare Valley and Eyre Peninsula. It all fits in perfectly with our economic priority of premium food and wine from our clean environment to export to the world.

We should not lose sight of the fact that, while we quite often brand things under the South Australian banner, there is great added value to be had by promoting the local region that it comes from as well. Just having come back from the US, one of the complaints they had about Australian wine was that they know the regions of France and they know the regions of Italy, and when they think of wine coming from Australia they just think of one whole region, and that is the country. So we need to be doing more in working with the wine industry to sell the Barossa, sell McLaren Vale, sell Adelaide Hills, sell Clare, Coonawarra—all our different wine regions—because it is those things that will add the premium to the price that people are going to be getting for their wine.

We had a number of the peak food and wine industry associations at last week's forum, including Food SA, the South Australian Wine Industry Association and Primary Producers SA. The forum was facilitated by Paul Henry and PIRSA. Brand SA and the South Australian Tourism Commission presented on regional branding and resources to help inform successful regional marketing initiatives. The feedback that we got was that it was a very informative session and we are hoping to get some really good proposals put forward by regions throughout the state to help market the great food and wine offerings that we know South Australia has to offer.

When you look at other parts of Australia, we think we do it much better than anywhere else. We are one of the few jurisdictions in the world that is phylloxera free, fruit fly free, and where it is illegal to grow GM crops, so they are the sort of messages that we drive home nationally and internationally, and the feedback that we are getting is very good. Now, if we can just bring that down to the regional level as well and help all the people in our regions employ more people, create more

jobs and bring more money into the local economy, then that is a terrific thing for the state as a whole, but also for local communities right throughout this state.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for State Development. That is you, Tom. Has the minister received any request from ACP to promote the Gillman project to potential investors or potential users of the site and, if so, has the minister participated in the same?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:06): I am the Treasurer and the Minister for State Development and it is my duty on behalf of South Australians to promote the economic activity going on in this state. I, for one, am more than happy to meet with anyone who is proposing to invest their hard-earned dollars in South Australia. If it is an oil and gas company, if it is an iron ore company, if it is a property developer, whether it is a Wokinabox franchise, whoever it is who wants to invest their hard-earned money in South Australia, this government is prepared to stand up and say we are open for business. If you are a franchisee or a franchisor, we are here to help.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is suspended under the sessional orders for the next half hour.

The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am more than happy to advocate on behalf of local South Australian investors. In fact, I think if I didn't people would be questioning why the Treasurer of South Australia or the Minister for State Development isn't advocating on behalf of businesses to develop the state.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:07): Supplementary: given the answer of the Treasurer and that it is a term of the option deed that has been referred to in this agreement, have you actually attended any of the meetings or assisted in that further investment or potential occupiers of the site?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:08): I stand by my previous answer. As I said, it is the role of the Treasurer and the Minister for State Development to advocate on behalf of companies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on a second. I also point out that, when there are joint ventures that are being negotiated or when an oil and gas company or an iron ore company or a property developer is seeking to get some foreign direct investment in South Australia, I can assure you that the one thing that those companies do not want is that broadcast all over the world, especially not being put on the public record.

Now, if the government devotes money or resources or taxpayer funds towards a development then the public have a right to know. If it is advocating on behalf of a stable regulatory environment where the state says there is no sovereign risk and people want to meet their political leadership, that is entirely appropriate, but what I am not going to do—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am getting to your point. What I am not going to do, though, is divulge publicly when I have meetings with the private sector who want to engage in foreign direct investment because one, it tips off their competitors and they can't come to us—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on a second. They can't come to us and talk about what their proposals are. Can I just say, the Leader of the Opposition met with ACP, was very supportive of their deal. I've never asked what was said at that coffee meeting. I never asked the Leader of the Opposition what it is he said. I've never asked the Leader of the Opposition if his previous commercial ties were competitors of ACP and have in any way biased any decisions he's made. I've never made any of those assumptions about the Leader of the Opposition.

I know that he is very close to some other developers who are in direct competition with ACP, but I don't believe there is any conflict here, because the Leader of the Opposition would be in breach of several codes of conduct if he were, and I'm sure he wouldn't do that. So, I know, Mr Speaker, that people talk with the private sector all the time.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer, I think, was speaking in the subjunctive.

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, if he was, it was hard—

The SPEAKER: No, 'if he were'.

Ms CHAPMAN: It was heavily disguised.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I've completed my answer.

The SPEAKER: Splendid.

Grievance Debate

TRANMERE BOWLING AND TENNIS CLUB

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:10): I rise today to pay tribute to a wonderful club in my community, the Tranmere Bowling and Tennis Club, which, believe it or not, sir, celebrates its 90th anniversary in 2015. Recently, I had the pleasure of playing at the Tranmere bowling club on Monday evening with the Rotary Club of Campbelltown. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the volunteers of that club, who for 90 years have been the backbone of the club, including the kitchen staff and those who help out on the greens and everywhere else in between.

I would especially like to thank the management of the club in this the 90th year of its anniversary: namely, the bowls president, Mike Porter; the vice-president, Ann Ellis; the vice-president, Geoff Thomas; the admin secretary, Grace Murphy; treasurer, John Bartram; as well as committee members Ian Abraham, Kathy Day, Bob Gilby, Veronica Dolan, Peter Holland, Tom Lycett, Beverly Cowles and Chris Douglas.

I refer to the *Tranmere Times*, issue No. 8. It points out that on 31 January the bowling and tennis club celebrated its 90th birthday. The land upon which the club bowls was originally settled in 1838 by David Wylie. He called it Tranmere after his home town in England. The name Tranmere was perpetrated firstly by George Morphett, one of South Australia's leading pioneers, who acquired the property and built the present Tranmere House in 1893.

The SPEAKER: Of course, there are the Tranmere Rovers of the English Football Association.

Mr TARZIA: It could be, sir. I know that that sport is very close to your heart, as it is mine. As I was saying, the name Tranmere was perpetrated firstly by George Morphett, one of SA's leading pioneers, who acquired the property and built the present Tranmere House in 1893, replacing a four-room cottage built in 1838. Pillars on Magill Road can still be seen as the original boundary of one of the earliest houses that were settled there. The grand opening day was 31 January 1925, and it was celebrated with Mrs Treloar rolling the first jack. She could be related to the member, Mr Treloar; I'm sure she may be. Mrs Catt rolled the first bowl. It would have been a very interesting day. Charles Hector Treloar was the founding president of the club, and after his death in 1940 the club championship trophy for the men's singles was named in his honour—the Treloar Cup.

The clubhouse was built and officially opened in December 1928. In 1943 the old croquet lawns were converted into four extra bowling rinks, bringing the total to 14 rinks, making Tranmere the equal largest club in terms of rink numbers at that time, which is a very proud thing. The Tranmere Women's Bowling Club was established in August 1950 and it continued as a separate entity until 1983.

I would like to pay tribute to a couple of players of distinction from this club: Mr John Daire and Dr John Flett. John Daire, I have been told, is actually the longest serving current member of the club. He has been bowling there since 1978. He says that he came to Australia as a ten-pound Pom, having secured a job with the South Australia Police Force before he left. I would like to thank him for his fantastic contribution over the years to the club and also to our great country.

I would also like to pay tribute to Dr John Flett, who is the patron of the club, and many members of the house may be aware of Dr Flett who is the oldest member still playing pennant bowls. As the member next to me has pointed out, he is a local artist as well. In fact, Dr Flett has contributed his paintings to raise funds for the Little Heroes Foundation—a wonderful philanthropist in the world who does great work for the community. I am proud to say that I have one of his paintings hanging up in the Hartley electorate office. I think it is wonderful that we have good community people like Dr John Flett who have given so much to our community.

In summing up, as a state member of parliament I will certainly always do what I can to support our wonderful sporting clubs like the Tranmere bowling club in our area to make sure they are the best they can be.

The SPEAKER: Of course, Tranmere is Merseyside, near Birkenhead on the Birkenhead side, opposite Liverpool. Member for Florey.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:15): In its long and proud history, the Modbury Hospital has weathered many challenges and arguably emerged stronger every time, and in the current process of Transforming Health, I have every confidence this experience will be repeated. This is because of the amazing staff involved who have given, and continue to give, great service to our community.

Since the failed experiment by the then state Liberal government to privatise management of Modbury public hospital and introduce a private ward within the public building, there have been big investments at the Modbury Hospital since it came back to public hands. While there have been changes to services, new and different services have come on site.

That failed privatisation saw a mass exodus of staff and proved that health is, and should always be, a not-for-profit essential service. While that was an ill-conceived and ultimately unsuccessful experiment, changes to service deliveries are essential if we are to continue to enjoy equality in health care with best care every time.

Federally, in the past 12 months we have seen the Abbott Liberal government seek to make changes to Medicare. This suggests that the time to debate sensible measures—not wholesale changes—to a system that has delivered health care to all Australians on an equitable basis has well and truly arrived. To do nothing is not an option. As the time to have a say in Transforming Health draws to a close (and submissions can still be made until 27 February), minister Snelling and his department are working very hard to make sure changes produce better health outcomes.

No-one embarks on major changes of this nature unless it is to effect a better outcome in the end. During what was known as the Generational Health Review, changes were discussed and subsequently introduced that were, at the time, a great challenge. Since then, health costs have continued to rise due to the longer life expectancies of the ageing population who have access to better technology and more procedures than ever before and ever imagined. As medical science continues to find better treatments this will continue, so we must plan, not only to improve outcomes now but well into the future.

Modbury Hospital has had around \$30 million of infrastructure improvements since 2002, including \$18 million in the accident and emergency area which will continue to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The exact details of Transforming Health are yet to be finalised, but I am

assured we will see additional investment in rehabilitation care to cater for the large cohort of older people in the Florey and surrounding electorates, better mental health services, continuing excellence in palliative and hospice services, and a centre for excellence established in ophthalmology.

What is unforgivable, though, is the climate of anxiety created by those who wish to scare people by creating uncertainty and this, in turn, creates an erosion of confidence in the health services at Modbury Hospital and at hospitals and health services throughout the city and beyond. The integrated approach to health care will be explained in the months ahead and, as always, each person's general practitioner will be the cornerstone to ensuring good health is part of everyone's life.

We all have a responsibility to our own health, be it in a commitment to good food choices or to exercise and social activity. The Modbury area has great services for people of all ages, and two in particular I would like to mention are for the older people in our area, that is, the University of the Third Age, which engages people from all walks of life on a large campus not far from Tea Tree Plaza, and the Tea Tree Plaza mall walkers, who see hundreds of people engage in healthy activity and then form great social bonds and networks with the people who are involved there.

During all these times of change the Modbury Hospital suffered because of rumours, but while there are adverse outcomes in any health system, the good stories rarely rate a mention save for the countless numbers of thankyou cards on display in the various wards in the hospital. They thank the staff for their dedication.

One such nurse, who was featured in the *Leader Messenger* in May last year, prior to International Nurses and Midwifery Week, was Bronwyn McCallum, who has worked for almost four decades at the Modbury Hospital. The *Messenger* states:

Ms McCallum, who is now one of the senior registered nurses in Modbury's emergency department, says the best part of her job is the unpredictability and knowing she can make a difference to people's lives.

As we work towards making sure that Transforming Health is welcomed into the community, it would be good to just let people know that there will be a public forum at the hospital on Friday, 20 February between 5.30 and 7.30 in the education area and urge people to come along, listen to what is proposed to be happening, have a say in what they think are important outcomes and be a part of this wonderful new way of receiving health services in the north-eastern suburbs.

RIVER MOTORSPORT

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:20): I would like to speak about a couple of events that happened in my local community last weekend and something that is very dear to my heart, which is motorsport on the river. First of all, we had quite a gala event, the Dash 4 Cash at the Renmark riverfront. The event is now almost becoming an international drawcard with the introduction of the Red Bull racing team in the Riverland. It has had a significant presence on national TV and now in international documentation and really is drawing the attention of all in the motorsport and watersport world.

Dash 4 Cash is all about short-circuit racing buoys set up in front of the Renmark community club under lights, and it really does create a great atmosphere. The Dash 4 Cash really is a great spectacle. For those who have not seen it, it is something to behold.

On the Sunday, we had our annual dinghy derby. This year was the 35th time that derby has been run. The derby races out of the river and into the creeks. It goes through some of the creeks: Deadwood, Ral Ral, No Duck, Kylies, Plummers, Cutoff, the Bulyong and the Nelbuck. The list of creeks goes on. These dinghies go through a very tight, intricate network of waterways. It is very exciting to watch. With the introduction of the Red Bull sponsorship and the drones that carry cameras, we are now able to follow these dinghies through the forest and in the creeks giving us a great perspective. I urge anyone who has not seen it to get onto YouTube and watch exactly what it is all about.

The dinghies do four laps of the creeks, and some of these 10-foot dinghies are doing upwards of 100 kilometres an hour. For those who have a concept of almost sitting on a matchstick doing 100 kilometres an hour through the creeks, it is quite an adrenaline rush.

Obviously the super class boats are the fastest, but we go through the standards and the engine classes. The derby is a great day for families and it is a great day to promote the region, but it is also a great day for just showing off the beauty of both the creek network and the river upstream of Renmark.

It has become very much a community-driven event, albeit Red Bull and the local bike and boat shops are the major sponsors. All the community businesses get behind it and they all have boats painted up. It really is becoming quite an event on the state calendar. They also have boats travelling to the region from all over: Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, and internationally people are looking at it and considering coming to the Riverland. I think it is a great event and I cannot speak highly enough about something that started 35 years ago between a couple of mates who made a bet that they could get around the creek network quicker than one another. It really is quite a spectacle to see the thousands and thousands of spectators.

One of the other motorsport events in the Riverland was introduced by the Riverland Junior Motorcycle Club. We had the first Arena Cross in the Riverland, which is a short circuit motocross, if you like, or supercross. That involved a new track set up by the members and the community. I pay homage to the hard work and dedication of the few who built the track and came up with the concept.

The Riverland Junior Motorcycle Club has really come of age in the last couple of years under a very passionate committee. What they did is set up a track under lights and, again, it was another spectacle that drew motorbike riders, motocross riders and arena cross riders from right across the state, New South Wales and Victoria. There were about 100 bikes there. For those of you who have not seen motorbikes racing under lights, there is a lot of noise, a lot of smell and a lot of dust, but it is great fun, and on a very short, small circuit it is very spectator friendly.

The open was won by Tyler Lange, a local lad, followed closely by Josh Spanos. The juniors was won by Jet Anderson, a lad from over on the Yorke Peninsula and a great asset to the Yorke Peninsula, and he was followed up by a lot of the local competitors close behind. So, it was a great spectacle and another great event in the Riverland.

VIETNAMESE NEW YEAR

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:25): I would like to speak about an event I attended a few weeks ago that marked a very early celebration of the 2015 lunar new year, hosted by the Vietnamese Farmers Association at the Virginia Community Centre. It is an event that myself and a number of members of parliament regularly attend, especially Mr Ridgway and Ms Jing Lee from the upper house.

This year marks the Vietnamese year of the goat. Under the Vietnamese zodiac the goat is a symbol of peace, harmony and tranquillity. Hopefully, those things will be the primary mood of this year, after some of the tragic events of last year. Goats are meant to represent the nature of being calm and gentle and an ability to show compassion and understanding to one another and a time of nurturing and healing. Certainly, the world needs that at the moment.

The event was attended by local farmers and community leaders. Under the leadership of the new Vietnamese Farmers Association, a new younger crop of leaders are taking that event and shaping it. This year was particularly special because it is the first one they have had a leading hand in. It was very dynamic and a truly enjoyable and joyful night.

I was joined at the event by the Hon. Tung Ngo MLC, Government Whip in the Legislative Council, Jing Lee and her good partner Eddie, David Ridgway, the Mayor of Playford, Glenn Docherty, and the Hon. Grace Portolesi, chair of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. It was great to have Grace back out in the Virginia community, after visiting there a few years ago as the minister. Certainly, she had a great time with the lion dance this year. I think the lion tried to eat her and she fought it off.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Isn't that lucky?

Mrs VLAHOS: It is lucky. Hopefully, it will be lucky for her this year. I would also like to praise the Vietnam veterans who were present on the occasion, showing their strong connectedness to the Vietnamese veterans, who fought alongside them in the sixties and seventies. Particularly, I

say hello to Mr Ian Le'Raye and the men and women at the northern Vietnam Veterans' Association, who are such strong supporters of the community. They are truly wonderful people who I treat as my own family.

On this night, I had the pleasure of presenting my annual \$100 community recognition award to a prodigious young lady called Jennifer Tran Nguyen. The awards, which are personally financed out of my electoral allowance, were designed to highlight and recognise the work of young people in the Vietnamese Australian community, who represent community values, hard work, ethics and success.

Jennifer came to me highly recommended by the new association committee. The office received a CD containing a compilation of some of her successful undertakings, including a *Today Tonight* piece about her advanced studies in English and Mathematics. She is about to commence university level maths. She is nine years of age. One of her pet hobbies is reviewing and interpreting Shakespearean plays.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

Mrs VLAHOS: Yes. She has recently changed schools. She came and spoke to me on stage. She has an amazing presence for a nine year old. Her mum, dad and family were in the audience. She is delightful, she is cute, she is charming and she is smart to boot. She is certainly a package for that family to be proud of. I was delighted to be able to talk to her about her successes and what she likes. She is very comfortable doing quadratic equations and differential calculus. She is also very talented at piano. That evening, she graced us with a fantastic rendition in karaoke of an English song.

Mr Griffiths: So, what excuse do we have? None at all. That's amazing.

Mrs VLAHOS: I don't think I can compare with this lady. She is a celebrity in the making, and she is on YouTube if you want to go and check her out. Her family are very proud of her. I wish her every success in the future, and I know that she will succeed in life because she has a fantastic set of skills already but also a great worth ethic.

I would also like to acknowledge Duy Lee, the president of the Vietnamese Farmers Association, and his leadership of the new committee. He is leading a great committee and the association has a bright future under his and the committee's leadership. I also acknowledge Mr Ly Hoang Duy, the chairman of the organising committee. He did a fantastic job on the night.

There were three lots of fireworks set off because it had been a very prosperous year for the farmers, and the Mayor of Playford certainly got a bang out of lighting that. It was amazing how quickly Glenn Docherty could move once the firecrackers started.

Mr Odenwalder: There was a video.

Mrs VLAHOS: There was a video. Glenn had fire protection stuff, and he was moving really quickly to get out of the way. The general population of the Vietnamese Farmers Association, who I run into regularly in my electorate, are a great blessing to my area, to the northern suburbs and to our great state with their horticultural productiveness. It is always an honour to be there at this event every year, and I praise them for their work. So, I wish everyone a very happy lunar new year and chúc mừng năm mới in the coming weeks.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:31): I would like to follow the member for Taylor on the theme of farmers and speak today about the transport of agricultural machinery on our public roads throughout South Australia.

The current code of practice that regulates the transport of farm machinery was put in place in 2008, some seven years ago, and my opinion is that the time has come for these regulations to be reviewed. I know that the member for Goyder at least, amongst other country members, has had numerous contacts on this particular issue—there are many similarities between his electorate and mine—and other country members will have had contact as well. Very simply, technology has taken the size, weight, width and height of agricultural machinery well past what the current code regulates for.

Late last year, I was able to meet with representatives from the Department of Transport. I would like to mention the particularly good work of Primary Industries and Regions SA (PIRSA), but also the Agricultural Bureau of South Australia. Andrew Kitto came down from the Mid North to make some representations, and also Karen Baines, on behalf of the Ag Bureau, was over from Ungarra on the Eyre Peninsula, so they had made quite an effort to get to Adelaide. Karen and Andrew, I am sure, have done a lot of work in relation to this in the past. Also present at that meeting was Mr Rob Kerin, well known to members in this place, who currently heads Primary Producers SA.

What we wanted to do was present to the department the constraints that we feel are imposed on farmers now. It is a fact of life that many farmers have blocks here, there and everywhere throughout a particular district, and transporting large farm machinery is part of day-to-day life, particularly during the busy times of seeding and harvest. In fact, I took a couple of calls late last year from constituents who were particularly agitated because they had been at the wrong end of a police officer's wrath because they had breached the regulations, unintentionally and having had no idea that they were breaking the rule.

I will just relate a couple of stories. One of them had picked up a brand new auger from the manufacturing business in my home town of Cummins. He was trundling off down the road with it on his ute and was pulled over. The auger was measured. Of course, an auger transfers grain from one bin generally into a truck but sometimes into another bin. They are transportable, they are on wheels, have one axle generally—

Mr Griffiths: And they are long.

Mr TRELOAR: And this auger was too long.

Mr Griffiths: And a lot of them have brakes fitted too.

Mr TRELOAR: I am not sure whether this auger had brakes fitted or not, but that is another issue, member for Goyder. So, he was taking this brand new auger home for the first time and was booked for being over length. More of an issue, I think, is that of field bins. Field bins are transportable, generally galvanised iron bins which are used for the storage of grain. Farmers will move these from field to field and they will also move them from farm to farm. Generally, there is an HR Holden rim on each side.

Mr Griffiths: Four or five metres wide.

Mr TRELOAR: Yes, and a constituent of mine was booked for towing a field bin that was—surprise, surprise—over width and over height and I think probably overweight, unbeknownst to him. The regulations have been in place since 2008. Farmers are more and more becoming aware, but that is not the issue. The issue is that the regulations are not appropriate any longer for where farmers are finding themselves.

Contentiously, those bigger field bins are of a weight where, according to the law, they are supposed to have brakes fitted. This would quite simply be impractical and incredibly expensive. There are literally tens of thousands of these bins across the state, none of which are fitted with brakes, so the cost to farmers, should this come to pass, would be extraordinary.

As I have said in this place before—and I will say it again and I will keep saying it—it is very important for our farmers who compete on a world market to be able to stay efficient and competitive. Any regulations that impact on that efficiency and competitiveness are detrimental to us as producers. I think we talk a lot about how much the export industries are worth to this state and, believe me, the grain industry in this state is amongst the most important of those.

I urge the government through their department—and the department has heard our presentation and I would have to say they were receptive to some of our suggestions and not so receptive to others—to give this due consideration, because in my opinion it is time for this code of practice to be updated, to be brought into the 21st century to keep pace with the latest technology. Just finally, I will commend Primary Producers South Australia and the Ag Bureau of South Australia for the work they have done on this and we look forward to hearing feedback from the department.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:36):

This morning, the member for Morphett made a contribution in which he discussed various matters concerning the emergency services sector reform. While I acknowledge and thank him for his service to the emergency services sector, I cannot let some of the completely inaccurate and misleading statements he made go unanswered.

The member for Morphett rightly points out that there need to be long-term solutions for long-term issues. As the member states, these issues include important matters such as training, resourcing, response times, triplication and duplication of services. They are his words. He also says they need to be sorted out calmly, responsibly and in a fashion that is inclusive. That is exactly the open and transparent process that I have been undertaking and now he is criticising me for that. He simply cannot have it both ways.

As the member acknowledged, I have openly engaged with nearly 2,000 members of the sector, both paid and volunteer. I stress that this engagement process with volunteers, paid staff, unions and associations at meetings and round tables has not been done behind closed doors, and everyone has been welcome to hear and participate in the discussion.

Like the member for Morphett, I have also travelled interstate to meet other emergency services. The main difference between the trips were that I included the unions and the associations—once again, an open and transparent process. Everyone heard the same feedback, both positive and constructive, about what worked well and what did not work well in those states.

The member also stated that it was only at Sampson Flat that I became aware of the importance of the AIIMS system. That is completely wrong. I have never wanted to change that system. My presence at the One Tree Hill incident management centre reinforced my view that the proposed reforms are not inconsistent with the ongoing use of AIIMS. To ensure that there is no further confusion, I have demanded that the new commissioner be appointed on the understanding that these processes remain unconditionally.

It is a bit rich for the member to come into this place and feign political indignation that in some way I do not understand volunteers, their value and contribution to our state. What I have said from the very beginning is that I want one organisation delivering three services, yet the member for Morphett keeps perpetuating the myth that this is a merger of these three services. This is completely untrue and has only served to cause angst amongst our emergency services personnel. That is why the conceptual model approved by the government incorporates three individual operational streams with the VMR affiliated with the SES.

The CFS operational stream from the operational head through to the firefighter on the ground will be made up of CFS personnel who operate as they do today, with the same uniform, and, as I have already stated, the same standard operating procedures and, most importantly, the same incident management system.

The belief that the chiefs of the three services are being sacked is a slur both on their excellent reputation and also on the actions I have taken to date. I have been working closely with them on how the transition into the new sector model will affect their current roles, but have also made it very clear to them that I hope they will consider taking up a new role in the new organisation because I do not want to lose their expertise and experience. I have also made it very clear that they are welcome to apply for the commissioner's role and should they be the best candidate, I will support their appointment. In fact, I reinforced that at a SAFECOM meeting this morning.

I have travelled the state for the past six months speaking with both volunteers and paid staff, and the process has not been rushed. The process which I have adopted is one I have actually announced right through the visits to regional areas, and at no point did anybody seem to complain about the process itself. Everyone is entitled to their democratic right to protest against something they do not agree with, but it is not always the most effective way to have meaningful dialogue, or a means to improving understanding. It is also important to remember that there are many volunteers and paid staff who have contacted me with positive feedback on the process and shared their ideas about how things can work better. I also acknowledge there is a diversity of opinion about the

proposed reforms, ranging from outright opposition to those who believe I am not going far enough. I am sure members opposite have heard some of these views when I visited their regions.

Again, I would ask any emergency service personnel who want to discuss the reform to contact my office or, alternatively, I am happy to visit any brigade, unit, station or flotilla across the state. In fact, I will be meeting some shortly because I have already accepted some invitations. The reform process is just commencing and there is still ample opportunity for all workers in the sector, both paid and volunteers, to have input in the design and implementation of the new organisation.

If I can leave the chamber with one last point it would be to encourage members to engage in this process, rather than playing partisan politics, which is only causing unnecessary fear in our emergency services. At the beginning of this reform process, I invited the member for Morphett to work alongside me because I was committed to an open and transparent process and a good outcome. That invitation to work with me is still open if he wishes to accept it.

Bills

HEALTH CARE (ADMINISTRATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:44): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Health Care Act 2008. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Health Care Act 2008 came into effect on 1 July 2008. The act changed the way hospitals and health services were administered in this state to ensure that the healthcare system was responsive to healthcare demands both now and into the future.

The act has brought together hospitals and health services to deliver services that meet the needs of their local communities, whilst at the same time providing for greater coordination and accessibility of services, with the minister and chief executive ultimately responsible for the delivery of services in South Australia. The act has provided, and continues to provide, a solid governance base for the system as it strives to reform health services and provide effective and efficient modern health services that meet the changing health service needs of the community.

The Health Care (Administration) Amendment Bill 2015 before the house seeks to make a number of amendments to the act, aimed at ensuring that the act continues to function effectively and meets the administration and governance needs of the South Australian public health system, and to clarify the intent of some of the act's provisions.

This bill is the same as that which was passed in the House of Assembly on 30 October last year and read a second time in the Legislative Council on 31 October. The bill was not progressed at that time due to the subsequent prorogation of the parliament. The bill will therefore be familiar to those members who were sitting members in the previous parliament.

The bill covers seven areas of amendment, which are outlined. However, I seek leave to have the balance of my second reading explanation incorporated into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Fees for services provided by the SA Ambulance Service that do not involve ambulance transport

Section 59 of the Act allows the Minister to set fees, by notice in the Gazette, to be charged for ambulance services. An ambulance service is defined in the Act as 'the service of transporting by the use of an ambulance a person to a hospital or other place to receive medical treatment, or from a hospital or other place at which the person has received medical treatment.'

The Act, however, does not currently provide a basis for the Minister to set fees for services provided by South Australian Ambulance Service paramedics that do not involve transportation in an ambulance. These type of services are those where a member of the South Australian Ambulance Service responds to a request for emergency medical assistance and attends a person's home or some other place to provide emergency assistance, and the person is then assessed and/or treated at that place but then does not require transportation by an ambulance. These services are commonly referred to as 'treat no transport' services.

Fees are currently set and charged for these services, under the *Fees Regulation (Incidental SAAS Services) Regulations 2009* under the *Fees Regulations Act 1927*. This situation is an anomaly for fees charged by SA Health for the provision of health services, as all other fees for services are provided for under the *Health Care Act 2008*. The Bill therefore makes provisions to allow fees to be set for incidental services such as 'treat no transport' services and to be set in the same way as all other fees for health services under the Health Care Act 2008.

Employment of clinicians in the Department for Health and Ageing (central office)

This amendment is technical in nature and seeks to provide an appropriate mechanism for the employment of doctors, nurses and midwives to work in the central office of the Department for Health and Ageing. There are a number of positions within central office that require the professional skills, qualifications and clinical knowledge that only medical practitioners, nurses and midwives possess. These are existing funded positions within the Department to provide independent professional advice to the Chief Executive, the Chief Public Health Officer and the Minister.

The Department employs medical practitioners, public health medical practitioners and nursing and midwifery staff to undertake key clinical advisory functions related to their professions. For example, as part of its public health role, the Department receives notifications of prescribed diseases and medical conditions and these notifications may require public health responses. For example, doctors and nurses are employed in the Department to provide a public health clinical response to diseases such as meningococcal disease where advice needs to be given as to which of the people in contact with an individual who has meningococcal disease need to receive antibiotics. The Department's clinicians also provide advice on immunisation to doctors, nurses and the community, receiving over 16,000 calls per year.

Clinical expertise is essential within the Department both for policy advice and for linkage with professional clinical networks.

In South Australia, a medical practitioner, nurse or midwife working in a public hospital is employed pursuant to the *Health Care Act 2008*. The relevant industrial awards and agreements, that is, for medical officers: the South Australian Medical Officers Award and the SA Health Salaried Medical Officers Enterprise Agreement 2013 and for nurses and midwives: the Nurses (South Australian Public Sector) Award 2002 and the Nursing/Midwifery (South Australia Public Sector) Enterprise Agreement 2013. These awards and agreements not only outline the conditions of employment for these clinicians but also recognise specific career structures and continuing professional development requirements for these professions.

It was previously thought that clinicians could also be employed to work in the Department for Health and Ageing's central office under section 34 of the Act, if they performed functions in connection with the operations or activities of an incorporated hospital. However, the Act as currently worded does not support this, and clinicians working in the Department would be required to be employed under the *Public Sector Act 2009*, pursuant to the South Australian Public Sector Wages Parity Enterprise Agreement: Salaried 2012, as the Department is defined within that Act as an administrative unit of the public sector.

It has become apparent to the Department that this is not an appropriate employment mechanism because the SA Public Sector Salaried Employees Interim Award and the South Australian Public Sector Wages Parity Enterprise Agreement: Salaried 2012 do not recognise the qualifications, entitlements and continuing professional development requirements for these professions. The Government believes that clinicians who choose to work in the Department should be able to retain any entitlements in line with their professional award. Continuing these professional entitlements will also assist the Department to continue to attract and retain suitably qualified medical practitioners, nurses and midwives and ensure flexibility in the workforce across the Department and the public health system.

The employment and conditions of employment of clinicians currently engaged to work in the Department remain secure since the Bill includes specific transitional provisions that ensure this. The provisions should also provide certainty to these employees that their employment, conditions and entitlements are not in any way altered by the previous oversight and by the introduction of the new employment mechanism as set out in the Bill. The South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association and the South Australian Branch of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation have been notified about the Government's intention to correct the anomaly that exists and to ensure equity with those working in incorporated hospitals and they recognise that this is a needed technical amendment.

Proclamations to dissolve three now non-operational incorporated associations and transfer their assets to the appropriate incorporated Health Advisory Council (HAC)

The Bill includes specific transitional provisions to resolve some ongoing issues related to three non-operational incorporated associations namely, Lumeah Homes Inc. (Lumeah), Miroma Place Hostel Inc. (Miroma), and

Peterborough Aged and Disabled Accommodation Inc. (Peterborough) that attempted transfer of their assets and their undertakings to their local country hospital sites in the 1990s and early 2000s.

At the time of the attempted transfers, the associations, and hospitals involved, which were then incorporated under the former *South Australian Health Commission Act 1976*, determined that the assets, liabilities and undertakings of the associations should be transferred to the hospitals. However, these transfers were never legally effected and as such the assets legally remain with the non-operational incorporated associations, although they have in practice been managed by the country hospital sites since the time of the transfers.

Since then, the *Health Care Act 2008* came into operation and Health Advisory Councils (HACs) have been established for specific geographical country communities. The functions of these HACs include holding assets on behalf of the country hospital sites to which they relate. The country hospital sites are all part of the Country Health SA Local Health Network Inc. If the assets of the non-operational incorporated associations had been legally transferred to the relevant country hospital sites at the time, they would now rightly be held by the relevant HAC. The transitional provisions included in the Bill will allow for these outstanding issues to be resolved and for the assets to be formally transferred to the appropriate local HACs, as is envisioned by the Act. The HACs that will formally receive these assets are the Lower North HAC, Lower Eyre HAC and the Mid North HAC. It will also enable the cancellation of the incorporation of the named associations whose functions were taken over under the *South Australian Health Commission Act 1976*.

Remaining areas of minor amendments

The Bill includes a small number of other minor amendments that are necessary to improve the functioning of the Act, and to clarify the intent of certain provisions. These amendments include:

- a minor amendment to the wording of section 29(1)(b) of the Act, to clarify that a body under the Act does not need to be providing services and facilities specifically to an incorporated hospital for the undertaking of that body (or part thereof) to be transferred to the incorporated hospital. That is, the body that will be transferred may not have been providing anything to an incorporated hospital, but it can still have its assets, liabilities and undertakings transferred to an incorporated hospital under this section.
- a new provision to be inserted into Part 5 of the Act to allow the Governor, on application from the Minister, to make proclamations to transfer functions, assets, rights and liabilities from one incorporated hospital to another, without the incorporated hospital to which these first belonged being dissolved. At present the Act only allows for these transfers to be made in the event that an incorporated hospital is dissolved. The proposed new provision is expected to provide greater flexibility in the establishment and management of incorporated hospitals over time.
- removing section 49(5) of the Act which allows the Minister to determine a constitution for the South Australian Ambulance Service (SAAS). This section is not required given that the functions and powers of SAAS are clearly set out in the Act. A constitution has not been determined for SAAS since the Act came into operation, and is not required for the effective functioning of SAAS.
- two minor amendments will be made to section 93(3) of the Act. The first amendment is to indicate more precisely when disclosure of information can be made legally, that is, disclosures can be made when 'required or authorised by or under law'. The current wording which reads 'required by law' does not adequately reflect the situation where disclosure of information can be authorised in some circumstances by or under law. The second amendment is to add the term 'substitute decision-maker' to the list of persons who may request, or provide consent, for information about a person to be released, so that it aligns with the provisions of the *Advance Care Directives Act 2013*, which came into operation on 1 July 2014.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Health Care Act 2008*

4—Amendment of section 29—Incorporation

This clause amends section 29 of the principal Act by substituting subsection (1)(b) to allow all or part of the undertaking of a specified person or body to be transferred to an incorporated hospital.

5—Insertion of Part 5 Division 1A

This clause inserts new Division 1A into Part 5 of the principal Act. That new Division consists of section 32A, which enables the Governor to transfer functions, assets, rights and liabilities of one incorporated hospital to another and to make other related provisions.

6—Amendment of section 49—Continuation of SAAS

This clause deletes subsection (5) from section 49 of the principal Act.

7—Amendment of section 59—Fees

This clause substitutes section 59(1) of the principal Act, allowing the Minister to set fees for the provision of incidental services provided by SAAS and defines what such incidental services are.

8—Insertion of section 89

This clause inserts a new section 89 into the principal Act. The new section enables the employing authority to appoint certain skilled or experienced people to assist the CE or the Department in the performance of their respective functions. The new section also makes provision regarding the nature of such employment arrangements.

9—Amendment of section 92—Conflict of interest

This clause makes an amendment to section 92 of the principal Act that is consequent upon the insertion of new section 89.

10—Amendment of section 93—Confidentiality

This clause amends section 93 of the principal Act to clarify when confidential information may be disclosed, and who can consent to its disclosure.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Employment

This clause makes transitional provisions that allow the CE to determine that certain employees of the Department will be taken to be employed under new section 89 as inserted by this measure.

2—Cancellation of incorporation etc of certain associations

This clause makes transitional provisions in respect of 3 incorporated associations. The functions of the associations were previously taken over under the *South Australian Health Commission Act 1976*, but the incorporation of the associations was not cancelled at the time and certain assets not transferred. The clause allows the Governor to correct the anomaly in each case.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:48): I was actually correcting the record on some information that the member for Kaurna provided to the house about pensioner concessions on council rates. I think the last number I referred to was \$269 million, which is on page 24 of the 74-page taxation review document that was released today, which relates to the total expenditure on concessions across all areas in South Australia in the 2014-15 year. It does deal with things like the emergency services levy, Save the River Murray levy, motor vehicle registrations, stamp duty on CTP, energy costs, council rates, water and sewerage, public transport and drivers' licences. The national partnership agreement, which was stopped by the federal government some 12 months early, was a \$27.7 million contribution towards that \$269 million cost.

My point all through the discussion about pensioner concessions has been that politics is being played here quite seriously, because the decision made to remove pensioner concessions on council rates was made solely by the Treasurer. No other person was involved in that. It was a state government decision. Yes, the feds made a decision across the broad section, but the Treasurer had decided to target that particular area. I do respect the fact that local government have the right to conduct a campaign and I have no concern about that.

I understand it is their role to ensure that the community understand the implications of decisions which factor against them, but I am very concerned that since a policy announcement has been made, and a very strong one, by the state Liberals of what it intends to do within the parliamentary realm on the amendments that are required either to the legislation or the regulations

that control that pensioner concession, it has committed from a very strong financial policy sense to return to pensioner concessions in the fullness of time from the March 2018 election, on the basis the Liberal Party is successful.

I am frustrated that the Local Government Association has not ensured in ways that satisfy me or in a timely manner that the community, who they are asking to contact the LGA website to get the information to forward their concerns onto other people or members in this chamber, actually has full disclosure available to them. That is where I think politics are being played at multiple levels. One could argue all three are involved in it, but there are strong policy positions out there. It is quite right that when 160,000 property owners are impacted by a decision—and that is the number of property owners who receive pensioner concessions—and it is between a \$32 million and \$34 million implication to them per financial year and less support to pay council rates collectively, it is an important issue, so accurate information needs to be out there.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Well, it is an absolute commitment.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: This is an absolute commitment, minister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRIFFITHS: The state Liberal Party has given an absolute commitment to do everything it can for pensioner property owners in the area. I want to go into a couple of things that I recognise are quite reasonable words in the Governor's speech. I must say that I love the reference in the speech that:

...South Australia can be known as the place where you age but you do not grow old—a place where people in their 70s, 80s and 90s maintain meaningful roles working, caring, and volunteering.

I have to say that is the place I want to live. That is a great aspirational target and the minister certainly acknowledges that too and we both want to be part of that.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: I am getting there closer than you are.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Well, we will see. I also fully support the fact that White Ribbon Workplace Accreditation be sought within all government departments. I think one of the most absolutely tragic things in human society is the violence that it inflicts upon others, particularly violence against women, so this is a very good aspirational target that the government has set and I fully support it on that. One would hope that it would be a quick matter of course to ensure that that target is met and that all the public servants adhere to it and talk to their relatives and friends about it, and we get it through to our society of nil violence against any person in our society. That is the important thing to me.

Quality health care is an important issue and the Transforming Health report of recent weeks and the references to it in the Governor's speech certainly put out that there are a lot of issues that people support and some have concerns about. For many of the people I have spoken to it is not the political argument for them, it is the reality of what the implications of it will be upon their lives in their time of need, but I do have one example given to me by a person who I know who has been tragically diagnosed with a very serious illness.

I had a call from their daughter-in-law only yesterday. They are from a country area and have been in the RAH having treatment. A suggestion came through Friday of only last week that they could take this person out and take him home and that his wife in her mid-70s could do that, but it was just physically impossible. So the family has posed the question to me: is that an example where through whatever tragedy that exists in the system there was a need for the bed to be vacated for a short-term period and it was being suggested to the family that 'you look after dad for the weekend'? Now, that did not occur.

A lot of discussion took place in the family. As I understand it, one member of the family who has a relationship with a member of the government rang that member on the weekend to talk about

what occurred. I do not intend personally on taking it any further, but it was terrible to hear about it and it is not something that I want to see occur in the future.

I will talk briefly about the state tax review discussion paper and I do apologise for the fact that in the time since it was made available to the opposition—I think I first saw an electronic copy at 10.30 this morning—I have not had the chance to review it, but I will read this because—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: No—it is an absolute key, and it is one of the reasons I tried to enter this place the first time. I do respect that Treasury relies upon transactions to occur and that is taxation policy in all of its forms. From those transactions is derived the income that it needs to provide services and infrastructure.

A continuing debate occurs across the chamber about where changes should be made to policy to ensure more equity, or to ensure that those who can afford it pay more tax. It is one of the key discussions that the state needs to have, so it is appropriate that it is out there, but it has to be followed through. We have to ensure that there is a change. I note that consultation is open until 10 April. It is no doubt an issue that many will have a variety of opinions on. Those who pay large amounts of tax already will say that they want it to be reduced. Those who do not necessarily pay quite as much will not want to pay any more either. So, how do you spread it and make everybody happy? I am not sure if you feasibly can, but it will be an interesting debate.

There has also been the announcement of a royal commission into the nuclear industry. I have done very little research on the implications of nuclear energy, but I am a person who believes that informed debates need to occur. My concern is that the discussion might be raised at this time because it takes away from some of the key issues of questioning that the opposition is pursuing the Premier and a variety of ministers on—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, I am; but the association of Kevin Scarce as the person who will be in charge of the royal commission certainly adds a very strong claim to the validity of how thorough it will be, and to ensure that South Australians are challenged to think about the future and what they want and what they are prepared to accept, what opportunities it presents for industry growth in the future, and what it can bring to our state and its challenges. Again, it is a matter that communities need to be involved with. This is a decision that will have far-reaching effects upon generations of South Australians to come, so it is important that the discussion takes place.

I also support the words 'the strength and vitality of a democracy is reflected in the quality of our educational institutions'. That was in the Governor's speech, and it is the sort of life that I want to live. I tell younger people in the Goyder community that, no matter what they might think about school, it is but the start of their lives, and education will empower them to undertake great things. 'Yes, it may be frustrating, but you will be excited by what you will learn. You've got to commit to it, you've got to be prepared to work hard on it, but if you put the hard work in the rewards will flow to you enormously and more than once.'

I am pleased to support in a small way things like the University of the Third Age. I know many members have such groups in their electorate. I know they live by the motto that learning is a lifelong experience. Being in this place has proven to me that you might think you know a lot when you come in, but you actually learn a hell of a lot more seemingly every day. Parliament is an example of us continuing to learn. Because of the challenges that South Australia faces, it is important that our economy works well to provide what the state needs going into the future. It demonstrates to me that skill development, learning opportunities and continuously challenging ourselves to ensure that we have that right balance in place to position ourselves to do exceptionally well in everything we choose to do relies upon our attitude to learning. It is a key aspect.

Minister Close, the member for Port Adelaide, in taking over that responsibility will have a significant responsibility to get it right. I have spoken to the member for Unley, and he is looking forward to the debate that will occur about that. It is from birth, basically, and the learning chances it provides and the engagement of the human mind to ensure that we get great outcomes.

I want to listen rather intently to the contributions of others on the Governor's speech. It is interesting that that 30 minutes or so sets the opportunity for a grand vision to be espoused. I am not necessarily sure if it did. I heard whispers that there were some things that it might have been included that are not. They are 18 suggestions that deserve consideration, and I hope the outcome from it is beneficial for South Australia.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:59): I rise today to speak in the Address in Reply debate to the speech by His Excellency, the Hon. Hieu Van Le AO, the Governor of South Australia. I congratulate him on his excellent reading of the speech, but I do note that this is a speech written for the Governor by the government, so let there be no doubt about that.

The first thing I want to look at in my contribution in regard to the Address in Reply is the commentary in the speech about the recent bushfires. Certainly, it was a very challenging time, and I quote directly from the speech:

If there was any doubt about our capacity to rise to a challenge, then it should have been removed in January when we saw South Australians work together in the face of catastrophic bushfires.

We saw many hundreds, probably many thousands of people involved in fighting fires—not just at Sampson Flat and Tantanoola. I also had a small fire at my property on the Dukes Highway at Coomandook where a wheel bearing on a trailer fell to bits and started a fire. I was up here in the city and thankfully the local brigades got there, and local farmers, and controlled that very quickly. I only lost about 150 metres of fencing and a little bit of ground was burnt. My personal experience with fire most recently was very minor compared to some of these other fires, and sadly we saw 27 homes lost. We did not see any loss of life, which is fantastic, and from what I understand we did not have any major injuries. There were certainly injuries sustained by firefighters—whether they be CFS or local people helping put out fires at their own place or their neighbour's property. I commend everyone for what they did.

I also commend the work of the air crews: Aerotech are one of the main contractors in fighting fires and they did a fantastic job alongside the helicopters and we had some planes come over from Victoria. I was listening to some Victorian media over the break, and I think they have access to over 60 planes and helicopters to fight fires. I think it just showed what can be done by people on the ground and that is extremely important, but you do need those air assets and I would just make comment in regard to what happened at Cherryville: I think if those air assets had gone up immediately, no matter whether they were in contract or not—and I heard all those arguments—there would have been a different outcome in Cherryville. I do take my hat off to everyone involved across the board with that fire suppression. It was a fantastic effort to limit the damage to as little as possible. I note that the government appreciates the support that it received from the commonwealth government and other state governments, and I acknowledge that support as well.

The speech also related to the uncertainty and angst felt by workers at Holden, and people who have recently lost their jobs at Arrium. We have BHP Billiton cutting jobs, and that is not good; it is not good at all. You have to wonder what is going on. I know there are low commodity prices, but we are seeing many, many jobs going. I know there has been some criticism from the other side of this house, from the government benches, about the so-called lack of federal support for Holden, but I have made it clear here before, and I will make it clear again today, it was Detroit that made the decision. They said that no matter how much money was thrown at Holden, General Motors were not going to support it, and that is not good.

It is not good that we will not have a car industry, not just in this state but in this country, after about 2017. I think there will be some vehicles, like the last Holden utes off the line, the last Fords off the line and maybe even the last Toyotas that come off the line in Australia, which may become a collector's item down the track. But, sadly, we are seeing cost of production putting more manufacturing in South Australia out of business. I want to concentrate now on one comment in the speech which says:

It is time to open doors to new opportunities for our priority sectors such as resources, energy and renewable assets.

Yes, that is a great aim and it is what we should be doing. It is what we are already doing to a degree, but why is the rural sector, the primary industry sector, barely mentioned in the speech? I think there

is one line talking about premium wine and food, which is trotted out by the government on a regular basis. The amount of money that agriculture supplies to this state, employing close on 25,000 people, is huge. It is time the government really acknowledged what agriculture does for this state.

When the Olympic Dam expansion fell over the government could not fall over themselves quick enough to talk about what our rural industries are doing, our primary industries and our added value industries. I am saddened that they barely rated a mention in the Governor's speech. I certainly support resources, our energy and our renewable assets, but with the cost of resource pricing and other matters, at the moment, they are not the world beaters that they could be into the future.

I am intrigued a bit with the debate around the nuclear issue. I note that after more than 25 years of uranium production it is now time to engage in a mature, robust and informed debate on the future role of the nuclear industry. As also indicated by the Governor, the government will establish a royal commission into the nuclear industry. I think that is a very good idea. I think it is time we had an informed debate. There was obviously heavy debate decades ago when Normie Foster—a Labor man who helped get Roxby Downs operational, Western Mining at Olympic Dam—crossed the floor in the other place. I think we do need to have this debate.

I am particularly interested in a few things, but one thing is whether there is a potential to value add the potential of uranium and enrich the product and make money out of that in a safe manner, but I also want to talk about burying waste. When we look at our continent, it is one of the most—if not the most—stable continents in the world. I think there are some vast opportunities that we are missing. We continue to store our waste up and down North Terrace, whether it is through hospital surgeries or in hospital basements. Low-level waste is being stored right here in the city, right under our noses, but we do not hear any outcry about that. It actually alarms me that this waste is so close to us and all around us.

I heard an interesting comment one day from one of the staff here at Parliament House soon after I was elected. He made a comment—and it was just a fairly dry comment, I guess. He said, 'We've had some nuclear protests here, and there would be more radiation coming out of the granite that the protesters were protesting on than there would be in a low-level nuclear waste dump.' So, I think it is time for a mature debate. Whether or not it goes ahead, that is up to the process. From what I gather, the new generation reactors are a lot safer and a lot better than any reactor produced before, but that will be up to the royal commission to look at, and I congratulate Kevin Scarce, the former governor, on his appointment to do that work.

Going on through the speech, I note the commentary about Adelaide being the heart of the vibrant state, it being talked about as another of the 10 economic priorities, which was identified by the government, and how the capital city has a critical role to play in South Australia's critical performance. Perhaps it does but, as I indicated earlier, what about our regions? What about our fabulous regions: from Mount Gambier through to the Mallee, through the Murraylands, the Fleurieu, the Clare Valley, around to the Mid North, Far North, Upper North, the West Coast, and Yorke Peninsula. We have some fantastic country that produces great wealth for this state and it does not get recognised enough. I stress that the government needs to take more notice of the benefits of our great state.

Sure, there can be things done in the city. I note that the government has said we must seize this moment to make Adelaide more attractive to businesses. If we had a more attractive business climate perhaps it would work. I note that the government has recently given \$10 million to OZ Minerals to set up an office here. Why should we have to give money so that a company sets up their office here? I think it is great if they are setting up their office here, I think it is absolutely fantastic, but why do we have to give them \$10 million? Would not that \$10 million be better going into the upgrade of the Strzelecki Track to support our mining industries in the Far North?

If this so-called oil and gas hub gets going at Gillman (at the ill-fated Gillman site, which is under a cloud through the ICAC) it would go a lot better to supporting our oil and gas industries by getting on with the upgrade of the Strzelecki Track. I fear, as someone who has witnessed the good road going through Queensland to Brisbane, that too many companies will set up in Brisbane or Toowoomba, as they are already (they have been there for decades anyway), and transport oil and gas supplies from the east. We need to get on with it and get that Strzelecki Track up and going. That is an absolute must. It is a horror story for trucks and certainly if you are driving up there in a

vehicle with a camper trailer, as I have done, if you go above 80 km/h you are in strife and you have to go a lot slower than in other areas.

I am a bit intrigued at some of the claims by the government about establishing a carbon neutral Adelaide green zone to make it the world's first carbon neutral city. Listening to 891 this morning, I think they blew that claim out of the water, and talking about that within a decade electric and hybrid vehicles would be the preferred form of transport within the Adelaide central business district. Does that mean that if I come up here in my V8 Holden ute, I have to park it at Glen Osmond and hop on a bike and come through? Some of these plans—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Madam Deputy Speaker, I might need your protection in a minute.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will spring to your aid immediately.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you. Members opposite might need to be reminded of what happened to the previous lord mayor, who seemed to have this vision of putting everyone on bikes and riding through Adelaide. Yes, Adelaide is a city, but it is basically the centre of business for everyone else in South Australia, who will commute in their petrol or diesel-powered vehicles and do want to be able to commute around the city in a viable manner so that they can conduct their business. That has to be remembered. To think that within a decade electric and hybrid vehicles will be the preferred form, well, I do not think so. I know lots of countries and jurisdictions are going that way, but I do not think it is going to happen.

There is discussion about the Motor Vehicles Act being reviewed in the Road Traffic Act and the government is going to legislate for driverless vehicles, which will revolutionise transportation in South Australia. I note the discussion about Google having a driverless vehicle. It has not been tested long enough to see if it rates the safety concerns, but there is going to have to be some massive investment if they are relying on phone towers to drive these cars. They will not be able to go too far in my electorate, I can assure you. They might be driverless, but you might be sitting out there like a fish without water, wondering: well, what do I do next? There are a lot of strategies going on with vehicles at the moment, with self-parking strategies, and some of the high-end cars have some self-driving capabilities, like recognising vehicles in front or the potential of impact. That is all great, but I think we have a long way to go.

I note here also that the government talks about enshrining in legislation an urban growth boundary for Adelaide, which will protect our prime agricultural land, and debates about future growth will occur with full transparency, as demanded by the community. I certainly think that is a reasonable statement, but you do not want to preclude certain areas for development. I have a motion on the table in this place about the potential of developing land in my electorate around Murray Bridge with the Gifford Hill proposal, and other expansion around Murray Bridge could get up to 4,000 to 5,000 homes very quickly within easy striking distance of the city, as Don Dunstan recognised with his Monarto proposal. It is the one thing Don Dunstan was probably on the money with. I will not agree with anything else he did, but he was actually on the money.

An honourable member: It's 40 years too late.

Mr PEDERICK: Well, it is a zoo now and it is a great zoo. We put a few animals in there. Anyway, there is some great potential. I think people need to look beyond the square about where development should really happen and where the options are. I certainly look at my electorate and in areas around Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend where I think there will be greater demand into the future.

Just quickly on that, I note the Peregrine-Shahin proposal for the motorsport park at Tailem Bend, and I wish that proposal all the best. I think that will be a great asset not just for my community but for the state. It will attract people to travel that short 95 kilometres from Adelaide and will be a great boon to add onto what is already happening at Tailem Bend in regard to the driver training, the four-wheel drive training and the drifting.

If anyone wants a little bit of excitement, if they are a bit bored one weekend, they should go down there when the drifters are there, sign the three or four pieces of paper that sign your life away

and get in and hold on. It is fantastic, it is unbelievable, so you need to get on. I also note that the speech talks about—

Mr Williams: Use the Fleet SA card, do you Peds?

Mr PEDERICK: No. The speech talks about creating affordable living in our neighbourhoods, well supported by public transport. I note again more commentary about opportunities to walk and cycle around our beautiful city. What about the rest of the state? Public transport is quite a notable issue at the minute in my electorate. It has been an issue I have taken to various ministers over the nearly nine years I have been a member of parliament. It is a hot debate in my electorate at the moment with Link SA deciding not to have direct runs through to the city at all. They used to have two runs—one morning and one in the late afternoon—straight through to the city from Murray Bridge and back. They have decided to still have seven runs with a connection at Dumas Street at Mount Barker into the Metroticket system.

At first glance, you think that is a great use of resources and that sort of thing, but it is not that simple. Since that proposal has come out and has had a bit of media attention in the last week or two, there are a lot of people, especially elderly people, who are not that keen on switching buses, and I understand that. They are not sure about security, and they are a bit unsure about which bus they change over to at Mount Barker and, certainly on the way back from Adelaide, where they go to get onto the Link SA bus, so it does create confusion. I think, at the end of the day, the government really needs to look at a link to Murray Bridge similar to what I believe happens with the link to Strathalbyn where there is a metro service but a country zone fare in place.

I certainly understand the costs of public transport. It is probably subsidised about 85 per cent by public money, but I think the 20,000-odd citizens of Murray Bridge and all those who surround the town need a better public transport system. I think it is obvious that Link are not that keen on it. They have cut the direct services through to Adelaide, and we really do need to look at a Metroticket system. I understand everything has to be paid for, but it may be a system where there is a country zone ticket applicable for the Murray Bridge to Mount Barker section, and I am happy to have that discussion with the minister at any time.

I look also at what the government is looking at with renewing Housing Trust stock. There will be 4,500 homes within 10 kilometres of the city. I hope they do not forget that the regional areas out there too need Housing Trust stock restored. Certainly but sadly, I have had to deal with a few issues in my electorate where sometimes people do not treat stock as they should and there have to be some quite significant rebuilds. It does sadden me. It is an issue that comes up from time to time. Quite frankly, people need to respect the housing they are being supplied with. Here is the one bit, the one line, about premium food and wine products in our region, and I quote:

The growing prosperity achieved across Asia has also helped more people realise a better quality of life. Demand for South Australia's premium food and wine products will increase in our region.

And that is it! That is the one line in all the pages of the document that the Governor read out for the government. I think there is plenty of growing prosperity across Asia. With free trade agreements to Korea, Japan and one just about signed with China, I think there is huge potential, especially when I look at the potential for the live cattle trade. It is really getting back on its feet.

I know some people do not like that, but it is a fact of life. It supports thousands and thousands of people from Darwin right through to the south of our great nation, right down to South Australia where feed is supplied. As demand grows, I know more and more cattle are sourced from the south—dairy heifers going out of Portland into China and things like that. I think there is going to be great opportunity and we must be able to supply that stock into the future to really get on board.

The speech talks about attracting significant, direct foreign investment. This can be a hot topic at times and I think we do need foreign investment. One thing I learnt during our sustainable farming select committee trip around the state was that some people were quite open that they would love a percentage of perhaps Chinese ownership or perhaps someone else in their properties, so they get that much needed capital in their farming properties so they can be more of a viable system.

It is what is happening right across the state, because some people might not believe it but it is very hard to make a living on what farmers get for their raw products. The costs are high; the

costs of machinery are high; the costs of land are massive. It is tough, and I can certainly see why some people are keen to see some foreign investment.

It needs to be managed, and I note that very shortly the Foreign Investment Review Board limit will be brought down to \$15 million and the Australian Taxation Office will be conducting an audit of all properties with any foreign capital involved. I think it is good to just keep track of what is going on, because I am not saying that Chinese investment is entirely a bad thing but we certainly cannot just go to China and buy their land. We live in different ways and we run our countries differently as well.

I note another comment in the speech about a cultural change within the Public Service to attract the volume of investment needed to create new jobs. I think that speaks for itself and I think everyone, whether they are public servants or in the private sector, needs to pick up to make sure we can get this state to be the great state that it is. I note the government is talking about taxation reform. They are open to radical reform, saying nothing is out of bounds. Will we have a land tax on every house, dwelling, business in South Australia? I do not know, but I have a funny feeling that that is where the government is leaning and there will be an interesting debate when that discussion paper on options to reform the state's taxation system is released. In fact, I think it has been released.

I will get to one of the real doozies of the speech and I note that the minister in the house was discussing the other day whether it is appropriate to remain in the Australian Central Time zone, which we have had since 1899. I think this is a commentary that they are using to try to deflect all the issues of the day, whether it is the Gillman land deal or the health reforms but, quite frankly, I think it is a waste of air. Perhaps this debate may have been necessary in years gone by, many years ago, but the simple fact is, with electronic communication and email, who cares what time it is? You can operate 24 hours a day.

We are only half an hour off beam with the Eastern States. The kids on the West Coast get on buses in the dark now. Next thing, they will have to get up before they go to bed. Now, that is a joke, so do not take that too seriously, but I just think it is a waste of time even discussing it. I know part of the debate is about whether we go further towards Western Australian time and I think there will be opposition from the government side in regard to that but, in real time, that is probably where we need to be heading.

I note there is discussion about the Electoral (Funding, Expenditure and Disclosure) Amendment Act coming into force in July this year, and the Governor talks about greater transparency. I take my hat off now, before that does come in, and salute volunteers. There will be volunteers on all parties—probably more paid people on the other side—that will have to keep up these physical records of finance. I am not saying that is a bad thing, but it is going to need a lot more work from a lot of people to make sure that donations are followed correctly and that the process and transparency is followed directly.

There is talk about the need to review the remuneration of members of parliament. No-one is going to win any prizes talking about that too much—

The Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, no worries; thanks. It was interesting, in recent years, when we used to be a couple of thousand dollars behind our federal colleagues in the base pay rate, but now we are I think around \$42,000 behind. I will just leave that out there for debate. I know it does not matter what we say in here, people will still say, 'Self interest is a great winner,' and all that, but people do need to be recompensed so that you get good people to represent their state, whether they are from the Labor Party, the Liberal Party or the crossbenchers, and work the many long hours that I know all members work in their capacity as members of parliament.

I noticed discussion around eliminating the anti-democratic practice of preference harvesting. I welcome that debate, because I think that if someone gets elected with 0.5 per cent or whatever ridiculous amount of votes, it is totally undemocratic. I think the public education system certainly needs a lot of work. I note my wife currently works in the system as a library services officer. I note in the speech it states:

...every South Australian child should be guaranteed the attention they need to reach their full potential. This is especially important for children with disabilities.

Absolutely, it is especially important for children with disabilities. Whether it be a physical disability, learning disability, or they have had an abused childhood, they do deserve assistance. My wife was basically employed in the last term of last year to look after one person. That one person was a bag of strife, but sadly it was not the lad's fault on his own. I think it was his upbringing, as he was a foster child.

But, I do think the reaction by the department in assisting this child, in sending out 13 senior Department for Communities and Social Inclusion and Education staff, was over the top. Sadly, there are too many of these cases, and if they are sending 13 heavy staff to address these issues all the time, that is tying up a massive amount of resources. I am not saying it is not a big problem, because it is, but it does need to be resolved in a better way.

Just in the few minutes I have left, as I am running out of time, the speech mentions that the government is looking at investing in 'quality health care for South Australians'. It makes a point in the speech that, 'Every metropolitan hospital and all major country hospitals have recently been rebuilt.' There is a lot of work that needs to be done on other hospitals throughout the regions. I am certainly appalled at the sale of the Daw Park Repatriation General Hospital, because I think that is just a disgrace, and it is an offence to our defence personnel.

I had cause to visit the hospital for a couple of days in December and talked to staff about the failure of EPAS, for a start, but not only that. They were appalled at the prospect of it shutting down. My wife and I have many friends around the place. A couple of them work at the hospital, and they are disgusted. They have long been loyal Labor voters but they might come our way because of this senseless decision by the Labor government in reference to not only our Diggers but the many civilians who go to that health unit, and I welcome that. With those few words, that is my Address in Reply.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (16:29): I would like to commence my Address in Reply by thanking and congratulating His Excellency the Governor Hieu Van Le. I think he and Mrs Le are a wonderful asset to this state. Every time I hear the Governor speak I am filled with pride, not only in his own accomplishments but in those of South Australia that shine through him. The Governor covered a lot of the challenges we face and the opportunities we can take to deliver better outcomes for South Australia in his address. This is our first and foremost responsibility.

I want to acknowledge that we are joined in this new session by two new members, Natalie Cook, the member for Fisher, and Sam Duluk, the member for Davenport. I very much look forward to working with them. Being a fellow conservative, I am sure Sam and I will agree on a lot of conscience issues in the parliament. I am glad to have Sam on the team. No doubt I will also agree with an awful lot of what Nat has to say, and I found her address remarkable. Sam is probably on tomorrow and I will make sure I am present for it.

If this government did nothing else in the remainder of its term in office it would be still a reformist government that had made a historic achievement, and that was WorkCover reform. That WorkCover reform—\$180 million worth of savings to business—in the way it was delivered by the Attorney and by the government, is simply remarkable. I am not sure if business or the broader community fully appreciate yet the full significance of that reform. Previous governments have tried and failed. It is an absolute credit to the Attorney, to the cabinet and also to the government caucus that they allowed that to go through. I know there were very diverse views on it and there would not have been full agreement. We will see how it works. Maybe it needs to be tweaked later, but I think it is a historic reform.

I think the Governor's address signals that this government is prepared to make further historic steps to ensure that at the end of this term it has got on with the job and made a difference, that it has got on with the job of ensuring that our children and our grandchildren go on to a prosperous and fulsome future, because indeed many of the things covered in the Governor's address are bold indeed.

I want to start with health reform, because I think that is as historic as WorkCover reform. I absolutely commend the Minister for Health for bringing that forward through the cabinet, through the relevant cabinet committees, through his own party caucus and then into the parliament. Many have tried and failed. When the Liberals were in office—and I was part of the government that did this—we sold Modbury Hospital to the private sector. There were attempts at reform between 1993 and 2002 because it was widely recognised that the health system needs ongoing reform because it is simply too expensive to sustain if it is not constantly reinventing itself to make itself more affordable and more achievable.

These procedures in our hospitals have changed: hip replacements, knee replacements. The sort of technology that is required and the things we can achieve now go so far beyond what was required when these hospitals were first built that you simply cannot spread yourself too thinly on the ground, and nine hospitals is never going to be a sustainable model going forward. Everybody who is intelligently engaged in this debate knows it. I know it. I knew it when I was the shadow health minister. I think every shadow health minister there has been would know that there is a need for health reform. The opposition would well know that, as does the government. The federal parliament, government and opposition, would know that as well, because there is a need for national health reform.

In commenting on health reform, it is incumbent on all, if they are unhappy with what is being proposed by the government and by the health minister, to be in a position to suggest an alternative. I do not think it is good enough to rip things down unless you are able to indicate what you will build up to put in its place. What the health minister has proposed I think is quite remarkable. It is a time of change. It will be emotional for many people.

I have one of those hospitals in my electorate. I grew up across the street from the Repat and my mother has regaled me with stories. My grandfather was in the 2nd/10th. He used to have barbecues at his house for the 2nd/10th boys in the 1940s and 1950s. Apparently they would come in their pyjamas and slippers from the Repat the two blocks to our place to the barbecue, have a barbecue and a beer all day, and go home slightly sozzled in their dressing gowns and slippers back to the Repat by 5 o'clock to get ready, because they had to be back or they were in trouble with the matron. That was in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

It is a wonderful hospital, but eventually it would have to be rebuilt either at its current location or somewhere else and the Minister for Health has come up with a plan that does both because part of it is going to be rebuilt where it is. I hope that includes Ward 17, but we will see. There is work to be done on that. Of course, there is a private health facility there now. The chapel is remaining and the gardens are remaining, but a lot of it is going to be rebuilt at other hospitals where new rehabilitation facilities are going to be created, hydrotherapy pools and gyms, close to where veterans live and work where they will be able to access those brand new facilities.

I can tell you veterans have heart attacks, they have strokes, they need emergency department services, they need rehabilitation services, and they need all sorts of things they will now be able to access that will be new, that will be world class and that will be right up to the measure. I am confident and I will be ensuring that we get a wonderful new Ward 17, not a flashy multistorey building, but something that is appropriate for purpose—hopefully at Daw Park, but we will see—that veterans and clinicians are involved in creating and that, at the end of the day, veterans will be better off not worse off.

I know it is also difficult at Hampstead and St Margaret's, but I am encouraged by the changes that we will see at Flinders, Lyell McEwin and the new RAH and at other locations like Modbury and QEH where we are going to see new facilities, enhanced facilities and a better coordinated system. I think, frankly, if this government did nothing else but WorkCover reform and health reform it could sit down at the end of this four-year period and say, 'We made a difference and we made historic changes to this state.'

So I absolutely commend the health minister for having the political courage to bring this forward because you know what? I have worked out in the 18 years I have been here that political courage is like other forms of courage—it is often in short supply, it is very easy to squib, and it is very easy to just make incremental changes and not be brave enough to bring in bold historic reforms.

There are two in the first 12 months of this government's life and I think they are reforms of which the government can be rightly proud.

Now, there are a lot of other things in the Governor's speech. There is going to be a review of time zones. There is going to be a review of the nuclear fuel cycle to see whether that is an industry which we can take full advantage of. There is going to be renewal of the Housing Trust stock—long overdue—which will stimulate the housing and development industries. There is going to be parliamentary reform. There is going to be further super schools, particularly in the secondary space, and I think the super school system has always been quite a clever model. I said that when I was in opposition and I will say it still. I think it has led to a lot of renewal within the education system and that is good. There are a host of other changes.

I think it is one of the boldest statements of a government's intentions that I have seen in the time that I have been here. I say that as someone who has contributed in the debates leading up to the ideas that were in the Governor's speech. I commend the Premier for being brave enough, as I mentioned earlier with the Minister for Health in respect of health reform, to bring forward an agenda which is bold and courageous and which is probably controversial within the Labor Party itself, both state and federal, in some of its aspects, but which has got South Australia thinking and focused and which has been well received by the business community.

I know it has delivered a couple of chestnuts for business associations like Business SA in respect of, for example, the nuclear fuel cycle and time zones which are issues that they hold dearly, and tax reform which is another important initiative further announced by the Treasurer today. Again, full points to the Treasurer.

This is the first time I have seen a government come into this house with a discussion paper on tax reform. I felt so passionately about it. When I was the opposition leader I had a tax summit and produced a tax discussion paper myself with members opposite just to get the debate going. I would hope, and I am sure they will, that members opposite will welcome this debate and be active contributors in it. Again, I say to members opposite, if you are not happy with what is in it, suggest some alternatives. Let us have a battle of ideas. Let us have some meaningful policy debate, because I know there are a lot of fantastic ideas on the benches opposite from the Liberal opposition and I would love to see those ideas blossom in the form of this debate. I do not think we should be afraid of that.

I think it is a more respectful parliament than it has been for many years. The first few years I was here I thought it was a little bit messy to say the least. I think we can engage in a battle of ideas without getting snaky or personal, and we can have an effective exchange of genuine ideas as we go through health reform, as we go through tax reform, and as we go through many of the other initiatives in this paper.

Frankly, I think the Premier is a decent enough bloke, along with the Leader of the Opposition, to allow both sides to have those debates and work through those issues in an intelligent way, over the coming year or two, in a way that all South Australians, I think, will find quite admirable. I certainly hope that is how it unfolds. I certainly hope what does not happen is that everything that has been put down in the Governor's speech is simply ripped apart over the next year or two and nitpicked with no meaningful alternatives put on the table. I think South Australians would like to see us work collegiately and collaboratively in their best interests.

I just want to hunker down onto a few issues for which I am personally responsible. I might start with, of course, investment and trade, because to me it is all about jobs, jobs, jobs. There are kids out there now at school who would have hoped to have been apprentices at Holden or in one of the related companies, and those jobs will not be there in a few years' time. We need to create alternative jobs for those kids. We also need to help those who are currently working in the automotive industry relocate into other opportunities. By being an outward economy, by trading, by exporting more, by attracting new investment into the state, we can create new jobs and new opportunities for those people, and that is exactly what we plan to do. Economic priority 9 of the Premier's 10 economic priorities talks a lot about that. I am principally responsible for delivering it, and we will, and we are doing that in a number of ways.

First of all, there will be a new investment agency created. I will have a lot more to say about that later. We have looked at the Irish model, we have looked at the Singaporean model. It will be funded. It is going to cost some money to make that investment, but a group of people will be put together to go out and progressively seek further investment into this state. If we can get more head offices here, if we can get companies that are here to expand through investment, if we can create new jobs and new opportunities through a more sophisticated approach to investment attraction, then that is to the betterment of all. There will be more brought to the house about that later. There are 6,000 new jobs that we have targeted to create over the next three years from inbound investment, and I am going to make sure that I play my part as a member of the cabinet team and the government team in delivering those jobs for South Australians.

I thank the Economic Development Board for their wonderful contribution to that initiative of the new investment attraction authority. They are doing a wonderful job helping the government on many fronts, along with the wonderful Professor Göran Roos, with his bountiful supply of bright ideas, who is again helping the government to be more business friendly. My message from the Governor's speech to the business community is: the government is on your side. The government recognises that if small businesses and businesses are thriving, then they are creating jobs, and if they are creating jobs our constituents are happy.

We want business to succeed, and that is why we are out there talking about tax reform, that is why we are out there talking about investment and trade, that is why we are out there talking about the things that Business SA and other industry groups want us to talk about, because the government is listening to them. We have heard it, we understand it, and I can tell you that the discussions we have around cabinet are very business friendly. Their debates engage not only with business but with the unions, because, guess what? The unions and workers want the same thing: vibrant and successful businesses that employ more workers and look after them. We are all pulling on the same rope here, and they want business to succeed. I will come back to that point later.

We did meet with the chief executive of the IDA in Ireland, Barry O'Leary, and talked about investment and trade. The Premier, during his recent visit to Singapore, talked to the president, Tony Tan, and the trade and investment minister, Teo Chee Hean, to discuss their government's success in attracting new industries, and we will be trying to emulate some of that success. That will require some reorganisation within government. Again, that will be changed, but it will be changed for the better.

I have also looked at the Gateway Program. We have reinvigorated the funding for the Gateway Program. We have revised the rules for the Gateway Program. I recently allocated seven or eight grants under the Gateway Program to make that funding more accessible to people. I want every dollar at my disposal deployed to the benefit of business so that we create more jobs and more opportunity. I want to get as many companies as possible—not only in the city but in our wonderful regions—and I agree completely with the points made earlier by the member for Hammond about the importance of the regions to our economic growth. We want to use this TradeStart funding to get them off overseas selling their wonderful products.

We have TradeStart advisers located in the northern suburbs, the southern suburbs, Naracoorte, Paringa and Port Augusta. I would like to thank them all for their efforts at the grassroots level for fostering export capability in our SMEs, and the commonwealth government for their continuing partnership with this important program. I ask all members in the house to encourage their local firms to get in contact with the trade and investment agency, ITSP, perhaps through our TradeStart advisers to explore opportunities to sell their products and attract new investment into their businesses.

On 5 February, the Premier announced that the government would be regularising its overseas business delegations, and this is an innovation that the Premier and I and the remainder of cabinet have worked on together. I can tell the house that we will be doing a regular outbound mission to China every May and we will be doing a regular inbound mission from China into Australia every September to align with the Royal Adelaide Show. We are going to try to repeat these missions every year at the same time and in the same form and make them better and better each year.

I am hoping to take as many as 200 businesses to China this year. The Premier will lead the mission, and it will be an all-in effort from government. It will be the biggest overseas trade mission the government has ever conducted, and we are hoping to make sure that there are as many South Australian businesses sitting down with Chinese businesses and writing cheques to each other and doing deals with each other as is humanly practicable. We have absolutely cranked up our efforts in China. We are already exporting nearly \$4 billion. The growth, with our efforts in China—and I commend previous ministers for the groundwork they have done—is extraordinary, and we are going to take that to a new level.

I can also tell the house that, having returned from India in January, we are going to have a regular outbound mission to India in August. I hope to go to Delhi, Mumbai and Jaipur in Rajasthan, and we will have an inbound mission from India every January to line up with the Twenty20 cricket. We have one commencing in the coming week to line up with the World Cup. We will model on that and develop further our business relationships, and the jobs and opportunities that come with it, with India.

We hope to take a delegation of around 60 businesses to India and we hope, eventually, to crank our level of interactivity up with India. It is a mystery that there are 11,000 Australian companies with a presence in the United States and only 350 Australian companies with a presence in India. The reason for that gap is something that we need to explore and we need to close it, because that is a wealth of opportunity.

We will also be shortly announcing our South-East Asia strategy. There will be a mission there this year and there will be more said about that later. I will be going off on a reconnaissance soon. The overall message though is if you are a winery, if you are a farm, if you are a flour mill, if you produce meat, if you produce grains or processed foods, or if you are an aquaculture business, or if you are an advanced manufacturer or service provider in the water industry or in the waste management industry, or if you are looking for students to attend your university, if you are looking to do trade of any kind overseas, the South Australian government is going to help you do business. We are going to help you get over there, we are going to help you make the right connections, and we are going to help you create jobs and opportunity and grow your business for the betterment of this state.

If your business is growing its profits, you are hiring more people and you are paying more taxes by the way—everyone is happy about that—and you are taking home more profits that you can reinvest in your business for the betterment of this state. That includes some very new initiatives which we will be announcing later in the year about investment models where we hope to attract investment into South Australian companies in ways that opens up lines of communication and distribution for them in the parent countries I have mentioned.

I want to move on and talk about time zones. I will be managing that process. We have put the issue out there. This is the first time the government has led on this issue. Private members have tried it. The government is dead serious about getting it resolved. There will either be no change, or we will go half an hour back to Eastern Standard Time or half an hour forward to make it an hour.

I was recently in the room of one of the biggest investors in this state overseas—they own billions of dollars' worth of South Australian assets—and the first issue they raised with me was the absolute joke of a half-hour time gap. We are a laughing-stock, which is confirmed by our Agent-General in London where it is regularly raised by European investors. A half-hour time zone, unfortunately, is the subject of ridicule. It either needs to be an hour, or it needs to be Eastern Standard Time in my opinion—that is my personal opinion—but we are going to consult with people and see what they think, and there will be a two-month period for everyone to have their say because everyone deserves to be heard.

At the end of that two-month period the government will consider a further period of consultation. That might involve putting a firm proposition on the table and then further consulting on that firm proposition. However, we hope that by the time it ultimately comes into parliament, if it does come into parliament and we do decide to change and the government does propose something, that it will have been very thoroughly consulted. We are very sensitive to concerns in the regions.

We know that there would be farmers down in the South-East who would probably welcome going to Eastern Standard Time but, conversely, there would be farmers over in the west, as west as Ceduna, who, for all the reasons that have been mentioned, would hate the idea of going to Eastern Standard Time. They all need to be given a fair go. We will look at all the options, moving the opening and closing hours of schools and government offices, look at all the things that could possibly be done to make this possible, but I can tell you that, as the minister responsible for managing this process, I will make sure everyone gets a fair go on it. Hopefully, at the end of it we will reach some sort of consensus.

I want to talk now about defence industries. There has been a lot in the media about this. I just want to make one very important point, and that is that it does appear that the federal government and the Prime Minister have made a captain's pick and are trying to engineer an outcome where we build submarines in Japan. There is growing concern that a contrived competitive evaluation process of some kind is being set up to give an appearance of a competitive tender, where the Germans, the French and the Swedes can have a go, but which is subject to a preordained outcome: Japan.

As a government, we are not disposed unfavourably to a Japanese submarine or a Swedish, German or French submarine. We do not care about the design. The Navy can pick that. The federal government can pick that. We want the best submarine to protect our shores. But what we are absolutely immovable on is that it will be built in this country. We are not going to export 120,000 man years of jobs and wages to somebody else's country, using our money, taxpayers' money, and we are not going to export up to \$250 billion worth of Australian taxpayers' money to build surface ships and submarines overseas because somebody thinks they will save money or that it will be expedient to do so, or because somebody thinks that we are not good enough to do these things.

What we need is federal leadership that says, yes we can. What we need are prime ministers and federal politicians who have faith in South Australian and Australian industry and our workers and their families and will back them. I can tell those workers and those businesses that, while it has breath in its bones, this government will fight for that outcome and we are absolutely immovable. We will do whatever it takes. We are not going to sit by and allow such decisions to be made.

I just ask a couple of senior federal Liberals in this state to reflect on their actions. They actively ripped the automotive industry down and there are a couple of them there—I will not name them in the house, but I tell you it is close—who are actively ripping down the shipbuilding industry. They do not want it to succeed, for ideological reasons or perhaps to curry favour to pursue their own careers—I do not know why—but they should be absolutely ashamed of themselves.

Can I also add that there are several federal Liberal MPs of whom we should be proud, and I want to make special mention of Sean Edwards and David Fawcett. I think Matt Williams has been pretty good, and I believe Anne Ruston. There is silence from some of the others. It is time to stand up, ladies and gentlemen. It is time to stand up for your state. That also goes for members opposite. You are not bound to lash yourselves to the sinking ship of a federal Liberal parliamentary party hell bent on building submarines in Japan. You can cut them loose at any time and you would win nothing but three cheers from the people of South Australia. Come with us on this journey. We have to win this one. It is too important to lose. That also holds for LAND 400, the \$10 billion combat vehicle project which is soon to be announced for first pass.

Again, I have sat with combat vehicle manufacturers overseas who have told me that the only customer they have in the world who does not require local industry content in their offering is the current Australian government. I have sat in with combat vehicle manufacturers gobsmacked that we are the only country in the world not saying to them, 'Before you tender make sure you've got 20, or 30, or 40, or 50 per cent local content in your bid offer.' Every other country in the world does. Two of them told me they just sent their industry participation people out of the room because they were not needed.

I will be looking at that tender very carefully, but if we have a government that wants to offload 750 to 1,000 combat vehicles down at the wharf, paint them, put a numberplate on them and drive them off to the Army base with virtually no value-add for our workers and our businesses, then that government should hang its head in shame because we have an opportunity to assemble those vehicles here. We have an opportunity to build some of the parts for those vehicles and even export

vehicles overseas based around that capability, if the government simply says, 'Let's get it right with industry.'

I can tell you, the unions have to play the game, businesses have to play the game, and I think they will because if they give us a competitive shipyard and a competitive combat vehicle manufacturing park we are all going to be winners, including the workers and the businesses. I think everyone wants this to succeed. What we need is leadership in Canberra; that is what we need. I hope that whatever happens in the months and years going forward that that is what we get, one way or the other.

We are receiving the Governor's speech in uncertain times. The global economy is awash with liquidity as a result of quantitative easing in the United States and a new raft of quantitative easing money printing in Europe. The Australian dollar has dropped spectacularly from nearly \$1.10 to into the 70s and interest rates have been cut. That presents challenges and opportunities. Oil and gas prices are at historic lows. That is bad news for companies like Santos, Beach and others, for the present, and I am sure they will bounce back, but it is very good news for businesses.

It is very good news for the punters of South Australia. I went to fill my car up with fuel the other day. It normally costs \$100 for diesel; I got it for \$71. I was pretty happy. If that is happening all over the state then somebody has got more money to spend on retail, more money to spend in a restaurant, more money to spend investing back into their business or on their kids' education, and that is good for the economy. I am confident that that will help with our economic recovery, because it is coming and it is coming like a steam train.

Can I also commend the parliamentary reforms mentioned in the Governor's speech. It is high time we had new deadlock provisions. Upper houses everywhere are blocking government budgets. It is happening in Canberra and it is happening in the states. I think it is wrong. There should be debate and delay, but there should not be blocking. The nature of our system is flawed. It needs fixing. My personal view is that I would favour joint sittings of both houses as a way to clear any deadlocked legislation, and particularly on budget matters there needs to be a process where the will of the people can be exercised and people can get their budgets through, both federal and state. Federal is not my problem to solve, but state is, so I am delighted the Premier has set out his determination to deliver some budget reform.

Can I just wind up by talking about veterans and the centenary of ANZAC because we will shortly commemorate the landing at Anzac Cove, during which so many of our great-grandfathers were killed. The beginning of the Great War was a sobering event for everyone in this state and those who preceded us in this very chamber would have stood here, just as we are today, solemnly reflecting on those events. As the Minister for Veterans' Affairs I think it is very important that we commemorate these next four years solemnly and that we remind the young of the sacrifices of those who came before them.

We will be talking to the people of South Australia about a very exciting program of activities that will get out of the city and into the regions, which will involve a number of capital works as well as individual events, of which I think all members will be proud. We will do it in a bipartisan way and I think members will be pleased with it. I commend the Governor's speech to the house and wish the parliament well in its deliberations over the coming year.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:59): I am delighted to be able to join this debate on the Address in Reply. I congratulate Governor Hieu Van Le on the opening of the parliament this week and on the way that he is conducting himself as the Governor. I congratulate him on attaining that high office.

I had the pleasure of having the Governor and his wife in my electorate in the latter part of last year when he came down as a special guest to open and be the guest of honour at the Coonalpyn Show. He told me that it was the first country show that he had attended in South Australia full stop, not just since he was Governor. At no better place could he have had the experience of attending a country show than Coonalpyn in the Upper South-East. We had a delightful day introducing him and his wife to a country show.

Having said that of the Governor, I need to ensure that nobody misinterprets my comments. I am fully aware, and I am sure the house is fully aware, that the speech delivered by the Governor

is not written by the Governor. It is not the Governor's opinion: it is a speech written by the government expressing the government's opinion. I am sure that the Governor, possibly, does not agree with everything in the speech. I certainly agree with very few of the things that are in the Governor's speech.

I will go through the Governor's speech in chronological order because, from time to time, there are things that I want to talk about. Just for the sake of somebody who comes along and reads the *Hansard* of my contribution, the order in which I am speaking on matters is the order in which they come up in the Governor's speech.

The first matter that I want to talk about briefly is the fact that we are going to have a royal commission to look into the subject of the uranium fuel cycle and the nuclear industry as it applies and might apply in South Australia. Can I say I welcome this move. I welcome this announcement by the Governor; it is long, long overdue.

I recall that, but for Norm Foster crossing the floor in the upper house, Roxby Downs may well have never got off the ground. It may still well be one of the largest ore bodies in the world but totally untouched. The Labor Party in South Australia has taken a long, long time to come to its senses on this particular matter. I welcome the Governor saying 'it is time to engage in a mature, robust and informed debate'. Hear, hear!

To remind the house how immature and how ill-informed the debate has been in South Australia, a number of years ago, since this Labor Party has been in office, one of my colleagues, the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, who was a member of the other place, came back from a trip to France as part of an overseas study tour. She commented that she had discovered there was a nuclear power station in the middle of the Champagne wine district. She just made that offhand comment. The then premier, premier Rann, put out a statement saying that the Liberals wanted to build a nuclear power station in the Barossa Valley.

That is the level of the debate we have had in South Australia to date, so I welcome this with open arms. At last, after having a uranium mining industry in South Australia for a lot more than 25 years, probably more than 30 years, the Labor Party has finally caught up with the nonsense of the position they have held for so long. It is way overdue.

Might I also note that the Labor Party's proposal to have a royal commission to look into this has nothing to do with establishing whether this is a viable or safe industry that we should have in South Australia. I think the jury is out on all those things. If we are serious about global warming, if we do believe that we have to do something about the fossil fuel cycle, nuclear is the only technology available, at this stage and into the foreseeable future, that can meet our energy needs without continuing to increase the percentage of carbon dioxide and other pollutants in our atmosphere. It is the only technology available to us.

We are not having a royal commission in South Australia because the technology is not proven: we are having a royal commission in South Australia because we need to either sway or confirm the public perception of the industry in order that we can have acceptance for taking this not incremental but giant step, which I hope we do in South Australia.

I counterpoint that particular position with this government's position with regard to fracking in my electorate and other parts of the state but principally down in the South-East in my electorate and the neighbouring electorate of Mount Gambier where the government and the Minister for Mineral Resources have opposed any form of inquiry into fracking within the oil and gas industry or unconventional gas.

As I have always said, I do not have a problem with the technology used in the unconventional gas industry, but I have to tell the house that many of my community members and many of my constituents and those in the rest of the South-East do have problems with it. They are not convinced. We need to have the inquiry, and I am pleased to see that a parliamentary inquiry is about to kick off into that.

Hopefully that inquiry will go a long way to allay the fears of the people in the South-East about the unconventional gas industry, just as the government is proposing to have a royal commission to allay the fears of people about the nuclear industry, bearing in mind that most of the

fears that are held by people in South Australia are held because the Labor Party has actually generated those fears over the last 30-plus years.

Mr Tarzia: Shame.

Mr WILLIAMS: It is a shame. We are a long way behind where we should be. The next part of the Governor's speech is where I really disagree with the direction of this government. He says:

'Adelaide, the heart of the vibrant state'...Our capital city has a critical role to play in South Australia's economic performance.

Then he goes on and talks about 'the vibrant city...the vibrant city...the vibrant city'. As my colleague the member for Hammond said, where was the comment in the Governor's speech about the economic drivers that still remain in this state, principally those in the rural and regional parts of the state, those parts outside metropolitan Adelaide?

There is a great part of South Australia outside metropolitan Adelaide. A great number of people live outside the city, outside the CBD. There are great industries operating outside metropolitan Adelaide. I constantly get the impression that this government fails to understand that, that they do not even realise what is happening out there. South Australia's future depends on a lot more than a vibrant city. It depends on a lot more than planning changes in the metropolitan area, and I will come to that momentarily.

A lot of the issues that the Governor identified in his speech with regard to planning and with regard to vibrancy in the city, etc., would be addressed immediately if this government were not so city-centric, if this government understood the potential we have in other parts of the state, if this government had a decentralisation policy where, instead of trying to jam another 100,000 people into the inner suburbs and the CBD, it said, 'Let's put the next 100,000 South Australians outside metropolitan Adelaide. Let's grow some of our major regional centres—Mount Gambier, Berri, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Murray Bridge.'

I have never seen in my time here in the life of the Labor government in South Australia any attempt to grow the centres outside metropolitan Adelaide. Indeed, a lot of the policies of this government have done the exact opposite. It has been centralisation, centralisation, centralisation, and I think that is creating lots of problems. An urban growth boundary for Adelaide would not be necessary if this government had the correct policy settings for decentralisation. The population of metropolitan Adelaide would grow at a much steadier rate. We would not have to have these sorts of policies about urban infill.

I am really concerned about this policy of urban infill in South Australia. I look around inner suburban streets where there used to be quarter-acre blocks designed for families and lots of open space. South Australians, I think, believe that metropolitan Adelaide is a city of gardens and a city of open spaces. That is wrong; it is not. We have less open space in suburban Adelaide than virtually every other major city in Australia. We have lots of open space around the CBD, with the city Parklands. Get away from that and Adelaide has very little open space.

That has not been a huge problem with the traditional quarter-acre block, but now in my street, most of those blocks have been cut up and three and four units have been put on those blocks. All of a sudden, for families growing up in those suburbs, in those streets and in those units, their children have nowhere to play. They have nowhere to develop through physical activity, because there are no parklands; there are no schools with extensive yards and ovals, because of this government's policy of closing down and amalgamating schools, and creating super schools.

Children do not ride their bikes to school; they have to go a long distance to their super school because they are farther and farther apart. They are generally transported, either on a bus or with their parents in a motor car, so they do not have access to the schoolyards, playgrounds, tennis courts and netball courts for out-of-school-hours activities. I really have some concerns about the whole idea that this government has with regard to planning. The Governor said:

But...our physical environment influences a person's health and wellbeing...

I agree. He goes on to say:

Healthy, inclusive communities will mean more South Australians will be ready to grasp the great opportunities in our midst.

I agree. I wrote here the word 'livability'. I think we are creating an urban environment which has no livability, particularly for families and growing children. I think that is one area where the government is just getting it wrong.

The previous speaker (member for Waite) made a lot of comments about jobs, and said it is about 'jobs, jobs, jobs'. I think the key to jobs in South Australia is not the government taxing those people who are running businesses and employing people in order to give money to other businesses supposedly to come here and create jobs. I do not think that is the answer at all. I think the answer is to get out of the way of existing businesses, making an environment where they can thrive, and watch them employ more people.

What is the point of taking \$10 million out of the pockets of existing businesses and giving it to the likes of OZ Minerals to shift their headquarters to Adelaide? That is an incredibly false economy. That \$10 million by and large came from existing businesses or householders, who I am sure would rather spend the money here in South Australia on something that they needed, or employing more people here in South Australia. It is a very false economy.

The member for Waite talked about the subs project. I do not think there is anybody in this place who does not want to see submarines built in Adelaide. I think we all want to see that. He also talked about the motor industry. He suggested that politicians in this country actively destroyed the motor industry. The motor industry in Australia was destroyed because it could not produce a product which Australian families could afford to buy. Australians chose not to buy Australian-produced motor cars. That is what happened to the motor industry. It was not some decision in Canberra. It was not even a decision in a boardroom in Detroit.

This really came home to me when the Ford Motor Company announced that they were closing down their operations in Australia. We all know that you can build a car more cheaply in Asia simply because of the wage rates. Ford announced that they could actually produce a car at one-quarter of the cost in Asia than they could in Australia, but what they also said is that they could produce a car for half the cost in Europe to what you could in Australia. The wage rates in Germany are not half what they are in Australia. They would be equivalent, if not even higher, but Ford can still produce a motor car for half the cost in Germany than they can produce it in Australia.

We have to ask ourselves the question: why is that so? If we ask that question, and if we ask it honestly and look at it carefully, we might get some revealing answers. By and large, one of the problems with industry in Australia is that the people who are supposed to be running and managing the business are hamstrung in making management decisions. Manufacturing in Australia is still controlled by unions that hamstring the operators to run efficient and effective businesses. That is why the motor industry will no longer be a part of the Australian scene in a few years' time, and I suspect it is one of the reasons that we are even having a debate about the submarines. It is the same problem, and the problem is not caused by a decision by some government, other than the fact that governments have not tidied up the mess that we have in our manufacturing sector.

The Governor talked about our public sector, that we need to modernise and have a cultural change within our Public Service. I totally agree. I suspect that large portions of our Public Service, although well meaning, are more about self-serving rather than providing a service to the public, which is what they should be doing. We have public servants or bureaucracies which continually stand in the way of things happening, and I think all of us would come across this regularly as members of this place advocating for our constituents. I do almost on a daily basis.

A constituent comes into my office, they have a problem, you try to sort it out for them and you hit the brick wall. There is not a can-do, will-do attitude in our public sector, and that needs to change. We have to have an attitude ingrained within our public sector that when somebody comes forward with a good idea you do not put your hand up and try to come up with a reason that they cannot go ahead with that idea, you acknowledge that it is a good idea and say, 'How can we help you?' I have to say, as disappointing as it is, that that is not the response I normally get.

We are going to have a debate about taxation, and I welcome that as well, but I have some concerns. I have not had time to read it, but I have had a very quick look at the State Tax Review

Discussion Paper that was tabled by the Treasurer today. I draw members' attention particularly to page 12 where there are two pie charts. I think as South Australians that we have to have a really serious think about this. Commonwealth grants on average to the state treasuries—this is general revenue—is 43 per cent of the states' revenues. In South Australia it is 49 per cent. Why is it so? Why is it that we are well above the average? We are a mendicant state, yet all the Premier does is squeal that those in Western Australia and other states want to change the way the money is distributed.

The Premier should indeed be asking himself, 'Why is it so?' and, 'Is it sustainable for South Australia to rely on the generosity of the other states indefinitely?' I suspect the answer to that question is no. I suspect it is the adage the good Lord helps those who help themselves. South Australia has to start helping itself. It cannot go on forever with its hand out and we have to stop telling ourselves lies.

Further down the same page at paragraph 3.2.3 is 'Horizontal fiscal equalisation'. I call on every member to read that section because it explains the reality of the funding arrangement between the states and the commonwealth:

GST grants are the current mechanism for achieving horizontal fiscal equalisation (HFE) in Australia. The aim of HFE is to ensure that after equalisation, each State would have the capacity to provide services and associated infrastructure at the same standard if it made the same effort to raise revenue from its own sources and operated at the same level of efficiency.

That is what horizontal fiscal equalisation is. It levels out the ability for each state to supply services. Post the last federal election when the now Treasurer had an argument with the federal government about whether money should be put on South Road at Darlington or on Torrens to Torrens, he came back and said, 'What a good boy am I. What a good job have I done. We are going to get both.' At the end of the year, through horizontal fiscal equalisation, the commonwealth government said, 'You asked for those two projects when we were only prepared to give you one. You asked for it. You will get the money, but you will, under horizontal fiscal equalisation, lose money somewhere else because under the Commonwealth Constitution we have no choice. We have to treat all the states equally.'

I think it is a bit rich for the Treasurer to come in here and say the commonwealth government has withdrawn money for pensioner concessions on local government rates because that is part of the result of the deal that he did to get the extra money on the Torrens to Torrens project.

I draw members' attention to and remind them what happened when we doubled the size of the desal plant. Then premier Rann told the parliament and the people of South Australia, 'Well, one of the reasons we have done this is the commonwealth government is going to give us an extra \$120 million. That will cover a fair bit of the cost and it is a good deal at \$120 million.' He did not explain to the people of South Australia that through horizontal fiscal equalisation over the next two years we lost \$112 million of GST payments. The net benefit to South Australia for that deal was a mere \$8 million.

That is the exact same thing that is happening now, yet we have the Premier, the Treasurer and other senior ministers bleat that the commonwealth government is cutting funding to this program or that program. The commonwealth government has a signed agreement with all the states. It is locked down because of the constitution. They are all treated equally. It is the states that make the decisions on how they spend the money they get. It is the states that make those decisions. So if we are going to have a tax debate—and I am delighted that this document reveals the lie that has been told to the South Australian people—let us do it in an honest fashion. Let us do it in an honest fashion and let us have one of those informed debates where we do not talk nonsense, we do not peddle lies, and we do not try to fool ourselves or the electorate.

Regarding time zones, I agree with the member for Waite that it is a nonsense to have a half hour difference to the Eastern States. I disagree with all of those who advocate that we should adopt Eastern Standard Time. I think we should put our clocks back half an hour. Anybody who suggests that a business has trouble operating across a time zone in this day and age is quite frankly kidding themselves. It happens all over the world.

There was one printing industry business in South Australia that specialised in printing wine labels. They had their office staffed 24 hours a day such that they could supply wine labels to every wine growing district in the world. They always had somebody available to talk with their clients in South Africa, California, France, Italy and New Zealand. That is the way modern businesses operate. I think it is a nonsense. I totally agree that the half hour does make us a laughing-stock, but to go back to Eastern Standard Time because of the geographic nature of our state, the width of our state east to west, I think the burden, particularly on those people on Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast, would just be too great.

Let us not forget that our state is made up of people—mums and dads and families. Let us have a little bit of care about the impact it has on those individuals. Let us not turn around and say, 'Oh, there's only a few thousand people over there on the West Coast; they can go to hell.' That is not the way that we should be addressing that particular issue.

The Governor spent a fair bit of time talking about our democracy, our election systems and things like citizens' juries. The member for Waite touched on parliamentary reform and the deadlock of matters between the two houses. He used the phrase, 'parliament has got to reflect the will of the people.' I do not need to remind people, surely, that our democracy in this state fails to reflect the will of the people, and it has done for decades. In four of the last seven general elections in South Australia the will of the people has been denied. We have had governments which the people did not want.

The Premier came in here after question time and moved a motion to establish a select committee. He made the Governor make comments about parliamentary reform, and we have had all these red herrings brought up about political donations. Where is the evidence? Where is the evidence that the Premier can bring forward about there being a problem in this state about political donations buying favours? I can tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, if it has happened in this state in the last 12 years, we know who is at fault. The only political favour you could buy in South Australia under our current electoral system, where it is not an even race, would be from the Labor Party.

I call on the Premier, if he has some evidence, to bring it forward, because I can guarantee there has not been any political favours bought from this side of the house, because it would not be a very good purchase. Your return on your investment would not be very good. Where is the evidence? This is another red herring, because the Premier does not want to talk about the real issue with regard to our democracy. Our democracy is a sham. We have an election. We put up an agenda. The political parties and the various groups, and minor groups and individuals, put up an agenda of what they would like to deliver for the people. And the people get out and have an election, and if a significant majority of those people say, 'We like this set of plans, we like this agenda,' if we had a working democracy they would get what they asked for, but that does not happen in South Australia.

It does not happen in South Australia; in fact, South Australia is one of the very few jurisdictions anywhere in the world where we have elections and we get the sort of result that we get. There would be very few places anywhere in the world. I have said this before: it is more difficult for the Liberal Party to get onto the government benches in South Australia today than it ever was for the Labor Party to win government in Queensland. That is the reality. I will not go back over my issues with the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission. I have canvassed that before, and I will again, no doubt. The first thing we have to address about democracy in this state is electoral fairness. We have to have a system that delivers the will of the people.

I could talk a lot about this, but I will be participating in a citizens' jury affair in my electorate over the next few weeks. I have been invited to present to a group. One of the things I will be saying to them is that, if we had a decent electoral system in South Australia we would not even be going through that exercise, because my constituents would not be treated the way they have been treated.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (17:29): Thank you for the opportunity to rise and say a few words about the Governor's speech yesterday. I would like to put on the record my admiration for Hieu Van Le, the Governor, and his wife, Lan. I think they are remarkably good people and they will do a remarkably good job.

I have known Mr Le for a number of years and had quite a bit to do with him on various occasions, and to be perfectly honest, I was delighted when he was appointed Governor. But equally,

I was embarrassed for the poor man yesterday in having to eloquently read out a speech prepared by the government, which, to my mind, had a fair bit of claptrap about it and not much of any substance whatsoever. Talk about an exercise in detracting from the main game. The main game, of course, being things like the closure of the Repat hospital, the Gillman land deal, pensioner concessions and a number of other things like that. We had a substantial amount of nonsense that the poor Governor had to go through.

I would like to pick up on a few things that I feel that the Governor's speech (or the government's speech, more to the point) missed out on. I will stand to be corrected—and I have reread it—but nowhere did I hear anything whatsoever about the huge problem we have with drugs in South Australia, and particularly with our youth. Nothing about the huge problem with ice methamphetamines, the enormous problems we have with marijuana and their effects and what it is doing to our youth. I am extremely conscious of what is going on with drug use in my electorate and the awful effect it is having on communities and families, and I think the potential serious break down of some sort of community order. It is abhorrent, it is terrible, and this government spoke nothing about what you can do about drugs yesterday. Absolutely nothing! We did not hear about it.

What do you see on the news regularly? What do you hear on the news regularly about crime activities around Adelaide and, to a lesser extent, regional South Australia? Well, when you drill down into them and find out a few things that happen, you know there are a lot of drugs involved, and these people are spaced out of their minds—they are not even thinking laterally. I urge every member in this place that, if you get the slightest sniff of drug activity, dealers, people selling drugs, or where activities are taking place, let SAPOL know. You may well be doing that; I do not know.

I do not hesitate to inform police officers if I become aware of what is happening around the traps. What really infuriates me is when there are people in the community who are probably getting a few dollars on the side who let these drug dealers and whatnot know that something is about to happen—they are informed. That is not coming from within SAPOL, I can tell you—absolutely not. I am absolutely adamantly opposed to what it is doing to our community, particularly young people, and there was no mention whatsoever.

Likewise, there was no mention of any effort to try to do something in regional South Australia. I am aware that there is only one member on the other side who comes from regional South Australia—the member for Giles in this place—yet we never heard a thing about it. We never heard a thing about regional South Australia. Absolutely nothing. You can look at the member for Frome but he is actually not a member of the Labor Party—well, not at the last count, not that I know of. We have heard nothing from him either, I might add.

We heard nothing about regional South Australia and the huge effort by way of economic input that rural South Australia puts into the state economy. You just do not hear about it. Occasionally you hear one of the ministers get up and wax lyrical about what a great crop we have had, or whatever, but very little else. There is no encouragement.

The Premier today—I think it was the Premier—talked about donations and about money from the fishing industry. What he failed to also add is that that organisation predominantly fishes in commonwealth waters. It does not fish in state waters. If I can just talk about fishing for a minute, let me return to something that was once again conveniently left out: the marine park sanctuary zones. I will rot in hell before I give up on this, because it is having a catastrophic effect in my electorate, an absolutely catastrophic effect.

The rock lobster fishermen are literally on top of one another with their pots. They now have restrictions on areas where they have traditionally fished sensibly, economically and sustainably for decades. They are now all seemingly putting their pots in the same spots. It depends on the weather and where you go. A lot of things come into it. What happens with the southern rock lobster fishery around Kangaroo Island particularly is going to be a frightening scenario.

Then I read the nonsense in the paper last week by so-called experts on marine park sanctuary zones. They were saying that it has been watered down too much. A couple of people in this place need to hang their head in shame over what happened with the marine park sanctuary zones. They will be crucified politically in due course over their actions or, more to the point, inaction. It is a sad indictment on them.

Much has been said about submarines over the last few months. We have not been helped on this side by some comments that have been made by our federal colleagues, but I concur with other speakers on this side who have said—and I think the member for MacKillop said it only a few minutes ago—that if you think that the Liberal Party in South Australia, the state members, the division, do not want those submarines built in South Australia, you are stark raving bonkers. Of course we want them built in South Australia. We are desperately keen to have them built in South Australia and we will do everything possible to make sure they are built in South Australia, but it is not our call: it is the federal government's. On that note, what the hell was the federal Labor government doing for the last six or seven years? They did not do anything about it. They could have made the decision and got on with it. Now they sit there squawking like a mob of corellas having achieved absolutely nothing. Talk about sidetracking from the main issues.

We have a huge collapse in jobs in the mining sector across Australia because of world economic conditions and iron ore dropping and China's consumption of iron ore reducing accordingly. I was told by someone who went to China on a Nuffield scholarship a couple of years ago that they were actually dumping the iron ore from Australia in the sea, to store it there. They were dumping it over the sides of the ships so that they would have a stockpile. The stockpile may have surpassed the requirement for current supplies of iron ore. It is no different in my electorate. Lately we have been seeing fly-in fly-out workers in the mining sector being put out of a job pretty quickly. We have missed the boat on mining in South Australia to a large extent. I am very supportive of the mining industry but, at the moment, we have missed the boat. I think the former premier and the former treasurer, and whatnot, went off on a spending spree, thinking that we were in goldmine conditions financially, and spent what we did not have and now the state has to pick up the baggage from that effort and it is not a pretty sight.

The Governor then spoke about the nuclear power royal commission, the debate and whatnot. My personal view is, and has been for a long time, that nuclear power is the way to go. If you want a clean source of power on a very stable continent like Australia, you go nuclear. The evidence has been that it is not financially sustainable at this stage for us to put a nuclear industry or nuclear power stations in Australia and—shock, horror—the Premier has had a complete turnaround from his longstanding position (and the Labor Party's) to the extent that he said that Bill Shorten and his mob can go and do what they want to do because he is going to have a royal commission into nuclear power. I will be interested to see what comes out of this.

Some years ago, I had a constituent from Goolwa (when Goolwa was in my electorate) who came to me with a plan for putting a large nuclear power station up the gulf somewhat and pumping the water through there, using the water for Adelaide and then pumping the water further over—this was during the drought—pumping whatever water was required into the Murray (further up the Murray, at Morgan, or wherever) in an effort to increase the flows down the Murray. It seemed it was an idea that he had.

At the time, the federal member in my electorate was Alexander Downer. I gave it to him and he was very interested. He actually met with the gentleman concerned, and that would still be floating around somewhere in (possibly) the Mayo electorate office. It was not an extreme idea. It was actually a sensible and practical idea. If you want to reduce the amount of pollutants in the atmosphere, the fact of the matter is that nuclear power is the way to go. So, we will see where this debate ends up. We will see, in due course, where the royal commission findings lead us. I suspect they will probably say, 'It's a jolly good idea, but, no, we can't do it,' or something like that.

Similarly, we have another sidetracking event called the tax review. Once again, I remind the house that this is another little deviation to get away from the fact that they want to close the Repat Hospital, they want to cut pensioner concessions, they want to do this and they want to do that, so you dream up the story about a tax review. I would put nothing past the sticky hands of this government in order to generate income from the poor unsuspecting community of South Australia. Nothing they do surprises me. They have absolutely no conscience on it and they will continue to pillage the community of South Australia in an effort to boost their revenues from the ridiculous amount of expenditure they have had over the last few years when we did not have any money. It will be interesting to see where that does end up. I, along with my colleagues, will follow that with interest.

I briefly heard the member for Waite in here a while ago. I really could not be bothered with a lot of what he said because I am over him and have been for some time. As someone who was a close supporter of the member for Waite, I find the man disgusts me and I cannot be bothered even listening to him. However, that is another story.

Then, we got onto the issue of driverless cars. The issue of driverless cars; what a wonderful idea. We do not make cars anymore in Australia, or we will not do soon. We have priced ourselves right out of the market there. It is a sad indictment on Australia what has happened with the wonderful car manufacturers we have had over the years, that in a very short period of time there will be no cars manufactured in Australia.

The iconic Holden will be gone, the Ford Falcon will be gone and everything that goes with them. Many of those things were born out of World War II, and they were remarkable achievements indeed. The Holden was named after the Holden family in South Australia, some of whom I know quite well. They and the families who have gone before them must shake their heads in disbelief at what has happened to this fantastic company.

Even though it was bought out by General Motors, it maintained the name. The Holden banner will disappear from a Commodore or Calais—call it what you may. I think, once again, it is a sad indictment on where Australia has gone. We have just completely priced ourselves out of the market as far as wages go and everything else.

Let me return to a regional matter which I talked about yesterday, which was the issue of Granite Island. Only yesterday, I gave my lunch tickets to somebody else, and I went over the road and had lunch in a place on North Terrace. This particular establishment said to me, 'I have always opened on ANZAC Day for my regulars who come up here, but we cannot do it this year.' I said, 'What is the problem?' He said, 'The penalty rates just kill us. There is no way known I can pay a 17 or 18 year old \$40 an hour to wash dishes on ANZAC Day, so I am not even opening.'

What is wrong with these people? What is wrong with you? You are just destroying our small businesses with penalty rates. There was a similar issue on Granite Island to some extent with the kiosk. The peak visitation time on Granite Island is obviously the school summer holidays over December/January, but every weekend is a peak visitation time down there. The people like the kiosk owners and the operators cannot afford the penalty rates. They simply cannot afford the penalty rates that are being inflicted on them, so they just do not open. They remain shut. They have the day off.

If you go in there and make X number of dollars, then have to pay out Y and achieve a negative result, there is not much future in that. So, unless they are a family business where they do not actually have to pay wages, they are just not opening. It is all around the place. It does not matter much where you go. Across my electorate, and I suspect across everybody else's, there are businesses everywhere that do not seek to open after hours or on public holidays or whenever it costs them a fortune.

South Australia is in a mess, and it is sad. I am highly disturbed and it worries me greatly that a number of our young people are leaving the state and getting out because they just cannot see any future in South Australia. Jobs interstate are far more attractive. Places in the north and in Darwin seem to attract a lot of our young people to move there where they will not be taxed out of their brain and can afford to get a job up there or wherever they choose to go.

I note on the tourism side that the minister has had a few words to say recently. Yesterday, they talked about bringing the Fashion Festival from Norwood into the city. I say, 'Why don't you take the Fashion Festival and put it out in a couple of the big regional centres and get a few people to visit them as well?' It might sound a bit bizarre; however, there is simply not enough done to create a market for people to go out and about and get out of the metropolitan area.

Adelaide—surprise, surprise—is not the centre of the universe in South Australia. Obviously, it is our biggest population base, our biggest business centre and everything else, but it is not the be all and end all. Particularly international visitors and others who wish to see a bit more of what the state has got to offer do not really want to be in Adelaide for any time at all.

I turn to my electorate and I will just briefly touch on the dairy industry. I did not hear anything about primary industries, as I reported earlier. I heard even less about the dairy industry—a great

industry in South Australia, which has had some ideal areas in which it can grow but it is all through the hard work of the industry. It is through no help of the government.

Companies like Fleurieu Milk have done a marvellous job in expanding their operation and are now going to be putting milk into China within 24 hours. Twenty-four hours, or in some cases less, after it is milked on the farm, it will be on the shelves in China. I think that is a wonderful thing, but they have to put up with the ludicrous demands that are put on them by bureaucracy, covering all aspects of water and waste disposal and I have a regular series of complaints from the farming community on the Fleurieu particularly from the dairy sector or anyone irrigating. The poor old farmers get the impression that they are the most terrible people in creation, whatever they are doing. Here they are producing export income, producing food to feed the world, Australians and South Australians, and they are pilloried.

I think the member for MacKillop talked about the public sector in South Australia. It seems to me that it does not matter much whether it is state government or local government. All they seem intent on doing is telling you how you cannot do something instead of telling you how you can do something. I get it all the time. They are looking for assistance. In the main, they do not want financial assistance. They want to be able to get on and do what they do best and not be told why they cannot do this and they cannot do that.

A classic example is the issue of little corellas. They are decimating an area at Yankalilla. They are decimating the bowling green and around the ovals, killing the trees. In desperation, the community went to the NRM board to ask if they could assist and they said, no, they could not assist. They really were very much opposed, in my understanding, to the destruction of little corellas. You just cannot do it. Let me tell you, little corellas are not protected and I think what you are going to find is communities taking things into their own hands to try to do something about it because the bureaucracy will not.

On that issue, I also just want to briefly mention pensioner concessions. That is something that the government has announced it is doing away with because that dreadful federal government is cutting the grants and cutting the funding. The pensioner concession is \$190. The federal component of that \$190 is \$19. The government, in my view, has successfully politicised the Local Government Association to the extent that mayors and CEOs have been writing to their communities with a standard letter talking about that dreadful federal government that has cut this money and the grants.

They have not mentioned in any way, shape or form that the agreement had actually finished. Every other state as I understand it—and I will stand corrected if necessary—is continuing the pensioner concession. I say to the backbench on the other side, you want to get on to your ministry and tell them to maintain the pensioner concessions because you know what we are going to do. We have announced it and it is no news to anybody. The crossbench in the Legislative Council will move to disallow the regulations to enable the pensioner concessions to be still in place.

My office and, I am sure, many others have had streams of letters, emails and phone calls regarding pensioner concessions. I am giving the standard answer. It is \$19 out of \$190. It is a state-based concession. It is not the federal government's fault, and for the Treasurer to keep slamming the federal government every time they run out of money on some particular issue is hardly surprising, but it is hardly sensible either, in my view.

I also pick up the thread on time zones, which other members have talked about in here. My personal view is: if you want to change the time zone in South Australia, you put it back half an hour. You do not go forward half an hour, because I think it is ridiculous. In the central part of Australia, you only have to look at how the Northern Territory operates; they are in the tropics, so it is slightly different, but not so different. I do not believe, in a state as geographically broad as South Australia, that it makes any sense whatsoever to put the time zone forward. When it is discussed in our party room, we will formulate a decision, but my personal view is to put it half an hour backwards and lock into Asia.

In the few minutes remaining to me, I would like to talk about a couple of issues on the island side of my electorate. The government and the opposition (the Labor Party and the Liberal Party) are at one over the need to do seismic survey for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight. We are at

one; there is absolutely no difference of opinion on this. It has been quite interesting for me to monitor a group called OIL Free SEAS_Kangaroo Island, which has sought to attack me fairly regularly, changed a few of my speeches around to suit their own purposes, and has been quite defamatory.

I am not worried about being defamed by them in the slightest. If I tipped them upside down and shook them I think their pockets would be empty, so there is no point in suing them, and I do not think it does anything for the public debate. These people are bewilderingly naive if they think that we do not need oil and gas. They are entitled to their point of view. I think they are completely wrong. The debate has been had. The former federal government and the current federal government have all been in agreement with where we go on this. They have put in conditions, and it is monitored by federal authorities. I will be delighted for South Australia and for Australia if they find oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight, because I think we need it. That is one issue.

I am also still concerned about the lack of action on managed investment schemes for blue gums. There are 13,000 hectares on the island which remain growing and growing, and nothing is happening. It is a convoluted problem, but it is one that needs some urgent action, and we need to get something happening at that end of the island. If I get time, I will come to why that needs to happen, but that lies in tandem with the issue of freight costs.

Once again, the government have done nothing about the problems on the island. What we went through last year with this ludicrous commissioner bill was just plain ridiculous. The government have built up false hopes on the island that this commissioner is going to do everything, save everything and be everything to everybody. Let me tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, it ain't going to happen—not with \$1 million a year; that will all be sucked up in bureaucracy. You are going to have an unholy fight with government departments and agencies over there.

The bizarre part of the whole outcome is that they are now advertising for a commissioner for three days a week. Three days a week! It is absolutely ludicrous, and I am hopeful that eventually people will see through it. But, in the eyes of some people on Kangaroo Island, Pengilly is a dreadful fellow because he does not support the commissioner. Well, this is a democracy. No, I do not support the commissioner, because I see no useful purpose served by it, and yet we have seen spin, spin, spin put out in the Governor's speech, and detractions from the main events and main issues.

I will sit back and observe, note legislation and note things that happen this year, but driverless cars, changing time zones, nuclear power and other things are all sideshows in comparison to what is going to happen to people's lives with the—I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not for 20 seconds; I think you are finished. Thank you, member for Finniss.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

Parliamentary Committees

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. A.L. McLachlan to the committee in place of the Hon. S.G. Wade (resigned).

At 18:01 the house adjourned until Thursday 12 February 2015 at 10:30.