

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 12 February 2015

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 11 February 2015.)

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (10:32): I rise today to give my Address in Reply, and can I welcome the new members for Fisher and Davenport. Welcome to the family here in this place, and I wish them well in their parliamentary careers. I have the utmost respect for the Hon. Hieu Van Le, the Governor of South Australia. I have known him for a long time. I first got to know him through my local Rotary club, and let me say—I know the Governor as a person—I was a little bit disappointed when I heard the words that came out of his mouth this week. They were full of motherhood statements, and I would like to draw the house's attention to some of these. Beginning—

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley, I am not sure of the standing order, and I know the member for Hartley does not intend to reflect on His Excellency, but we are all aware of the conventions regarding the Governor's speech or The Queen's speech. Perhaps the member for Hartley's formulation of his response to that speech is somewhat inelegant.

Mr TARZIA: No problem, sir. What I would like to talk about, in that case, is the government's priorities, which I think have been perhaps called upon in the speech. As I said, it is by no means a reflection on the Governor personally, but rather on the government's priorities that I would like to draw the house's attention to.

Beginning in my own electorate, in Paradise and Glynde, what we have seen in Hartley is that this is a government that is prepared to do anything and say anything to stay in power. Within the first year of this term, we have already seen an election promise broken in Paradise, where they promised a park-and-ride facility, which they have already pulled. Secondly, in Glynde, on the eve of the last election, this government promised to find alternative land to move a substation to, which they again have failed to do. It shows that this government is prepared to literally do anything and say anything to get into power and to stay in power. It is treating the people of South Australia as if they are quite silly—but they are not. We will remember these lies that are being made, these promises that are being broken.

I want to start, firstly, on the proposed tax on the family home. In a tax review paper released just this week it was suggested that a broad-based property tax would be introduced to replace conveyance duty, costing South Australian families \$1,200 every year. Let me just say that the phones are ringing absolutely hot in Hartley; people cannot fathom this, they cannot understand how a government that prides itself on governing for all South Australians can be so out of touch—especially so out of touch with low income earners, with people who own one property. I had an elderly lady, a widow, call up. She has one house and is on a pension. How the hell is she supposed to come up with \$1,200 a year on her home? It is an absolute debacle.

You would think the government would stop at these massive ESL hikes but no, now it also wants to introduce a new tax on every family home. We are already the highest taxed state in the nation. Under this government, since 2002 state taxes have increased by 106 per cent, property charges have increased by 120 per cent, our electricity bills have increased by 140 per cent, gas bills have increased by 157 per cent and water bills have increased by 236 per cent whilst, at this very time, inflation was only 41 per cent. It is an absolute debacle.

The height of hypocrisy is what we saw this morning. I did not see one member of the government at the front standing with us, standing with war veterans, standing with doctors, standing with nurses out the front on this very hospital.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: Were you there?

Ms Hildyard: I didn't know about it.

Mr TARZIA: You did not know about it? You were not invited? I will tell you who was overlooking the whole thing, and there is a photo doing the rounds. One of your members is looking down at the Repat volunteers protesting against the disgraceful closure which your government wants to do against the Repat. It is an absolute disgrace. There are doctors in my electorate who are absolutely appalled about this. There are nurses in my electorate who are absolutely appalled about this. I fear for the next closure; I fear that the next closure after the Repat will be the Modbury Hospital. I really do fear that because, as the member for Waite once said, I believe, the first part in closing a hospital is to close its emergency room.

We understand that the government plans to close the Repat hospital, which is an absolute disgrace, and cut the emergency departments at The QEH, Modbury and Noarlunga. This will be subject to intense scrutiny. This is not going away. At the last count 30,000 people had signed this. Even the nurses federation is opposed to this; they have said that there is an outrageous lack of substance to support the proposals. Nurses are even saying that; there is a complete absence of detail in that blasé document. Transforming Health is completely at odds with the minister's previous commitments in this area.

There is a question that I have for all government members: are you with us? Are you with the doctors? Are you with the nurses? Are you with the volunteers? Are you with the war veterans, who have made extreme sacrifices, some of the highest sacrifices, for their country? Are you with us or are you against us? You should stand up to your government, because this is an absolute disgrace. This is more than a hospital, this is a symbolic gesture—

Mrs Vlahos: You don't even understand the terminology. They're veterans. Some of them are peacekeepers; they are not just war veterans, they are peacekeepers as well.

Mr TARZIA: Absolutely, and all the rest. Exactly right.

Mrs Vlahos: All the rest! You don't even know the terminology, you don't even know the portfolio—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I just remind members—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet. That means you sit down. All members are entitled to be heard in silence, so I remind members of standing order 142. I will not hesitate to draw up the book today and start warning and calling people to order. Please do not lower the decorum of the chamber.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: All of you—and if I hear you giggle once more you will be down for 'audible giggling'.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes; not just laughter but giggling. It is a new ruling. Speaker Bishop will take note.

Mr TARZIA: There has also been commentary by several members in relation to the lack of attention given to the regions by this government. Let me just say that I reiterate the points. I also reiterate the points made by the member for Morphett in relation to the CFS. I cannot believe it: I am being approached by former members of the Labor Party who are resigning in droves because of

the CFS changes and the unhappiness that they have with the union situation in that proposal. They are coming to us. Let it be a sign to this government that this is not going away.

In relation to jobs, I fear for many young professionals in this state, from what they are saying to me. It is a bit like that show *The Young and the Restless*: they are young and they are restless at the moment. They are wanting new opportunities to embark on. They are wanting to stay in South Australia. They want to grow up and live here—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell is called to order.

Mr TARZIA: Thank you for your protection, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And you will be, too, if you need to comment on things from the Chair.

Mr TARZIA: We saw the latest ANZ job data released just recently. There were just 151 jobs advertised in South Australia per week in January. That is a 17 per cent decline in one month and a 60 per cent fall over the last 12 months, as the member for Unley pointed out. Can you believe it? In fact, there are now fewer South Australians in jobs than when Labor promised to create 100,000 new jobs just five years ago. This is the point, Deputy Speaker: this government will do anything and say anything to get into power and stay in power. How is that 100,000 figure going? Earlier this week we heard how the 6,000 figure at Gillman could not be justified. The 100,000 figure cannot be justified. What is the point of having priorities if you cannot stick to them?

That is even before we talk about tax. We have seen, this week, a paper released by Treasury about tax reform. A state tax review discussion paper has been released, and it says that they are open to radical reform of our taxation system. Let me tell members that I think radical reform is definitely needed because, when you put all your eggs in one basket and the bet does not pay off, you have to hedge your bets.

Nothing is out of bounds, they say, be it taxes, levies or concessions. I would like to point out an article published in *The Advertiser* whereby Business SA and the Lord Mayor actually backed an initiative for tax-free zones for start-ups. If you are serious about bringing investment into South Australia, let us see something like this. It will bring people into South Australia. You want certain things: you have certain objectives, I understand, in your tax review, being revenue, business, households, efficiency and stability. What better way than to create economic tax-free zones in this state? It has been done in Dubai and it has been done in New York. It is a fantastic opportunity for this government to now show some vision and get on with the job, because young people are leaving the state in droves. Businesses are not setting up in droves because they cannot afford to do business in this state.

You would think that, following the announcement of a bold agenda, we actually would have had it, but what do we have? We had a time zone distraction. Give me a break: what is going to be next—an eight day week? Seriously! As Valdman pointed out in *The Advertiser*, I think he referred to someone as Jetson Jay. Give me a break. Again, they have failed South Australians by refusing to tackle the biggest challenges facing our state and, instead, they throw in this curve ball called a time zone distraction.

We can make all the arguments in the world about time zones and doing business with the east coast, the west coast, the north coast or the south coast, or whatever—or Antarctica, for that matter—but a point was raised with me that really touched my heart when I was walking to parliament this week. A person from the West Coast said to me, 'Vincent, my family and I live on the West Coast and lighting and darkness as to when people go to work and finish work and the amount of time that they can spend on their families is leading to such issues as it is.' We all know that mental health is such an issue in the country. I thought that was a very interesting point of view and I had to relay that to the house. It just goes to show that this government is not interested in the regions. They obviously do not care about mental health in the country. If they do, they would have at least considered something like that before they put forward a preposterous idea like proposing changing the time zone.

Where are the priorities here? Where is the evidence that change is needed? I have not seen any of it. I invite the government to present some of these facts to the house. They talk about having conversations, they talk about listening—well, where is it?

I want to also draw the house's attention to the nuclear debate. Many years ago the then premier supported and stood side by side with that great Labor luminary—which one was it?—Mark Latham, a great Labor luminary.

Members interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: How is that going for you?—and Mike Rann.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Colton. The member for Colton is called to order.

Mr TARZIA: In 2004, the Hon. Mr Rann said:

I am proud, as Premier of this state, to stand here today to put on the record for generations to come that last Wednesday 14 July 2004 the federal government abandoned its plans to establish a national radioactive waste repository in the north of South Australia. This is a great victory for the people of South Australia—

That's how he would have said it, too, 'a great victory for the state of South Australia.' Finally, the left of the Labor Party have been brought to the table kicking and screaming.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TARZIA: They have squibbed our mining boom; the left has squibbed this boom. The Governor's speech spoke about the 25 years of uranium production. Yes, we do have the largest-known uranium reserves in the world. Amazing: who would have thought the Treasurer finally rummaged through that with his staff and has convinced the left, and they finally discovered that we have uranium in South Australia. I actually raised that in my maiden speech, Deputy Speaker, 10 or 11 months ago. I cannot believe it has taken the Premier and his Treasurer 13 years of government to understand the fact that we are sitting on minerals and potential exports of extraordinary wealth.

In fact, Andrew Bolt—my good friend—released an article. I think I have been quite fair, without referring to Andrew Bolt. Deputy Speaker, you might know of his politics—he also raised this exact thing. It is just a shame, in all fairness, that they have discovered that mining exists when global commodity prices have halved.

I was talking to the Treasurer about this recently. I understand that he is working hard in this area but the mining boom, that every state experiences, has passed us by. Western Australia's exports—have a look at them: they were \$130 billion last financial year. How much was ours? It was \$16 billion.

The government wants an informed debate about the nuclear industry and technology. Mike Rann led a government that included Jay Weatherill and Tom Koutsantonis and they were instrumental in shooting down, as I referred to, a proposal to have a nuclear dump in outback South Australia, spreading a climate of fear about nuclear energy and its potential in Australia. That is what the left does best, but I welcome the left to be brought to the table kicking and screaming after they have wasted years of opportunity, years of prosperity in this state, years of jobs in this state.

They have realised that we are in serious economic decline here in South Australia and they have abandoned their false idealism. Why? Because you have to be practical. They have been brought kicking and screaming into the 21st century. I welcome Labor's inquiry but it is about 20 years too late. If we had this debate 20 years ago we would be a very prosperous state today.

Ms Digance: You should have done your maiden speech 20 years ago.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order

Mr TARZIA: Twenty years ago I was eight years old. I wasn't allowed to vote. You might want to change that law; I'm not sure. What about pensioner concessions, talking about the cost of

living? An absolutely disgraceful treatment by this government. Pensioner concessions still exist in every other state: why not South Australia? Because the poor economic and budgetary management of the Labor Party after 13 years has allowed them to be drawn into this situation to the point where these measures are being taken by them. The worst offenders in this whole charade are the government and the Treasurer who seek to blame everyone else for budget problems other than themselves.

I am so disappointed in David O'Loughlin who I thought was quite a reasonable chap but politically he is a failed Labor candidate. He has led, from the LGA, what has been a very disappointing campaign. I am very disappointed in David O'Loughlin. I thought he was better than that.

It is the Labor government that has scrapped the concessions. It is Labor that has spent 13 years wasting our declining revenue on projects that create little or no economic growth. After all of this it is Labor that uses your money to fund its partisan campaigns. Where was David O'Loughlin with the other partisan campaigns? Are you going to be drawn into these partisan campaigns?

To add insult to injury, Labor have also written to councils across South Australia to use ratepayers' money for their campaign. And Labor and the affiliates in the LGA are using one hand to take money from pensioners and the other they are using for public money to fund their own interests. This is absolutely appalling of the Local Government Association, and I absolutely and unequivocally condemn it.

On page 12 of the speech, freedom of expression was referred to. That is why in the Liberal Party we supported shield laws on this side of the chamber. If the government is serious they will support shield laws too. On page 13 there was a reference to corporate campaign contributions and how they can be inappropriately used to influence public policy. Yet, when queried yesterday during question time, not one of the government ministers could point out evidence of this. Where is the evidence? Where is the evidence of this influence? We have an ICAC. If there is something that is alleged to be corrupt, report it.

Why do we need more red tape in this area? The government simply wants to tighten the taps. They want to tighten the taps to try to stay in power, because that is all they are interested in. They are not interested in saving money; they are only interested in staying in government. So, if there are lobbyists threatening the integrity of our political processes, again, where is the evidence and why has it not been reported to ICAC, and why has it not come out, and why have they not been put on the record? In relation to the citizens' jury that is referred to—

Mr Knoll: Which one?

Mr TARZIA: Yes exactly, which one? Well, I will tell you the best one. The best citizens' jury are the people of South Australia, 53 per cent of whom did not vote—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: How did they vote? Fifty three per cent—did they vote for this government? No, they did not vote for this government, did they? That is the best citizens' jury. If you want to start talking about systems, if you want to start making sure that a group of peers are deeply involved in the decision-making process, well, get the electoral system right. My colleague to the right here has been on a crusade to do that for some time.

After having such disgraceful NAPLAN results, I welcome the requirement for teachers to hold a Masters level qualification. I have had an enormously positive contribution from teachers in my electorate who have had welcome things to say about that. Again, it is just a shame that it has been left this long, that these standards have been allowed to deteriorate so much.

In relation to school amalgamations, I note that it is pointed out that it needs to be explored to further amalgamate facilities. That to me is just a big red flag. I want to know from this government, and on behalf of the parents in my electorate, on behalf of the teachers in my electorate, on behalf of the students in my electorate, where the amalgamations are going to occur. They need to come forward and tell us. Where are the amalgamations going to occur? Is a broke state government going

to sell off school land, just like the McNally site has been sold off, just like other schools around the state are being sold off? Shame on this government for selling off school land.

South Australia certainly has an ageing population, and it is essential to make use of the best technology and to work closely with health professionals and the community. As someone who has over 5,000 households with people over 60 in Hartley, I could not agree more. I could not agree more that more work has to be done. That is why I cannot believe that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is going to have fewer beds; it's going to have fewer beds than the existing one. How does that even work?

Then they talk about prisons. They want to talk about prisons and how they want to look at options behind fines and behind prisons. They say that people who are not dangerous to others can be managed. Well, if you are not dangerous why are you in prison in the first place? Not only that, why are the gaols full? Former police officers would know why the gaols are full, because this government had a policy to rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em. And do you know what? When you do that they get full. Now that they are broke and now that the gaols are full and they have stopped building some of them, and that sort of thing, they want to look at other ways to host prisons. Where are we going to keep them?

Mr Knoll: We can bring them in here.

Mr TARZIA: We are going to bring them in here, the member for Schubert says. It was pointed out by the government that democracy should not discriminate, and I could not agree more: democracy should not discriminate. It is a wonderful thing. It is something I am very proud to represent—democracy—and yet we do not have that with our current electoral system. I encourage the government to take that up.

South Australia's exports are also setting a very concerning trend. I briefly touched on how other states have taken advantage of the mining boom and other export issues and how we have been lagging behind. We have been lagging behind for way too long. We have seen the current debacle with Gillman and other issues. The Attorney seems to be in a hurry to reform our current legal system. I would say that that is because he is about to be appointed to the bench. I welcome the Attorney's reform agenda, but let's see some reform. Let's see some courage from the government on this issue.

For far too long now South Australia has been dwindling. South Australia is falling behind compared to the rest of Australia and it is just not good enough. We need to do something. We need bold action now. There are a number of ways to boost tax revenue, if tax revenue is the concern of the government. How about trying to grow the economy? It is going to be much better than taxing yourself out of the market, just like the government has taxed itself out of the market on other issues in other areas.

What about tourism? We know that tourism businesses have been decimated under Labor. Tourism Australia research data recently showed that all 12 of South Australia's tourism regions recorded a decrease in the number of tourism businesses operating within their respective regions. These are extremely disappointing stats, confirming the loss of one million visitor nights from regional South Australia in the last two years alone. It is partly because of this toxic business environment.

You can have small bars. Do not get me wrong, small bars are great, but you need more than that. People want more of a reason to come here. I am embarrassed. I want this state to do well. If you guys come up with a good idea, I will support it, but come up with some vision, with some energy, something that is actually going to get this state moving so that young people will want to stay here, so that people will want to stay in South Australia to raise a family and retire. At the moment that is just not happening.

Tourism Australia research statistics show that, since 2010, 855 tourism businesses have disappeared from Adelaide, 74 from the Fleurieu Peninsula, 62 from Yorke Peninsula, 51 from Eyre Peninsula, 49 from the Limestone Coast, 47 from the Flinders Ranges and Outback, 41 from the Riverland, 17 from the Murraylands and five from Kangaroo Island.

It has to be apparent by now that raising taxes to unsustainable levels is not conducive to creating a productive economy which fosters small business growth. After 13 years of Labor, we

have seen payroll tax almost double and the ESL skyrocket. We have the highest water and electricity prices in the country. Some of these costs are obviously passed on. It is not rocket science.

I want to see some vision from this government in relation to tourism. We have fantastic regions, they are second to none. We have many regional members here. They share my disappointment as far as this government is concerned. One thing is for sure: we will see the frequent flyer points of the Minister for Tourism go up this year, but I want to see tourism revenue also go up. I have no problem with ministers going overseas and bringing business back, but let's see some results. I pray on behalf of the people of South Australia.

In summing up, Deputy Speaker, what can I say? I am very disappointed in this government. I came to parliament as a representative of my local area with great ideals, wanting to make a difference and wanting to see the government, which has a civil duty to perform for the people of South Australia (even though it does not have a mandate to be here, having 47 per cent) make some tough decisions. These tough decisions need to be made because, with spiralling debt, increasing deficit, reducing revenues, a cost base that is not promoting the facilitation of wealth for businesses or the facilitation of jobs in South Australia, South Australia needs change. It needs to go in a different direction.

That is why I am disappointed. This government has let South Australia down, not just my local area but across the state. I want to see some change from this government. Stand up and be counted. Do what the people have elected us to do as representatives, and that is to govern well and govern properly for all South Australians. Let's get South Australia moving again.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (10:59): That is a hard act to follow, Vincent. I will not be as shouty as the previous speaker, but I do wholeheartedly support this motion. I would like to add my voice to the member for Hartley's and others who have congratulated the (now not so new) Governor Hieu Van Le on his appointment. I do not know the Governor personally, as others here do, but I have made the observation, in the short time that I have seen him at work, that he is always the best-dressed man in the room. His sartorial elegance puts the rest of us to shame and should be an inspiration to us. I am sure he has other qualities too, but—

The Hon. P. Caica: What are you saying? What about me?

Mr ODENWALDER: With the exception of the member for Colton—

The Hon. P. Caica: Thank you.

Mr ODENWALDER: —I think he is always the best-dressed man in the room. I do want to thank all the other contributors for their contributions to this Address in Reply. I particularly want to pay tribute to the new member for Fisher, and congratulate her on her election and also on her elegant, honest, passionate and brave Address in Reply yesterday; I want to particularly acknowledge her.

There were some highlights for me in the speech and I am really pleased that some areas of policy which I am particularly passionate about are forming part of the Weatherill government's agenda for the next three years and beyond, so I will go through them in turn. Firstly, I welcome the government's continued focus on making Adelaide, as our capital, more vibrant, more livable, more cycle and pedestrian friendly, and, as part of this agenda, the ambitious aim to make Adelaide the world's first carbon-neutral city.

The Governor made it clear that people, particularly young people, judge a city by the vibrancy of its capital. Over the term of this government, the city has undoubtedly become a more exciting place to live and to visit. The small bar and restaurant scene is thriving; the music scene, which was such a fixture of Adelaide in the 1970s and 1980s—and I am proud to have played a minor role in that—is coming alive again; and the Riverbank Precinct, of course, is the jewel in the crown and will only get better. I regularly walk the stretch of Linear Park which runs from the Zoo to the weir, and a more beautiful piece of urban parkland you would be hard pressed to find anywhere.

So, despite what others have said, I think there is a sense of progress and renewal everywhere. I am really excited that the government is continuing with this agenda, and indeed there will be even more of a focus on walkability, on cycling, on public transport, and on electric and even

driverless vehicles. I note that the mention of driverless vehicles has been the subject of some mirth on the other side of the house, but this may prove to be the most visionary part of the agenda that the Governor outlined. There has been massive investment in driverless vehicles overseas. The technology and political will to trial and embrace this technology is evolving, and it is growing in leaps and bounds.

The US, of course, has been a leader in places like San Francisco and Los Angeles, but Germany and London both have, in the past month, announced large-scale trials with a view to making driverless vehicles part of their transit mix. So, as I said, it is moving ahead in leaps and bounds, and who knows where it will end. It is absolutely visionary for the government to move now to make sure that the regulatory and legislative frameworks are in place to embrace this technology. These are exciting times, and I hope that this agenda gets bipartisan support. There is no reason why Adelaide cannot hold its head high and stand side by side with Portland, Toronto, Copenhagen and even Melbourne, as a leader in liveability and sustainable urban development.

As a complement to all this, I am really pleased that the government has committed to renewing all of its old Housing Trust stock over the next 15 years. This is great news for communities like mine, ultimately, and I will be lobbying for the renewal of the stock, particularly in Elizabeth, as soon as is practical. This will hopefully dovetail neatly with the City of Playford's commendable goal of making Elizabeth a genuine second CBD.

It is my hope that we can create in the north—in my hometown—a community every bit as liveable, walkable and cycleable as Adelaide is becoming. I want to be part of that, and I intend to devote a lot of my own energy over my remaining time in this place to helping to make that happen. I think that the clearer and more open approach to limiting and changing the urban growth boundary is another real step in the right direction.

We do not talk about transport-oriented developments (TODs) as much as we used to, but however you describe them—TODs, hubs, urban villages—it still makes sense to concentrate medium and high-density living and mixed-use residential and commercial developments around existing transport nodes, such as Elizabeth train station and city centre. The urban village example, which I would like to explore further at another time, has already been used in places like Seattle, particularly, with quite a lot of success. I think it mirrors what councils like the City of Playford ultimately want to achieve within the state's 30-year plan.

These ideas are not particularly new: it is back to the future, really. Suburban planning over the last 30 years or so has moved away from what it used to be towards the sprawl, towards McMansions, the cul-de-sac, the enormous undercover shopping centres surrounded by oceans of car park. These are developments that are designed with the best intention—to make people feel safe—but they often isolate people, and they do not encourage a sense of community.

The urban village movement, or whatever you want to call the move towards more liveable cities, is a move back to community, a move back to the main street and to seeing many of your neighbours every day, walking, cycling, and really living with each other instead of steadfastly apart from each other. I fully intend to be part of this movement in my own community and, particularly this year, to expend a great deal of energies to that end.

But, as you know well, Deputy Speaker, our community in the north faces challenges. I never thought I would see the day when we do not make cars in Elizabeth. My dad worked there, as I have said many times, my uncles, my brothers-in-law—I have so many connections to that place that I cannot count them. I still hold out a sliver of hope that something substantial might fill that particular gap, but the slow wind down and the ultimate closure of Holden is presenting the north with a challenge that is serious but not insurmountable.

The local community and this government have responded by assisting workers to assess their own skills and to retrain and move into other industries through the Workers' in Transition Program which is getting up and running, and also by helping automotive component manufacturers to diversify, to transition and be sustainable and retain their workforce. I particularly want to pay tribute to the former minister for automotive transformation (member for Port Adelaide). I was lucky enough to visit some supply chain industries both large and small, and I saw how her passion and

her dedication made a difference to the attitudes of both the workers and the employers she spoke to.

There is more work to do, obviously, and I offer the new Minister for Automotive Transformation, along with the task force led by Greg Combet but also extremely ably served by, among others, my predecessor, the Hon. Lea Stevens, and AMWU secretary, John Camillo, my full support in the hope of making the closure of Holden as painless as possible.

Moving on, I also wholeheartedly support this government's intention to set up a royal commission into the nuclear industry. I note that those opposite support that and I think we will get a good, strong, bipartisan position on at least exploring these issues and investigating what role South Australia can and should play in the nuclear fuel cycle, because this is an idea whose time has well and truly come. We are obviously in a unique position here in South Australia. We are home to the world's largest uranium mine, with prospective potential for far more. We are politically stable. We are, for the most part, geologically stable. We are extremely well regulated with highly-developed environmental safeguards.

It may well be that nuclear power generation proves uneconomic and, of course, we do have abundant opportunities for renewable energy development, but we should certainly investigate it, and we should most certainly investigate the opportunities for value-adding in the form of uranium enrichment. Above all, we should support this royal commission and let it gather its evidence and then make policy based on that evidence.

With the time left available to me, very close to the top of the list for me on this government's agenda is the growing recognition of the scale and seriousness of domestic violence or family violence. I know there are different problems with using different terms, but I will use the terms interchangeably today, and I hope I do not unduly offend anyone in doing so. The Governor said that his government will continue to strengthen responses to violence against women, and he outlined some of the new initiatives, particularly a court assistant service and an early warning system to provide an escalation point if there have been flaws in the responses of a government agency to reports of violence.

These are all commendable developments and perhaps long overdue but they do come on top of this government's and the Premier's real commitment to tackling the epidemic of family violence and, particularly, to treat the causes of this violence by reaching out to men, both to change their own behaviour and, importantly, to clearly and openly challenge the behaviour of other men. As the Governor said, this approach will ultimately improve the lives and relationships of men as well as women. As I said, the Premier has shown a real and genuine commitment to tackling family violence and to making it a priority. We know it is a priority; indeed, the Premier has called it an emergency. Already this year, six people have actually died as a result of domestic violence and that is in addition to the many instances of violence.

On 1 January, Sydney hairdresser Leila Alavi was stabbed to death allegedly by her estranged husband. Her body was found in a car in an underground car park near her workplace. On 20 January, Renee Carter and Corey Croft were stabbed to death at their Gold Coast home, allegedly by Ms Carter's former partner. The couple's five-year-old son was home when the killings took place and he told neighbours that he found the bodies.

On 25 January, a 50-year-old woman was murdered by her partner in Perth's northern suburbs. Police say the man killed the woman before taking his own life. On 2 February, a pregnant Gold Coast woman, Fabiana Palhares, died from massive head injuries after she was allegedly attacked by her former partner, who has been charged with murder. She was reportedly attacked with a small axe. On 7 February, a mother of two, Adelle Collins, was found stabbed to death at her home in Ningi, near Bribie Island, north of Brisbane. Her former partner was charged with murder.

Here in South Australia, in the wake of the coronial inquiry into the death of Zahra Abrahamzadeh we had to come to terms with some serious flaws in our overall responses to reporting, investigation and prosecution of family violence matters. The Premier and the government moved quickly to announce new measures to tackle this problem and also, importantly, to commit the government to an open-ended search for real long-term solutions.

One of the most important initiatives, and one which can, in my view, form the basis of many future improvements to the system, is the establishment of the multiagency protection service, bringing together staff and experts from SAPOL, Families SA, Housing SA, health and education in order to share information and provide well-coordinated responses and early intervention in cases of domestic violence.

As I said at the outset, I am passionate about this issue. I am lucky enough—indeed, looking at the stats, I am unusually lucky—never to have been personally touched by family violence, but I did work for several years as a police officer attached to Elizabeth patrols and Elizabeth CIB inquiry section. It is difficult to quantify now, but an enormous amount of our work was dealing with what we would call then 'domestics'. It is a notoriously difficult area to police, for cultural and structural reasons, and one of our challenges is to make systemic and legislative change which would lead to better outcomes for investigators and for prosecutors of these crimes. This is easier said than done, of course, and the sheer size and complexity of the problem means that any increase in convictions of family violence offenders throws up further social problems as unintended consequences.

However, these are problems we need to grapple with, and we should not be deterred from treating these crimes as crimes, crimes which ruin lives, crimes which irreparably damage children and by extension damage our society. I am certain that there will be more reform on the way and I personally will be doing all I can to ensure that all options are explored. I know that following a motion from the member for Reynell, who I know is deeply committed to this area of policy, the Social Development Committee will soon be examining some of these issues. I will be following this inquiry with great interest.

Towards the end of last year, I became aware of some work that was being done by the UK Law Reform Commission in relation to offences against the person, or assaults, in order to simplify and modernise the UK's sprawling offences against the person statutes. Part of the consultation focused on whether domestic violence offences should be designated as stand-alone offences rather than simply classed as assaults.

The Law Reform Commission is due to bring down its recommendations later this year (in fact, submissions closed yesterday), but the UK government is already moving on this. In particular, they are moving to criminalise nonviolent domestic abuse, controlling and coercive behaviour, financial abuse and the like, which already constitute grounds for intervention orders but are not criminal behaviour. I think there are good arguments for making specific offences related to domestic violence. The law already acknowledges intimate relationships of trust as aggravating factors, but I think—and this is my opinion—clearly labelling them would have some real benefits.

I do not want to comment particularly on police operations. I will note that the Coroner's report into Zahra Abrahimzadeh's death made it clear that there were some serious deficiencies. I think they were broadly canvassed at the time and I think SAPOL responded to them quickly and thoroughly and is still responding to them. I think that some of these deficiencies could perhaps be explained by broader society attitudes towards domestic violence as a private domestic matter and often not as a serious crime.

In 2013, the UK home secretary commissioned her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) to review police responses to domestic violence. In their subsequent report, the HMIC made it clear that police, at least in the UK context, did not always see domestic violence as a serious crime, particularly when it is seen as nonviolent.

I do not want to give the impression that I think police do not take domestic violence seriously, because I know for a fact that they do. I am also not denying for a second that there are complex social issues behind these crimes, but our society's attitude to domestic violence—that it is essentially a private matter—and a sometimes understandable reluctance to break up families, may impact on police actions, so I think that creating specific offences within or without the CLCA for violent and nonviolent domestic abuse may send a clear and consistent message to police and to other front-line agencies that these acts are crimes. They are not just grounds for intervention orders; they are actual crimes. They are serious crimes and they should be prosecuted. Offenders should be arrested. They should be charged and they should be prosecuted.

The Home Office consultation paper into offences against the person notes that explicitly capturing this in legislation may also help victims identify the behaviour they are suffering as wrong and encourage them to report it and cause perpetrators to rethink their behaviour.

I think there will be other advantages in specifically labelling these offences, whether or not they attracted different penalties. The first is it may help in the collection of data and provide clearer statistics for use in further evidence based responses. Secondly, it may help people who need this information get easier access to it and to know that the people they are dealing with are a certain type of criminal. Frontline police officers will know when they read an offender's history on their PIMS system. Courts will know when they read antecedent reports and consider past behaviour and even employers will know when they look at potential employees' clearance certificates.

I hasten to add again, this is not government policy and I am happy to be proved wrong about any of these matters, but I think we should be considering all avenues to address domestic violence. In that vein, another idea which I have flagged the government might consider is a domestic violence disclosure scheme such as that recently trialled and rolled out across the UK. In the UK it is known as Clare's Law after a woman called Clare Wood who was murdered in 2009 by a man she met on the internet and who had a long history of domestic violence. She approached police time and time again and for various reasons her pleas were ignored.

The scheme basically provides a framework whereby police working with other agencies can disclose details about an offender's history of domestic violence to potential victims and to others who might be in a position to prevent future violence. The scheme, as it operates in the UK, has two components for the disclosure of information—the right to ask and the right to know.

The first, the right to ask, gives people, whether they are a potential victim or someone concerned for another person's safety, the right to ask police about a partner's previous history of domestic violence or violent acts. The second, the right to know, means that police can proactively disclose information in certain circumstances. For both of these requests police perform a series of checks and risk assessments to build up a picture of the potential victim and their partner. If concerns are raised, police obviously go through a rigorous process of checking facts with all their relevant agencies.

As I mentioned before, our new multi agency protection service in the South Australian context would be ideally placed to facilitate this process and decide which agency, if any, would be the best to disclose the information to the applicant. Obviously, if there is an imminent danger identified, police will either disclose immediately or act in some other appropriate way. Conversely, they may decide not to disclose for one reason or another, and obviously there are many privacy issues attached to this.

It is early days and the scheme is not without its critics, obviously, but it appears that the scheme has been very successful in the UK. Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner, Paddy Tipping, talks about the protection of vulnerable people to prevent them from entering a violent relationship, and he notes research that it is much harder to reach a victim once they have committed themselves to an abusive partner. So these measures will be about prevention, labelling these people as criminals and then giving potential victims the information to make informed choices about their and their children's safety.

I say again that this is only my opinion, obviously not government policy, but we should be examining every option. I think the Governor's speech made it clear that we will be doing all we can to tackle domestic violence, and I will follow the inquiry in the Social Development Committee with great interest.

So, as I said at the outset, the Governor's speech was bold. It was visionary despite what we may have heard from the other side. It foreshadowed major changes to our approach to education, to the tax system, to the criminal justice system and, of course, to the health system, and I commend the motion.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:18): I am pleased to make a contribution to the Address in Reply and I would like to thank His Excellency the Governor, Hieu Van Le, for presiding over the opening of the Second Session of the Fifty-Third Parliament.

I would like to congratulate the newly elected members to this place that we saw sworn in on the first day of sitting on the Tuesday of this week. The newly elected member for Fisher—may her career be rewarding and her time here in the parliament be rewarding, not necessarily long, while she is here. In particular, my hearty congratulations to the newly elected member for Davenport. Congratulations to him. I am confident that the newly elected member for Davenport's career and performance will be at least that of his predecessor. Congratulations to both the members for Davenport and Fisher.

I want to spend some time raising issues in relation to the recent emergency that part of the state was confronted with being the Sampson Flat bushfire, and I understand there is a motion before the house to be debated in relation to issues concerning the fire. That fire was of significance, particularly to me personally, my family and a section of my electorate. It covered the electorates of Schubert, Morialta, Newland, and I think it may have even crept into Little Para into the north.

Mr Knoll: Maybe Playford as well.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: And Playford into the north-east. It was a significant emergency that the state faced. In relation to my own experience, my home property was directly in the line of the fire front at a number of stages in the course of that fire over the five days that it was burning in what was regarded as an uncontained manner. Thank goodness, due to the direction of the wind, the fire front did not progress any closer than two kilometres to our home property. I was very thankful.

I woke up on that Saturday morning very early at 4.45am with the whole district surrounded in a shroud of smoke and listening to the radio warnings in the morning. We were facing a very precarious and threatening environment on that Saturday morning, something that conjured memories of Ash Wednesday, with the forecast of 110km/h winds coming from the north which would have blown the fire straight onto our property and the surrounding districts. Thank the Lord that did not occur. We were fortunate, not like many property owners who lost a significant amount of property and their homes.

I want to make this observation, and I probably will not get time today to cover all the issues coming out of this fire event, and we will look to cover that perhaps when we get to debate the motion before the house. The emergency part of it lasts for about two or three days and that is a very anxious period for many people. You have to experience it firsthand to understand the level of anxiety that an individual experiences, and I can tell you that I and my family were experiencing significant levels of anxiety on that Saturday morning when we were looking at the fire blowing onto our property.

It is like everything. You have to experience it firsthand to understand what it is like. However, the emergency passes in two or three days but then we move to what we call the recovery period. While the emergency is up to about four days, the recovery period is two to four months, two to four years, two to four decades. I know some folks perhaps have not recovered fully from the Ash Wednesday fire in 1983, which was 32 years ago.

We need to be very mindful of the recovery process and the recovery period as a consequence of an emergency. I know there are quite a number of community meetings being held in the Hills and surrounding districts, and the member for Morialta and I attended one of those meetings in the Cudlee Creek hall. It was a very good meeting run by the CFS and SAPOL, and they had some other government officers from DPTI. The town hall was to capacity.

These community-held meetings are a very important—I want to emphasise that—a very important part of the recovery process. There was a meeting held at Gumeracha last night that was encouraging to a lot of the people and property owners in and around Gumeracha, because that township and surrounding areas was directly affected by the fire. I have some meetings with some constituents tomorrow at Gumeracha in relation to that.

The government has done an excellent job with the recovery. Obviously at this time I want to acknowledge and sincerely thank the magnificent effort particularly of our CFS volunteers, all the other emergency service people involved and also SAPOL. Our police obviously played a very significant role in managing part of the emergency where we saw no life lost. It was a crucially important part of the whole process that we did not see one life lost, compared to many, many lives lost in Ash Wednesday. So I want to acknowledge and sincerely thank our CFS volunteers for doing

a magnificent job. If I have time I will get onto other issues relating to the CFS and the appalling treatment that the government is showing to our CFS volunteers at the moment.

It is very important to acknowledge the contribution that the New South Wales Rural Fire Service played in assisting in our emergency. On the Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of the fire, I went to my local CFS brigade station at Paracombe and offered my assistance. I helped a friend of mine who provided his water tanker truck to go out and supply homes that had been affected by the fire and had run out of water. They were not on mains water and had run out of water by them fighting the fire. We were refilling rainwater tanks and also some CFS appliances. Obviously we were not on the fireground, but it saved them a trip back to the fire hydrant by the station. On the Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of that week I assisted in that role, and I was very pleased to do that, in a small way assisting the local community.

A local recovery centre has been established at Gumeracha. I called at the centre a number of weeks ago and met the Hon. Karlene Maywald, who has been tasked with the job as the coordinator of the recovery. She has a big job to coordinate the recovery process. My meeting with her went for about half an hour. I just called in. I did not actually know she would be there. I called in to say hello, introduce myself and greet the people in the centre. I met some Red Cross ladies who were there and introduced myself, with my big booming voice in this small area. Obviously, it got the attention of Ms Maywald and she appeared at the door of an office, so we had quite a worthwhile meeting that morning.

It is very important that the house and members who have not experienced a fire emergency such as we have just seen are very aware of the recovery process. It is an enormously important part of the whole thing. As I said, the fire burnt in a number of electorates and consumed over 10,000 hectares—a significant area of land—and was actually comprised of two fires. When the member for Morialta and I attended that meeting, the regional commander involved in it—region 1 I think it was, wasn't it, John?

Mr Gardner: Think so.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Region 1.

Mr Gardner: The one north of the river.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, the one north of the river. The regional commander gave us a time line of the progress of the fires and when the responses were made. That was a very informative part of the meeting, I thought. There were actually two fires. The Sampson Flat bushfire was comprised of two separate fires. I have taken some notes. At 13:46, the first fire was contained. So, at 1.46pm in the afternoon, the first fire was contained, and then, at 14:14—14 minutes past 2pm—the second fire was reported, and that was the fire that blew up and started to just compound in its ferocity through the land and the area it consumed.

I know the police are continuing their investigations in relation to the causes of the fire. We would be very interested to have the reports of the investigation, once they are completed, because there are a lot of rumours flying around in the local district in relation to the cause of the fires, but it is not for me to speculate about that. At the community meeting that both the member for Morialta and I attended, there was obviously the information part that ran for about three-quarters of an hour. CFS officers spoke, the local inspector for the LSA from SAPOL spoke and representatives from DPTI spoke, and then they took questions. There was a range of questions, but one of the key issues that has come from these community meetings and the feedback to Ms Maywald, which she raised with me and which local people raised with me as well, is the issue of return to home.

Understandably, roadblocks were put in place by SAPOL for the safety of people, but there were sections of the area that were not affected directly by the fire front. As a consequence, those roads were open. They were not obstructed by falling trees or the like. The member for Morphett is a member of the CFS and he was on a fire truck. He was taking a unit, I think, up to Williamstown, and he told me that some of those roads through the Hills were obstructed. You can see now where the trees have fallen over the road and smashed down onto the guard rail, because some sections of the guard rail have been destroyed and have had to be replaced.

So, I fully understand why those roadblocks were in place, but some of the locals who knew their area had not been affected to that extent were frustrated that they could not return to their home. They were concerned that the fire front had moved through, but there were still pieces of timber burning around their place. They knew that the CFS were tasked to different areas where the priorities were higher, and they were very keen to be able to return home and implement their fire action plan by dampening down burning logs and material such as that.

What we know can happen is that the fire front moves through, but the remaining material that is just smouldering away, if you get a strong enough wind, will reignite and start another localised fire. The CFS senior officers were concerned about that, that there were pockets within the vast area of country burn. There were islands they referred to that had not been burnt—that the fire had gone around, jumped over the top or whatever—and they were concerned that those islands or pockets of unburnt country would ignite from flare-ups. I know the return-to-home issue is something that the government and the recovery coordinator Ms Maywald are seriously considering, and I think it is a very good thing to look at.

The recovery process, as I said, can last for weeks, months, years. It is a long, difficult, arduous, distressing and anxious time. I know, having experienced it firsthand in the west as a consequence of the Ash Wednesday fires. That did come through and consume our home property but, as I said, thank God we were spared this time, as the fire front came within two kilometres and then burned away in a different direction from our home. We were very fortunate. I will conclude my remarks in relation to the Sampson Flat fires there, because I want to get onto some other issues in the time remaining.

I want to turn my remarks to this issue of the Gillman land and the absolute debacle that the government has exhibited in their handling of this issue. We have had a number of condemning reports, absolutely damning reports, in relation to the way the government has managed the sale of a portion of this Gillman land. We have had a court case, we have had the Auditor-General's Report, we have had witnesses come to the Budget and Finance Committee, and we have had past board members raise concerns about the government's handling of this. What is the government's response? 'Oh well, too bad. It's our call. We don't care. We'll just push all this through. We don't agree with what the judge said. The Auditor-General can say what he likes, but bad luck.' Well, I think that is an absolutely appalling attitude to this issue.

We have seen questions asked in the house. The deputy leader over the last two days has been asking the Deputy Premier and, to me, he seems quite flippant about it—really 'What's the big deal?' This is public property that has not been put out to a proper tender process. How do we know what the true value of that land is unless it has been put out to public tender? I know and everybody knows that the value of something is only what you can sell it for, but how do you know what you can sell it for if you do not ask around and you only give one proponent the opportunity to purchase this land?

Where do we want to be with this? The government is completely nebulous, to my way of thinking, on what the endgame will be and what the outcome will be of the sale of this land. The other day, the Deputy Premier was not making a joke of it but being a bit, to me, flippant about what the Treasurer had outlined were to be the benefits from the sale of this land. I think it is all a bit nebulous. We know that land had been identified for the now completely defunct, out-the-window and gone MFP. That was all pie-in-the-sky stuff. Some of us are old enough to remember the MFP. I think that was proposed in the Bannan government back in the 1980s. That was all pie-in-the-sky, airy-fairy, nebulous sort of stuff.

Mr Pengilly: A bit like time zones.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That is right, and, to me, this proposal that the government has for the future of this land that it has sold is pretty much the same. It cannot really guarantee what the outcome or the benefit will be from the sale of the land.

I have been down there. If my memory serves me correctly, back before the 2010 election there were proponents of establishing a motor sport facility there. I think I was the shadow minister for road safety at the time, and they were keen for me to come and inspect the site. It was just off the North Arm there. So I am sort of familiar with parts of that area of the north-western section of

Adelaide suburbia—although it is not suburbia because it is sort of open land, but I think the house understands what I am saying. I understand what is down there.

How can anyone know what the true value of the land is without asking more than one entity? You cannot, and the government has been caught out. It has been caught red-handed in relation to this Gillman land issue. They seem to be recidivists in this type of dealing. We saw the fiasco with the rezoning of the land at Mount Barker, and that was subject to an investigation by the Ombudsman with a less than satisfactory report handed down by him in relation to the rezoning of the land at Mount Barker. I know that they are not exactly the same, but it goes to the point.

I remember at the time that the now Deputy Premier, who was then the planning minister, was saying, 'There'll be no more Mount Barkers on my watch.' Well, what are we faced with here with the Gillman land? The government is running roughshod over the proper process. It ran roughshod over the process at Mount Barker and Buckland Park was similar, and now we see the same process, running roughshod over a proper process in relation to the Gillman land sale. It is a disgrace, an absolute disgrace, and the government should own up to its mistakes and not just try to spin it, obfuscate, sweep it under the carpet, whatever description you want to put on it, in relation to this mess. I can tell you that it will not go away. I can tell the house that we will be hounding the government to the end of the earth in relation to the absolutely disgraceful way it has dealt with this.

I also want to make some comments in relation to the future of the Repatriation General Hospital. There was a rally held on the steps of Parliament House this morning, and I estimate there were at least 300 people attending that rally.

An honourable member: Were there any members of the government there, though?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: No. It was after church, because I went to church myself. Church was at 8 o'clock and finished at quarter to nine. The rally was at 10 o'clock, and I attended both. So you cannot use the Parliamentary Christian Fellowship Ecumenical service as the reason why there were no government members at the rally. As I look around the house there were a number of members here from the opposition who attended, and the feeling on the steps was palpable.

The emotion of those people who attended the rally was extreme, and for a very good reason. The Daw Park Repatriation Hospital is not just a place where there are buildings where people go for treatment. It has a soul, if I can use that description. Veterans and other people go there. They view it as a place of sanctuary, as a place of solitude, as a place for respite. I have been to the hospital myself, during my days as shadow minister for veterans' affairs. The chapel there is iconic. It provides, as I said, solace, and it is a sanctuary, and it is a quiet, calming place for people who have issues, who have problems, who have worries, that they can go to for help. You jam all that into the Flinders Medical Centre or other places, and you will destroy that; there is nothing surer than that.

During my term as shadow minister for veterans' affairs I got to understand to some degree what makes the veteran community operate. Everybody knows a veteran. The member for Finniss's father was a World War II veteran. The member for Hammond's brother was a veteran. Our family bought our farm from a World War I and a World War II veteran—a father and son. The father was a World War I veteran and the son was a World War II veteran. Everybody knows a veteran, whether it is a family member, a friend of the family, an acquaintance, or somebody like that. It is a vast community, and for the government again to run roughshod over this community is an absolute disgrace. The veteran community and those people who are supporting that community will not tolerate it. They will not tolerate it, and there was clear evidence of this on the steps of Parliament House this morning in relation to that.

A contract was signed by the government a number of years ago in relation to the Repatriation General Hospital, and the government is looking to break that contract. Again, that is an absolute disgrace—an absolute disgrace. I will talk about Ward 17. That is a unique facility, as I said, where troubled souls can go to have treatment. They know they are secure in that facility, they know they are safe, and that is a very important part of treating people with those types of afflictions. I think it is abhorrent that the government is looking to close that facility forever.

In closing and in the very short period of time I have got left, I want to raise the issue of the Mount Barker freeway interchange, what is regarded as the Bald Hills Road interchange. I attended the Public Works Committee meeting this morning where that project came before the committee. I was pleased to be invited to attend. I am absolutely delighted that, after 10 years of heavy lobbying, we are going to see that project progress.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:49): I would like to rise today to thank the Governor for his speech and to acknowledge his passionate and dedicated service to the people of South Australia, and also the support of his wife and two sons. They are great ambassadors for our state and are passionate in their new roles. I also welcome the new members for Fisher and Davenport and look forward to working side-by-side with them on many issues in this house, as I am sure we have common ground, even though we sit on different sides of chamber.

I would also like to acknowledge the service and commitment of the member for Wright and the work that she did on the front bench for many years. She was always dignified in the way in which she conducted herself in very difficult portfolios, and showed tenacity in trying to solve and address some of the problems she faced with those portfolios. I would also like to thank Uncle Lewis O'Brien elder of the Kurna people for his Welcome to Country. Uncle Lewis always provides a dignified but also humorous start to any event that we are privileged to represent the government in, and his work is tireless as well.

The Governor's speech outlined a broad raft of reforms that this government is undertaking to improve the lives and livelihoods of all South Australians. Our state has many examples of the potential for growth and expertise in our local economy and this government is committing to fully realising the potential of our state's economy by supporting local industries, and I will touch on that in this speech.

Nuclear fuel is one of the areas that I am particularly passionate about and have been a long time advocate for. When I first went to an ALP national conference, I voted on these issues and I have continued to vote for the peaceful use of nuclear fuel. I highly commend the Premier's recent announcement to establish a royal commission to allow South Australians to have a mature debate and consider the role our state can and should play in the fuel cycle for the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Many community members and business leaders have discussed this with me over many years.

The commission—to be headed by former governor, Kevin Scarce, a better appointment I could not think of—is a watershed moment where we can really look closely at how our state can leverage nuclear energy and our natural resources. I am also keen for us to add and further discuss the use of thorium, something that not many people seem to be aware of in this state. There is a great appetite for a mature discussion in this area from all sectors of the political circus. In fact, I have met members of the Greens, who have mature discussions about this. It is not just an emotional tirade; it is time we talked about facts and evidence, and I welcome this.

I would also like to talk about the future of submarines. The government has been highly committed to our local defence industry and the approximately 26,500 men and women who work and are employed in this sector. We have taken a very strong stance against the federal government which has tried locking us out of the Future Submarines Program. We have world-class technology and expertise on our doorstep and our industry and contractors deserve better and deserve our support.

It is shameful that the federal government is equivocal about whether our shipbuilders and maritime people should have the opportunity to have a look in and build our own submarines. It is also a sovereignty issue. The fact that the Prime Minister used the threats of Russia and North Korea yesterday in the debate is laughable and is not worthy of the position he holds.

Land 400 is similarly an important project that this state needs, and South Australia is well placed to play a major role in Defence's expenditure of roughly \$10 billion in a land combat vehicle system procurement program with the Land 400. This is one of the largest, active armoured fighting vehicle programs in the world and is the army's equivalent to the Navy's future submarines and the Air Force joint strike fighters, which I had the pleasure of seeing in Fort Worth with the then minister for defence in 2013.

We are engaged with potential bidders from around the world promoting the state's credentials and exploring how we can best support their bids. I commend how the South Australian government is prepared to make significant investments in strategic infrastructure to ensure that South Australia is the home for the Land 400 project. I also note that the government recently launched a vision for a purpose-built Land Combat System Precinct, something I am very passionate about, seeing land combat vehicles regularly at the Edinburgh base in my electorate.

Something in my electorate that I am equally passionate about, apart from the Edinburgh base and the defence of our nation and the men and women who serve there, is the horticulture industry. Horticulture is a major economic contributor to my electorate and the state's economy. In fact, the industry contributes more than \$1 billion to the state's economy. This government has been tremendously supportive in working with the industry to see that investment and trade continues to create more opportunities.

Late last year I hosted a round table to discuss how we can reform existing fire codes and building regulations, that were postponing more than \$50 million worth of investments in the Northern Adelaide Plains. With the key support of cabinet ministers, key departmental staff and industry bodies we are now working closer together and this has allowed for trade and investment to flow into our area and to our state.

The minister's specification review, that was triggered as a result of the round table discussions for building codes, is progressively working very well. This will equate to more jobs and more investment. This will mean that more modern high-tech polyhouses are constructed and at a greater rate.

The Northern Adelaide Plains currently has around 1,300 glasshouse/polyhouse growers, but this will rise, as a result of the cutting of red tape, to around 1,800. The Northern Adelaide Plains region is being viewed as a good place to set up business. This is part of the \$50 million in developments that was being delayed before the roundtable that are now coming to pass. The word has spread amongst the Vietnamese community predominantly that we are open for business and they are voting with their feet and wallets from Sydney and Melbourne. This is a great outcome.

Vietnamese polyhouse growers currently represent over half the polyhouse businesses in my electorate: 650 of the 1,300. I look forward to continuing to work with Hortex alliance and local growers to support them in building the horticulture industry. It is truly a growing sector and a green, prosperous sector that has many sustainability things, with the transition to the GMH plant's closure.

I would also like to mention a few things that I am passionate about in my private life that I welcomed in the speech of the Governor, representing the government's priorities. The renewal of public housing stock, as the member for Little Para mentioned, affects the northern suburbs. Having held the suburb of Elizabeth South for my first term, I am very passionate that that area eventually receives the attention and renewal it deserves. I know that the member will do a good job in representing them and I was happy to hand them over and know that they were in safe hands.

I am also passionate about transforming health, as a former health administrator, and veterans' affairs and I know this government will not do anything to harm the veterans community and will only build to substantially improve the conditions of all veterans communities of all age groups, particularly focusing on the returned veterans who are coming back from their recent service and peacekeeping operations abroad.

Tax reform is needed and is being welcomed by the business community and I look forward to that discussion. The paper on reforming our justice system is equally important. Proposals for time change: I have been listening to people from the West Coast as well as the edges near Mount Gambier in our state, and it is time we had these discussions in a mature way. I think it is important that a government leads and shows vision and depth and foresight and I am proud that the Premier and our cabinet are taking steps to advance these.

Family violence, as a former secretary of a domestic violence service in the southern suburbs, is something I am very passionate about and I work alongside the Northern Domestic Violence Service whenever I can to support these people. In fact, I get cases that come to my office that are truly tragic, and I think the reforms in this area are just as important.

In closing, I would also like to say that, being someone who likes fashion, I am very happy that *Fashion Icons* at the South Australian Art Gallery has received such a positive reception. As someone who might travel to arts events from time to time on behalf of the minister in that portfolio, moving the Adelaide Fashion Festival and expanding it into the CBD is a tremendous thing and I am very pleased that the government is supporting that. It is a dynamic and unique sector in South Australia that we should be growing, and it adds to the dynamism and vibrancy of our state. Thank you.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (11:58): I rise today to thank the Governor, Hieu Van Le AO, for delivering the Premier's speech. I have had the pleasure of spending some time listening to and watching the Governor carry out his duties since his appointment, and beforehand, and can I say that he and his wife are doing an exemplary job. The work they do is outstanding and of great service to the people of South Australia.

As a relatively new member of this house, I find it amazing that a 13-year-old Labor government is relaunching its agenda. You would think a government that has been in power for that long would know what is going on, but it now appears that the Weatherill Labor government is totally out of touch and has lost its way and is having to relaunch and reset. But the people have caught on to what is going on. For the first 12 months of government there has been no plan, there was nothing, and now the government is building its strategy on distractions.

Last year's Premier's speech, given by the Governor at the opening of parliament, featured making South Australia an affordable place to live—number one on the Weatherill Labor government's seven strategic priorities. So, after 12 months of nothing what do we see the government doing, or what has the government done, I should say? Well, our state debt just continues to grow. Last financial year, it ran up a \$1.2 billion deficit. That is reckless and irresponsible. There is no fiscal discipline within this government.

So, after 12 months, and all that the government has delivered is more debt, it then prorogues parliament; in other words, it wipes the slate clean and starts again—a restart, a relaunch. I ask: what has been happening for the past 13 years? The Premier and his cabinet sit down at the relaunch and think, 'Well, we have got through the last 12 months without doing anything', and they decide what to do: let us have a bold new plan. That is right—another one!

First, they try a transforming health plan. After countless overspends on the new RAH project they have to find some savings, so they look for cuts. They label these cuts as a transforming health plan, and they cut the emergency centres at Noarlunga, Modbury and The Queen Elizabeth. That is right: they cut the emergency centres at three of our major city hospitals. Then they axe the Repat Hospital, thumbing their nose at veterans who have served our country with such distinction.

Well, that did not work. That was a great failure for the government, and the people of South Australia have been up in arms. There is a 24-day consultation process on this new bold plan—less than a month to decide which hospitals will be closed. It has been covered in the media and South Australians deserve more respect than this government is showing them. The backlash is great; people are up in arms.

This is added to the fact that South Australians have also realised that Treasurer Koutsantonis and the Premier have not been honest about the cuts to council rate pensioner concessions. The Treasurer has constantly blamed the federal government for the removal of these concessions, but the truth has come out: the federal government is responsible for just 10 per cent of the concessions, and the state government and Treasurer Koutsantonis is responsible for 90 per cent of these concessions. So that means that with the \$190 concession for pensioners the federal government has removed \$19—and, like everyone, we wish the federal government was not in a place where it had to tighten its national belt.

But the fact is that it is tightening by 10 per cent, while Treasurer Koutsantonis and Premier Weatherill have strangled the state's waste by 90 per cent. They have tightened the belt by 90 per cent, while the feds have by 10 per cent. Treasurer Koutsantonis and Premier Weatherill are taking \$171—that is right, \$171—from pensioners, and we oppose that attack on pensioners by this state Labor government.

There has also been the removal of the ESL rebates, with not one extra dollar going into emergency services. So, constant mismanagement has forced this state Labor government to cut, and it is cutting at a very big rate, hurting pensioners, as I have mentioned. So the news is not good. The Premier and health minister Snelling are attacking hospitals across the state, and Premier Weatherill and Treasurer Koutsantonis are attacking pensioners through removing 90 per cent of the pensioner concessions for council rates. Bear in mind that no other state has made this attack on pensioners. I mentioned last year's out-of-control spending, with the \$1.2 billion deficit, \$300 million of which was unbudgeted spending—a \$300 million overspend that is out of control by this state Labor government.

Then there is an ICAC inquiry into the sale of Gillman land. This government is hiding, dodging and spinning any story it can because it cannot explain why it gave away land at a bargain basement price without following proper process. When a Supreme Court judge has questions about the government's processes, South Australians should be concerned.

So, with all this pressure coming to bear, and this going on in the media and South Australians up in arms, as they should be, what does this government do? It digs deep into its book of tricks and goes for distractions. It turns to the page headed 'distractions'. I have worked in the media for a while and I know how this distractions game works—I have seen it tried many a time. One of the old ones that is very popular: the AFL will always put out its distractions on Melbourne Cup day. It puts out its bad news on Melbourne Cup day and hopes that no-one is paying attention.

The state Labor government has gone for the same little track, the same spin: it has gone for distractions. All of these problems, with all the cuts it is making in health, what it is doing to the pensioners, the removal of the ESL rebates, is going for distractions. First, let us go for time zones: that is right, no agenda, no plan, let us just start a talkfest, let us start some distraction.

They say it is supported by Business SA, but I have never been approached by Business SA with this as an issue. I think it was an issue a decade or so ago but, with the evolving electronic age, it is much less a concern. Again, no-one in my electorate has ever come to me talking about time zones, and Business SA has never raised this with me. This is strategy No. 1, distraction No. 1.

Next, let's talk nuclear. Before the election, the Premier said: not on his watch. There was no way he was going to have nuclear power or the nuclear conversation in South Australia. But South Australians are still up in arms about the health cuts, about the cuts to pensioner concessions to council rates and about the removal of ESL rebates, so they need distraction No. 2. They go to the book and here it is. Distraction No. 2 is easy to roll out: let's start the nuclear conversation.

By all means, let's have the conversation but, if you are going to start this sort of debate, surely the state Labor government, after 13 years of being in power, if they were showing any sort of leadership, would start the debate with an agenda for discussion. They would have a scope for their royal commission. But, no: they deliver nothing. They must have given it some consideration. They must have had some ideas if this is what they have been working on for the last 13 years, or this is something that they think is important and they want to take it to the state and show some direction. But they have no direction at all. They just use it as a distraction, as I said, to hide behind the health cuts they are inflicting on South Australians and the cuts they are inflicting on pensioners.

The next step in the Weatherill Labor government's bold new plan is driverless cars. Do not get me wrong: I am all for us being a smart state. The idea is thrown out there, but where is the plan? Where is the agenda? This is just another distraction. If this was not a distraction, if this were not a tactic to draw people's attention away from the health cuts, pensioner council concession cuts and closing of the Repat hospital, if this were really a bold new reform, we would have legislation before this house as soon as we came back to parliament.

We would have detail about what and when we will have driverless cars on our roads. When is it going to happen? How will safety issues be covered? Who will be liable for accidents if cars are driverless? Will people in a driverless car be able to interact on their mobile phone? What is the detail? If this government were serious about driverless cars, we would have information on the table, but they just want another distraction. They want people talking about it in the media. This government wants to talk about driverless cars; the next thing you know they will want to talk about space ships. Let's get the detail on the table.

They want to do this because they want to distract people from the real public transport issues, too. I will just take some time to outline a couple of those because people are still talking about the Gawler rail line electrification. On one hand, they want to get the conversation going towards driverless cars but they do not want to talk about the Gawler rail line electrification. The Auditor-General's Report recently outlined \$46.6 million that is written off in this program—wasted. Nearly \$50 million is out the window, the Auditor-General says, because of mismanagement of this process.

There is too much waste by this government. They do not want to talk about it. They are not readdressing it. They are not going back to this situation. They are just going on and causing distractions, talking about pie-in-the-sky driverless cars without giving any detail to the people of South Australia or the parliament. Let's bring it on, I say. Let's go.

There is also the tramline down King William Street and the \$20 million that has been wasted there—a \$20 million spend on laying conduit to run the tramline from Victoria Square down to the Morphett Street Bridge. This is quite astonishing. It was in the media I think early in the new year: a report was released where there are over 1,000 defects in this tramline, a job that was rushed to be ready before the election and there was money wasted.

Plumber friends of mine have looked at the scope of this report and some of the faults that have happened in this project and they say that, in their plumbing jobs, if they had returned the same sort of workmanship, they would be sacked. There is no bedding sand laid down in the conduit pipes, the conduit pipes are running in the wrong direction, and water is leaking into the pits. We paid \$20 million.

The government have legal action pending over this and we do not know what action is being taken. South Australians have paid \$20 million for this upgrade, for workmanship that is not up to standard and does not meet specification. A report tabled and issued by the government shows that this is not what they paid for: it is below-standard workmanship. To get what they paid for and to get the scope of the project that they ordered, we have to dig up King William Street and re-lay this conduit down there, otherwise we are coming up short on what we have paid for.

This state needs to know this and these are the sort of issues that the government does not want out there. It wants to keep throwing distractions at you. We will need to find out more about what is happening with that conduit and the cable that has been laid down King William Street that does have water leaking into it. It has had some repairs already and \$20 million has been spent. How much needs to be returned? How about getting the project that we scoped for and paid for? This government is not seeming to address that issue. The government does not want to talk about that. It wants to talk about things with no substance; things that it has not laid on the table.

The other one, of course, is the tax reform and the land tax that is being proposed. Here is another one they are trying to slide through. Quite frankly, South Australians have had enough. They want to talk about adding a \$1,200 a year land tax to the average home. That is for a home valued at \$400,000. Who knows where it is going to stop if your home is valued at a little bit more than that. South Australians do not know. They make it sound good on one hand by saying, 'We're taking away stamp duty,' but then they will add this new tax on again. This is a government that has mismanaged for 13 years and now they are trying to claw back cash any way they can. South Australians do not want another tax, especially a land tax. This government is just clawing back money, trying to take it back from South Australians any which way they can.

We also talk about the hospital and millions of dollars wasted there. Whilst we are on the topic of automatic or driverless cars, we can bring up the EPAS system, the driverless delivery system, the robotic transport system that is supposed to be rolling out in our hospitals. That is having all sorts of problems and even the government will concede that it is not on track and it is way over budget. On the one hand, we are talking about driverless cars but we cannot get the projects that this government has already started—they cannot get them operating efficiently and effectively. The EPAS system, again, is another one of them. They do not want to talk about that; they would rather have distractions and talk about things that are off into the future, that they are not putting on the table, they are not putting a process forward for, they are not putting an agenda forward for, they are not putting a scope forward for. We have nuclear, we have time zones, we have robotic cars or driverless cars. This government really is all about distractions and not about substance.

This government cannot understand that working with the people of South Australia and taking them on the journey is what this is all about. You cannot just keep throwing curveballs at people and asking them to front up and bat up every time. Remember that we are not 12 months into a first-term government—let's get this right: this is a 13-year-old, tired state Labor government. It has been 13 years and all it can offer up are distractions with no substance. South Australians deserve better and they want better, so I say let's get on with it.

The distractions in the media and on talkback radio—time zones, the nuclear debate, driverless cars—with no direction, no agenda, no scope from this government—they are just thought bubbles. It is a government of thought bubbles: it is all it can offer. Again, let's stop the thought bubbles and let's call on the government to stop the thought bubbles. Let's get into action; let's get on with running the state and stop the distractions. I call on this government to quickly start delivering.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:13): Congratulations and thank you to His Excellency the Governor for his speech on Tuesday. Thank you also to Uncle Lewis O'Brien for his welcome to country on Tuesday. We also thank him for his enduring leadership in our community on a range of issues impacting our Aboriginal brothers and sisters, and South Australia as a whole.

As I said in my inaugural speech, I remain committed to working alongside our Aboriginal community and our community at large towards constitutional recognition of Aboriginal people. I remain hopeful that it is in this term of federal government that it will finally occur. I look forward to what we can do here in this place to strengthen our community's understanding and progression of this issue which goes to the heart of what we value as Australians.

It is a pleasure to give this Address in Reply and it remains an incredible privilege to represent the people of Reynell in this place. It was also a privilege to be here in this place yesterday to hear my dear friend and now colleague, the member for Fisher, give her inaugural speech as part of this Address in Reply. It was a beautiful speech underpinned by her beautiful values, and it was a speech throughout which her integrity and determination to represent people well shone. It is an honour to call Nat Cook (member for Fisher) a friend, and I look forward to everything we will do together with and for our southern community and for all South Australians. Although he has not yet had the opportunity to give his inaugural speech, I also congratulate the new member for Davenport on his election, and wish him the very best for his time here.

It is just over nine months since I had the opportunity to give my inaugural speech. Every moment in every day of the almost a year since I was elected to represent the strong, community-minded, resilient, hardworking and kind people of Reynell, I am grateful for the privilege of doing so. It is an honour to do so, and I remain committed to working as hard as I possibly can to ensure that every member of our community is treated fairly, is able to live their life with dignity and respect, is able to access great services and support when they need them, is able to access quality health care and the best possible education, can be supported in pathways to decent and secure jobs, and is able to be included in every aspect of community life no matter what their circumstance.

My motivation to work with others to create a fair community remains, and indeed is strengthened by the unique perspective that we have as elected members of parliament: a perspective where I get to see, know, support and empower so many people in our community who are committed to supporting others and seeing them flourish, and where I witness on a daily basis the web of this selfless generosity that is the soul of our community. It is also a year where I have witnessed, in my own community, a great resilience and camaraderie when times are tough, and that is both a great privilege and a source of continual inspiration.

It is the year where I have had the privilege of seeing this web of generosity and resilience at the heart of my community, but I have also witnessed it across our great state. Our Governor spoke about the spirit of community and cooperation he witnessed during our recent fires, and also spoke about the extraordinary capacity of South Australians to overcome adversity and emerge stronger. I could not agree with him more.

I could not sleep during that first Friday night of those terrible fires—unfortunately, sleep is rarely my companion, but that is another story—and as I watched news services and social media for hour after hour, I was unbelievably moved by two stories unfolding before my wide-awake eyes: a story of frightening fire burning into people's lives and devastatingly sending them fleeing from their

homes; and a story of inspiring courage displayed by those fleeing and those who helped them in so many ways.

I visited our local Morphett Vale CFS station as soon as I could, to see if the hardworking volunteers needed anything at all. I was moved by their tireless work, their humour amidst their weariness, and their incredibly well-organised operation. I pay tribute to every one of our emergency service volunteers who worked around the clock in the days, weeks and months that followed, and who continue to do so, week in and week out, to keep our community safe.

As the days and weeks following the fires unfolded, our community's story of generosity and resilience continued to be written. Community organisations, churches, sporting clubs, service organisations, and individuals who simply made a decision to lead, to give, and to do something, emerged from every corner of our state. Our community's determination, sense of common purpose, resilience and generosity made a real difference to people's lives. As our Governor said, it is that determination, sense of common purpose and resilience that will enable us to also successfully meet the economic challenges that confront us.

Having proudly spent many years in the union movement, representing workers and bringing them together during the toughest of times, I feel deeply for those workers at Holden and in the car components industry, including a number in Reynell, who are currently uncertain about their future job security. Equally, I feel for those workers at ASC who, due to our federal government's failure to recognise their skills and careless disregard for the need for local jobs, also face an uncertain future.

As the federal government's cruel budget cuts reach deep into the community sector, whose workers support and empower our most vulnerable citizens, I am outraged by the fact that these workers, and those whom they look after, are also feeling uncertainty about their jobs and their capacity to keep supporting our community as the impact of these cuts looms.

These workers work in one of the fastest growing industries in our country. Amongst them, they have the highest number of multiple tertiary degree holders. Eighty-five per cent of them are women, and daily they support people at the coalface of need in our community, which has an ageing population and a growing complexity of community need. It is imperative that we work together as a state to support all these workers and their industries. As our Governor said, we need to throw open our doors to new opportunities for our priority sectors.

I welcomed the Governor's comments about the need for a more open planning system, but one which includes everyone in the process of improvement and renewal. Good planning is planning which incorporates the community's voice and engenders the principles around development that community identifies. Healthy communities are communities in which everyone has a say about what makes their community strong and vibrant and what could be improved. Community members must be at the centre of envisaging what their suburbs will look and feel like in the long term.

As mentioned in my inaugural speech, I am committed to ensuring the community's voice is heard in the contemplation of the renewal of Christie Downs and the renewal of people's Housing Trust SA homes in that suburb. It was lovely to hear about our Governor's passion for promoting South Australia to South-East Asia and beyond and how South-East Asia remains close to his heart.

Since having the privilege of hearing our Governor's speech when he first became our Governor, his words about his and his wife Lan's journey to Australia have stayed with me, particularly his words about arriving with nothing but a 'suitcase of dreams'. I wholeheartedly support his words about the beautiful diversity of our community and also wholeheartedly support the need to move away from simply accepting new people into our community to a community which understands and welcomes.

We have a long history of leading the way in relation to multiculturalism, and I look forward to our state leading further national discussion about how we can become a community that truly understands, welcomes and accepts people from every corner of the globe. I share his passion for attracting new jobs, investors and tourists to our great state and welcome the establishment of the body focused on this.

Our Governor spoke at length about how our exchange and engagement with community is integral to our state's character. I could not agree more. I am proud that in relation to key issues in

our community, health reform, the nuclear industry and taxation reform, our government has invited South Australians to express their views and to participate in the debate. Change can be difficult, but it is effectively made and/or tempered when the people whom a proposed change affects are engaged, are enabled to have a strong voice and are encouraged to traverse the journey together with their representatives.

Our Governor also spoke about the renewal of the Department for Education and Child Development and its services. It is beyond question that the education, development, wellbeing and support of our young citizens is the highest and most important responsibility for all of us in this place, and indeed for the entirety of our broader community. I know from my own experience that, no matter what difficulties a child faces, they are helped to flourish with the right kind of care, attention and support at school and in the broader community.

It is imperative for the future of South Australia that as a community we look after our children and young people, prioritise ensuring that they have access to the highest quality education and the attention they deserve in our schools and see every one of our children and young people nurtured, treated with compassion and respect, safe and supported to reach their full potential. We can only achieve this through working together with compassion, with kindness, with the use of our best possible collective thinking, through rigorously putting the needs of our children and young people first and through educating, empowering and protecting our children and ensuring our schools, as our Governor said, remain first and foremost focused on students and their families.

I come from a family filled with teachers and I know from what I hear from the many people that I encounter who have been taught by one of my family members that they, like many teachers, are dedicated to the students they teach and work tirelessly to ensure the students in their care flourish. I look forward to our debate about teaching qualifications.

I also look forward to our work to continue to prioritise early childhood development. Rightly, our government sees an investment in early childhood development as the single most important way to alleviate poverty and disadvantage, particularly for Aboriginal people. I am motivated by a strong belief that through bringing every energy in a community together around the goal of alleviating poverty that we will make a difference with and for our younger South Australians and, in doing so, with and for every South Australian community. Together we can make a difference for our most vulnerable citizens. Together we must make a difference and together and only together we will.

We can also make a difference together in eliminating discrimination across our community and ensuring every South Australian has equal access to every service and institution in our community. I wholeheartedly support our government's intention to invite the South Australian Law Reform Institute to review every avenue of discrimination against South Australians on the basis of their sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or intersex status to ensure that every aspect of our democracy is inclusive.

I was heartened by our Governor's affirmation in relation to the strengthening of responses to violence against women and reassured that the connection between gender inequality and discrimination and violence against women was recognised. Shockingly, six women have already died this year as a result of intimate partner violence. Domestic violence is now the leading cause of death and illness amongst women aged 15 to 44. More than one woman is killed in Australia every single week as a result of domestic violence. Every statistic about domestic violence is worse if you are young, if you are Aboriginal or if you have a disability.

Ending violence against women is one of the greatest challenges our generation faces across the globe. It continues to stem from gender inequality which remains in our community in so many different areas. The fact that gender inequality continues to reinforce to some of our young men that it is okay to control a women through physical, emotional or psychological violence just because they have been in or are in a relationship with them is unacceptable. It is up to every one of us in this place and every one in our community to reinforce using every means and forum that we can that violence is never an option.

I will not and cannot rest until we end violence against women and I will be relentless in doing whatever I can as a member of government to progress the strategies outlined in the Governor's speech and every other measure that we can. I know that there are many others in this place who

have a similar resolve, and on that note I thank the members for Little Para and Taylor for sharing their passions in this regard in their Addresses in Reply this morning.

I will relentlessly fight the federal Liberal government's \$44 million cuts to homelessness services which will devastate those services that support women and children escaping domestic violence, and I invite every member of parliament to join this fight and every community member who wants violence against women to stop to join also.

It is too important for us not to fight this cut together or for it to be caught up in party politics. I will continue to work to ensure that the recommendations that arise from the Social Development Committee's inquiry into domestic violence that I moved to establish are fully considered and enacted and, again, I invite every member to work together towards the full consideration and enactment of those recommendations.

In thousands of communities in more than 200 nations around the globe this Saturday, Valentine's Day, community members will participate in a global action against violence against women called One Billion Rising, named so because devastatingly now more than one billion women and girls around the world experience violence at some time in their lifetime. If anybody is interested we will be gathering at Rotary Park in Christies Beach at 10.30am to join this action and I invite all members to be part of it.

Mr Knoll: It's a bit of a drive.

Ms HILDYARD: It is a lovely drive. Come to the great part of town. Again, only together with one strong voice can we end violence against women. In closing, I draw on our Governor's closing words and reiterate them. We must keep our hearts and minds open. We must continue to work together and insist on fairness and integrity if South Australia is to be a place known around the world as the place where people and business thrive. I look forward to bringing those values to life and working together for South Australia throughout this current session of parliament.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:29): It was wonderful to hear the new Governor speak on Tuesday. He is an impressive man and one I have now had the pleasure of meeting a number of times, even this morning as we sat at the ecumenical service to mark the opening of parliament. All parliamentarians need to use opportunities for reflection and potentially for trying to save our souls from the often difficult decisions we make in our parliamentary careers. I am very much looking forward to the prayers of the combined clergy who were there today as they help us in our deliberations.

It has been a restful time in the electorate of Schubert. I have managed to get around to quite a number of events locally over the Christmas break and a lot of events in response to the Sampson Flat bushfire. I want to leave my broader remarks on that score to the motion that has been put forward in relation to that so as to deal with that topic more fulsomely.

I would like to welcome everyone back to this place. We have all very much assumed our places again. The clerks and the house staff are ready, attentive and eager to continue the high standard of service to the parliament that we have come to expect. The government backbenchers have already slumped into their seats, looking disinterested, but I expect them occasionally to stir from their torpor to interject with what they believe to be witty observations—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are reflecting on members.

Mr KNOLL: —that for the rest of us only serve to make us realise that they have forgotten that they are part of the government, and from time to time they might like to take responsibility for that fact. We, on this side, stand ready to play our part, to hold this hapless government to account and to offer an alternative vision to the people of South Australia.

I am pleased to welcome the new members to this place: the member for Fisher gave her Address in Reply speech the other day, and my great friend, Sam Duluk, member for Davenport, I have no doubt will leave his mark on this place as he gets more involved in the workings of parliament. He is a man of great values and a man of deep thinking who will add much to the parliamentary deliberations.

I would like, for a moment, to reflect on the year that was, 2014, especially as we consider the opening of parliament that happened in December. At a time when we can least afford it, and in light of the fact that just 11 months after an election we need a bold new agenda, we can only see 2014 as an abject failure for the government, a year when the government had been in charge of the state for 12 years—a Labor Party that went to the election with a booklet that was always safely nestled into the bosom of the Premier. I wonder where that manifesto has been for the past year. I genuinely do. I understand the half with the glossy pictures but I figured the other half would have had something worth legislating in it. It makes me realise that they have had no agenda for South Australia for the past 12 months.

Without the Attorney-General, who I have quietly coined the Quiet Reformer—and I know that he is quite chuffed when I mention that—we could have put this parliament into extended recess for all the legislation that was brought to the house. This proroguing, and the speech by the Governor, is a clear signal that even after 12 years in office this government needed its gap year. It needed a gap year to go and find itself, to get its head straight. This is the clearest signal to the people of South Australia that we have had 12 months of wasted government and wasted opportunity at a time when our state can least afford it. When I joined the Liberal Party, I was young and ebullient and sometimes a little bit obtuse—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What? You are not anymore?

Mr KNOLL: —and had discussions with other precocious young Liberals about the nature of power as we sat there dreaming of our potential future careers. Through the course of our discussions we came to the idea that before you seek power you must understand what it is that you want to do with it. Before you seek power, you must understand what it is that you want to do with it. It is clear from the process that we are currently undertaking here today that the Labor Party does not understand that. They went to the election with the sole aim of winning that election, and they will figure out what they are going to do with the governing part afterwards.

Can I say that I do not blame solely the state Labor Party. I will give them some latitude. I believe it is something that befalls all centre left governments and parties around the world. Since the Labor Party split over communism, the Labor Party struggled to understand who it truly is, from the Whitlam 'spend it like there's no tomorrow' era, to the Keating-Hawke microeconomic reform agenda of the eighties, to the dour sensible management approach of the Bannon government.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! All members are entitled to be heard in silence. I remind members of standing order 142 and ask the member for Schubert to continue his remarks.

Mr Picton: Because the member for Schubert always does that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: I say this quite cynically, to the dour sensible management approach of the Bannon government, but I suppose that is a bloke whom we do not talk about too much anymore, and probably because there is a \$3½ billion hole to his credibility. I will genuinely enjoy pointing out that fact in future private members' motions.

Mr Gardner: That was just two years of time as treasurer.

Mr KNOLL: That is right. There was only a \$1.2 billion deficit this year, but it is okay because I have made the books look like we are going to turn it around this year. We move on to the spin, spin and keep spinning approach of the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd and Rann eras. It is true that Labor cannot articulate what it stands for anymore. The loose term of social democracy and a fair go is hollow and it has been manipulated. It is code for, 'Spend until you run out of other people's money. Whack it all on the credit card and pray for a fiscally responsible Liberal government to clean up the mess and make the hard choices later.'

The Labor experiment has failed and 53 per cent of South Australia's population at the last election agreed—53 per cent of the population, a two-party preferred vote that in any other jurisdiction in the country would have delivered a resounding Liberal majority government. As I said in speeches

last year, I admit that the Labor Party won the election based on the system and the boundaries that we have.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, I draw your attention to my previous ruling and I will have to call you to order if you continue in this frame of mind.

Mr Gardner: He's obstructing you, ma'am.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will obstruct all of you in a sec!

Mr KNOLL: What I will not accept is whether this system delivers the government that the people of South Australia want, or indeed whether this system delivers the best for the people of South Australia. Electoral reform is essential and I have come into this place as a 32 year old who has nowhere else to go, and this is a cause that I will continue to champion. I would love to have met Adam Slobodian, the Labor candidate for the seat of Schubert, but I understand that his campaigning activities may have been a little bit more limited than my own.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You devastated him.

Mr KNOLL: I was waiting for my great debate. Alas, it did not come. Electoral reform is essential, not so that the Liberal Party can win elections—and I am cuing scoffing from the other side—but because a reformed system can lead to better decision-making across the state by removing a degree of politics from economic decision-making. We had much discussion last year around alternative models and I am a great advocate (as was the previous member for Davenport) of the top-up system, because what it does is it removes marginal seat politicking from having primacy in our electoral cycle. It will actually remove that by allowing the two-party preferred vote to have primacy and therefore valuing the entire state equally. As Don Dunstan used to love to talk about one vote, one value, I would love to see a vote in Taylor or a vote in Little Para be just as important as a vote in Newland or a vote in Florey.

Since 1965, South Australia has been on a slow and steady decline. In fact, I think the Premier referred to it as a genteel decline. Whether it has been population growth, share of the national economy, household prosperity or any number of measures, we have seen this great state slide. We are a great state that has been let down by a government with no credible plan to advance our economy. This government reminds me of a child at high school who consistently comes home with a subpar report card and comments from teachers saying, 'Johnny has a lot of potential but fails to do the work. Unless he changes his attitude he will never amount to much.'

We in SA have so much potential, from our strong agricultural economy and downstream food manufacturing to our strong services and education sector or our world-class tourism sector, especially that which is based in our regions—in the beautiful region of the Barossa Valley and the Murraylands—to our mining sector. It is only the Liberal Party that has the underpinning values to see our state prosper. Our understanding is that we need a strong economy to create jobs and, in order for this to happen, we need to have strong fundamentals, and by that I mean competitive taxation and a taxation review that does not say from its outset, 'Hang on, we are not going to lower taxes. Everything we are talking about here has to be revenue neutral.'

Any hope that the community has out there for tax relief has been dashed in the first blow by this current taxation discussion paper. We need competitive taxation, a lean, efficient and dynamic public sector, infrastructure investment in our productive capacity and a culture that breeds and rewards entrepreneurialism, risk-taking and aspiration. Fifty-three per cent of the state agreed with our values and have given us the mandate to do what we can from opposition to advance this.

Speaking of the sense of déjà vu that many of us would be feeling at the moment, thinking, 'Hang on, didn't we go through this exact process nine months ago?', I took a look back and took some time to see what the Labor government told us they stood for last year. I came across this quote from the Treasurer soon after his appointment as the Treasurer, and I believe it needs repeating today. He said it in an *Advertiser* article, and I would like to quote this quite clearly: 'I very much don't believe in high taxation.' The Treasurer said, less than 12 months ago: 'I very much don't believe in high taxation.'

I believe that the people of South Australia deserve an apology. If the Treasurer so very much does not believe in high taxation, what is the attempted introduction of the new car park tax? What were the emergency services levy increases? What were the pension concession council rate increases? What are the water price increases with the overinflated valuation of the regulated asset base? This government has done nothing over the past 12 months if not prosecute a high-taxing agenda.

The Premier says, and he states it often: 'When we are looking at whether or not we are going to try to increase revenue or cut spending, we will always err on the side of increasing revenue.' He talks about it in terms of protecting jobs, but it is a dog whistle that is there all the same to say that he is a man who is all in favour of increased taxation.

There are a great many ideas that we could be discussing in this place rather than the blunt, simplistic and failed high-tax model that the Labor Party has put forth. We could be talking about, for instance, community-based service delivery that connects our most vulnerable people with the government around them. We could be discussing public sector reform to unlock the potential of our dedicated people in our government departments. We could be talking about asset recycling so that we can afford to build new productive infrastructure instead of just whacking it all on the credit card.

We could be talking about taxation reform, and I mean real taxation reform, instead of just where else it is that we can find money within the state to prop up the failing budget—reform that helps to grow our economy and not stifle it. We could be talking about strong industry policy that enables our secondary and tertiary economies to grow and is committed to removing roadblocks to job creation. We could be talking about education reform—a platform which the Liberal Party can be quite proud of having taken to the last election. This is a real reform agenda for our education sector that does not accept the current mediocre performance of our system.

But we talked about none of these things. Indeed, we talk about not much except for the latest measure that the government takes in hitting the household budget. It has been a theme over the past 12 months, and we have seen it with the Governor's speech a couple of days ago. Indeed, we saw it with the taxation discussion paper that was released yesterday. What we are going to see going forward is increasing taxes, more increasing taxes and further hits to the household budget.

I would like to turn my attention to the beautiful electorate of Schubert. Out in my neck of the woods, the people of the Barossa and the Murraylands have been getting on with the job despite what is happening here on North Terrace. Can I say that, since the late nineties and early 2000s, since the boom within the wine industry and the associated tourism boom that went with it in my area, we have seen a stagnation in the wine economy in South Australia and around the country, and that has been largely due to increased plantings and increases in the dollar, and there have been market fluctuations in the demand for Australian wine. It has been due to a whole heap of factors, but we have seen a really negative, pessimistic mood in the wine economy basically over the past decade. But can I say that, in the Barossa at least, we are starting to see the green shoots of recovery and the green shoots of optimism. Certainly, the drop in the dollar by 20¢ has helped largely in that regard.

What excites me about the wine industry is that it is an industry that invests for the long-term. In fact, in Germany, in Bavaria, they have a term for long-term businesses that reinvest in their assets and also take a longer-term view of their lifecycle, and it is called *Mittelstand*. There are businesses that are *Mittelstand* businesses that everybody would know about. Audi, for instance, is a *Mittelstand* business. Siemens is often referred to as a *Mittelstand* business.

There are bootmakers to semiconductor manufacturers to all types of industries where there are family-owned, intergenerational businesses that realise that you cannot move beyond your means, that if there are bad times now you need to reinvest to wait for the good times to turn around the corner. Can I say that, if South Australia had more of a *Mittelstand* culture, our economy may not be as dynamic or as exciting, but it would be stable, it would be growing and it would be much more resilient to deal with the hard times.

I have seen a lot of that in the Barossa, because even though the wine economy has been stagnant, we have seen investment and we have seen a strong confidence that goes against the prevailing economic mood over the past decade. We have seen the approval now of a new shopping

centre complex to be built at Nuriootpa by the co-op. Can I say for a moment that the co-op is a fantastic local institution. It is a cooperative model that I think we need to encourage and roll out across the country. It has 17,000 members, which according to them says that about 90 to 95 per cent of the people who live in the Barossa are members of the co-op.

That co-op has turned around and is looking to reinvest in its infrastructure and bring more services and more products to the people of the Barossa Valley. I look forward to that, because I think it will help to keep people in our region as opposed to them having to go down to neighbouring towns such as Gawler to do other types of shopping. No offence intended to the beautiful electorate of Light.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: They still do come.

Mr KNOLL: They do, indeed. We are working on it as we speak. We have seen the completion of the Jam Factory and Fino restaurants at Seppeltsfield and the millions of dollars that have been poured into bringing what was an iconic South Australian business back to life. Can I thank Warren Randall and everyone else around him for that work, because it is a real shot in the arm for the Barossa and, especially with the opening of the Fino restaurant, helps to develop a culture of fine dining in the Barossa that will help to attract a new breed of visitor to our region.

We have seen approval and demolition work start on a new St Hugo cellar door at Jacob's Creek. I was lucky enough to tour the future facility a few weeks ago and to look at the amount of money that an international business such as Pernod Ricard is investing in South Australia, which really underlies the resilience of the wine industry in the Barossa. We have seen investment in Barossa Valley Estate and a new-look cellar door that is on its way to being opened, and that is again a great investment in a business that was otherwise on its knees.

We have seen the expansion of storage capacity at Vinpac. In fact, if I go for a jog, it takes me about 500 metres until I look at the beautiful new sheds that are being finished off at Vinpac there in response to the demand for wine and wine storage that that business has undertaken. It really is a great business to have in the Barossa, because it does underpin manufacturing jobs that we are seeing being lost around other parts of the state.

We are also seeing, and it is a few doors up from my house, the long-awaited extension to the Barossa Valley Cheese Company. It is great to see Victoria McClurg and the fantastic people and products that they produce expanding. They have knocked down the old baker's cottage that was there and have levelled it off. I know that work is going to begin very soon on putting down the foundations. Again, it is a fantastic investment in the Barossa. It will help to diversify our food production and economy up there and is really exciting.

We have seen new dealerships being built in Tanunda and the shift of Jarvis Subaru from Angaston to Tanunda. All of these investments which would add up to many tens of millions of dollars show a real confidence in the local economy that really quite excites me.

One project, though, that is not on the list—and, again, this is another perennial that the members for Schubert deal with—is a new health facility for the Barossa. Transforming Health was seen, especially by the government, as a genuine chance to look at the needs of all communities in relation to health but, unfortunately, the Transforming Health document does nothing for regional and rural service provision across our state. Certainly, one could argue about regional people accessing city-based hospitals, and I accept that argument, but I do not accept that we should have substandard health care in the regions.

It is interesting to note that some of the arguments put forward about the Repat and the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre concern the age of their facilities. Well, I have a hospital in Angaston that was built in 1910—and if that is not a facility that is due for an upgrade, I do not know what is. I have another facility in Tanunda that was built in the 1950s and has not seen any real money invested in it since that time.

The Barossa is crying out for a new health facility if for no other reason than the Barossa Council is the tenth fastest growing council in this state. Population growth will demand increased and better service provision in the Barossa, and the sooner the government comes to that realisation,

the sooner we can get on and start delivering a project the people of the Barossa have been talking about and, indeed, fundraising for since about 1992.

Can I say again on that score that, as a 32-year-old man with nowhere else to go, this is a project I will not let go of. I will be speaking about this until the day it is delivered—and, indeed, if it is delivered by a Labor government, I will be more than happy to give credit where credit is due and would be more than happy to sing the praises of what would be a very visionary and very bold announcement.

I am looking forward to this parliamentary year. It is not in my nature to be pessimistic, it is not in my nature to be relentlessly negative; unfortunately, when I am delivered so much fodder, it is too easy. But I remain optimistic for the coming year, Deputy Speaker. Indeed, it may not be rational but, as a politician, I need to have hope, especially sitting on this side of the chamber because, without hope, how am I ever to deal with the disappointments to come? It is extremely timely that, once again, the members of Schubert, in the plural sense, are here to continue fighting for a new health facility in the Barossa. I would like to acknowledge in the gallery—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's my job.

Mr KNOLL: Oh, I'm sorry. I wouldn't want to take that pleasure—

Mr Griffiths: You can do that too.

Mr KNOLL: Well, if we both do it, he will feel more important. Can I acknowledge the current President of the Parliamentary Wine Association, and I look forward to continuing that service after the AGM today. I also congratulate him on his elevation to the position of Chair of RDA Barossa, and I look forward to working with him closely, so that he can continue his legacy and I can continue my legacy in delivering for the people of Schubert.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:52): I too would like to rise and make a small contribution. First of all, I welcome our two new members to the chamber. One thing I have noticed is that, on this side, we have welcomed both new members into the chamber, but I have seen a lack of support from the government side of the chamber in welcoming our new member for Davenport.

An honourable member: It was done earlier.

Mr WHETSTONE: I am not talking about the new member for Fisher; I am talking about the rest of the members in the chamber with their speeches.

Members interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: Maybe Eddie did; maybe John did.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Confine your remarks not to a reflection on other members' speeches but to your own, sir.

Mr WHETSTONE: Perhaps the minister needs to concentrate on his portfolio with the CFS. I would like to welcome the two new members into the chamber. I am sure that they will make a fine contribution. I know that the new member for Davenport will make a good contribution. With his financial background, I am sure that he will be able to point the government in the right direction about how they can pick up the mess they have got this state into over 13½ years. What we do need to reflect on is having good people in the parliament and making sure that they can make a contribution, that they can represent their electorate.

What I would like to do is to kick off quickly with the elephant in the room that I do not think too many people would want to talk about, and that is the remuneration for the members in this place. We always seem to dodge and weave that issue, because the media seem to pick up on it and give us a belting, saying we have a big fat salary and large retirement packages. Well, let me tell you: we don't.

I am sure I speak on behalf of everyone here that all MPs work extremely hard. They have to be resilient, they have to be on notice 24/7, their work is 24/7. For those who aren't, they probably do not deserve to be here. But I do speak on behalf of everyone in this chamber when I say that the remuneration package is not what the fluff implies, when people say that we have a fat retirement

package on its way and an exorbitant salary. So, I welcome the announcement that we will look at a remuneration package. Having been here for five years and coming off the land, it has been quite an adjustment, financially, but it has been very rewarding in many other ways.

I will move on now and talk about the Governor's speech, prepared by the government. I think the Governor has great talent. He has a strong background in South Australia, he has great knowledge of his roots and South Australia's needs, and I would like to have thought that he could have written the speech on his own. But I am sure that he was directed by the Premier and the government to come out and say what he had to say.

I do congratulate His Excellency Hieu Van Le on the great job he is doing. I have known him for a number of years, and I think his appointment to the role is most welcome. I think he will do a great job in his term, as did Kevin and Liz Scarce, the previous governor of the state and his wife. And I congratulate the great work that he has done and will continue to do for the state.

There are a few things that I noted in the Governor's speech. One has been noted a couple of times on this side of the house, namely, that there was very little acknowledgement of regional South Australia and even less acknowledgement of the economy driver in this state that has been around for 120 years and will continue to be around for 120 years—it is a sustainable economy—and that is agriculture. It is farming, which produces our food, produces a majority of our exports, produces 45 per cent of tourism in this state and also employs a lot of people.

While we see the mining resources come and go, we note that the government continues to pin its hopes on what the mining sector will offer this state as it continues to slide out of our grip. It is becoming a factor when it comes not only to the economy today but the economy of the future. We are seeing the mining sector having to reform, and we look at a lot of the big miners at the moment laying off jobs, positions, restructuring and looking at better ways they can extract ores out of the ground and have them processed. But what we continue to see is a sustainable agriculture sector that is a renewable.

We continue to get better every year. We do not dig a hole in the ground and all of a sudden we have less in the ground. We grow, and we are growing more and more within a certain designated area. We are growing more with less water. We are growing better production with some of the technologies, but with a decreasing amount of R&D going into the sectors. The government is continually walking away from its responsibility with funding SARDI. I see PIRSA is almost a basket case when it comes to the funding and support the government is giving that department. That is a real concern when we know we have a Premier who continues to bang on about food, wine, safe, clean and green, and yet we are being lent on, if you like, when it comes to R&D.

We see many of the sectors having decreased support around their R&D, but still having to work out how they are going to access markets, about how they are going into some of these new export markets. And I see there is a lot of pomp and ceremony about what the current government is doing with its new trade and investment minister at the helm. However all we are seeing is a lot of ministers travelling overseas without businesses. Instead we should be setting up how we can better trade with our new free trade agreement partners and how we can better trade with our neighbours. We have, for instance, the Gateway Program. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to acknowledge in the gallery visitors today from Concordia College, guests of the member for Unley, and note they will be with us at question time.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament students of Concordia College, where the former member for Playford used to administer corporal punishment, who are guests of the member for Unley.

*Condolence***WHYTE, HON. A.M.**

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:00): I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Arthur Mornington Whyte AM, former member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service, and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Arthur Whyte was born in Adelaide in 1921 and was the youngest child of four. His family part owned and managed Yankaninna Station in the Flinders Ranges, 128 kilometres east of Copley. He went to school in Quorn where he shared the classroom with many Aboriginal students and later worked in the Gawler Ranges as a station overseer.

In 1940, Mr Whyte served for three years in the Second World War and was a part of the 2nd/48th Battalion. He fought in Palestine and Libya, and spent six months in the historic siege of Tobruk as well as the battle of El Alamein. Upon return to Australia in 1943, Mr Whyte lost his arm during a military training exercise and was discharged from the Army.

A stockman and a significant landowner, Mr Whyte stood in a by-election for the Liberal Country League in the Legislative Council seat to represent the Northern District of South Australia in 1966. Winning the seat, Mr Whyte served as a member of the Legislative Council from 29 October 1966 until 7 December 1985. During this time, he served as President for seven years from 28 February 1978 until 7 December 1985.

He contributed to hundreds of bills during his time in the Legislative Council and played a major role in the passing of legislation to construct the Olympic Dam uranium mine in 1982. He had a particular interest in, and was a strong campaigner for, Aboriginal rights, strongly advocating on behalf of the Maralinga people on the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation and later, on the Maralinga lands bill.

Sir Thomas Playford, Steele Hall, Don Dunstan and also John Bannon served as premiers while Mr Whyte was in parliament. He has four children (Caroline, Annette, Martin and Nola), and I express my sincere personal condolences to Mr Whyte's family and to the house.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): I also rise to speak on behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition on the condolence motion for the Hon. Arthur Mornington Whyte AM. Arthur was the definition of an Australian hero. He was a hero to the country, a hero to his state and a hero to his beloved community of Kimba. Most importantly, he was a hero to his family. In 1921, Arthur was born the youngest of four children to parents William and Caroline Whyte.

Arthur was raised at the remote Yankaninna Station, 128 kilometres east of Copley, and in a personal memoir he recounted how the harsh land had made life very hard for his family. Despite the drought and the tough landscape, he spoke with great love and affection for his father, a renowned stockman, and his mother, who was often left alone for long periods of time to raise four children in isolation. It is clear that these early experiences living in the Flinders Ranges gave him a strength and tenacity that would serve him well once he entered the world of politics. After a period of financial hardships and drought, the family relocated to Wilcherry Station, 50 kilometres north of Kimba. Arthur recounted that the day after his father signed the lease for Yankaninna over to his business partner, it finally rained.

Over the intervening years, Arthur and his family would live on multiple properties throughout the northern parts of this state, centring on Quorn and Kimba. Despite the frequent relocations, busy farm chores and small community schools, Arthur was a natural scholar who excelled academically. He qualified 12th in the state in his year 7 exams, but the school was so small it closed once he finished.

Arthur had horses in his blood and, like his father, was a talented stockman from a young age. As a young man, he worked across the state in various roles, from breaking in horses and mustering to working on his family's land. He loved his dogs and attributed one, Mucksie, with saving his life after it fetched help following a nasty fall from his horse.

However, word soon came from Europe that Hitler was on the move and, in 1940, Arthur enlisted in the 2nd/48th Battalion. This decision saw Arthur serve during the infamous siege of Tobruk and the 2nd/48th Battalion went on to become the most highly decorated Australian unit in the Second World War. Arthur was fortunate to survive Tobruk unscathed. However, whilst preparing for a second service in Papua New Guinea, he lost his left arm in a training accident—not that the loss of an arm could ever stop Arthur. He returned to Kimba and the life of a one-armed stockman. He threw himself into family and community life and was an integral member of the Kimba community. He served on the Kimba council, was president of the Kimba RSL and was chairman of the Northern Districts Stockowners Association as well as countless other professional organisations.

Arthur was an accidental politician. He may never have put his hand up to serve for the Liberal Country League had it not been for the untimely death of the Hon. Dudley Octoman, who had died only 12 months into his term representing the northern districts in the Legislative Council.

Arthur took to the parliament with gusto. In his maiden speech, he outlined his desire to carry out his role for the betterment of his constituency and the progress of the state. He realised that his lack of formal qualifications put him at a disadvantage when compared to his colleagues, so he spent many hours researching and reading legislation and bills after hours, determined to represent the best needs of all South Australians. He was particularly interested in the land rights of Aboriginal South Australians and played an integral role in the Maralinga Land Rights Act and the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act.

In 1978, he became president of the Legislative Council. Again, it was a mix of fate and timing that saw Arthur claim the presidency following the sudden death of the Hon. F.J. Potter. In a newspaper article from the time, Arthur states that he was not intending to nominate at all but put his hand up 'on the spur of the moment'.

Arthur also played a vitally important role in ensuring that the Olympic Dam mine legislation passed the parliament in 1982. He was credited as successfully swaying Labor member Norm Foster to become an Independent and support this important legislation. Both men were Rats of Tobruk and, although they differed on their political philosophy, they both understood the importance of this mine to the future prosperity of our state.

Arthur served the people of South Australia in the parliament for 19 years and worked under five different premiers—Steele Hall, David Tonkin, Thomas Playford, John Bannon and Don Dunstan. Personally, I was lucky enough to meet Arthur only last year, with the member for Morialta, when we visited him at his retirement village in Dernancourt. Despite his long years, I remember him as an engaging and intelligent man who was kind enough to share some of his political wisdom. On behalf of my colleagues, I extend my heartfelt condolences to his family and friends, and I hope they find solace in the imprint that he has left on the history of South Australia. He left the state better than when he found it, which is a sign of a truly great politician.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:09): Mr Speaker, I would like to join and commend the condolence motion for Arthur Whyte. Many of us knew Arthur extremely well. Many of us, of course, served with his daughter Caroline Schaefer until 2002 and would know Martin, his son, extremely well.

Arthur was, as we have heard, a veteran of the 2nd/48th of Tobruk. My grandfather was 2nd/10th and Norm Foster, whom we heard of, was 2nd/10th. They all knew each other and they came from a value system that would see them stand up for what they truly believed, no matter what the circumstances and, as we have heard, they did.

Arthur was a bit of a character, a true conservative, a man true to his values. He would often ring you up with a few words of advice. I remember on one occasion passing through Kimba. I was in a bit of a rush and I did not have time to catch up with him. I got a call two days later saying, 'I heard you were in town and you didn't come and see me.' I never made that mistake again. When you sat down with him you would be sitting with a font of wisdom. He was a very intelligent, policy-driven bloke, a good country man who solidly believed in his state and in his regional community. Kimba and the whole of Eyre Peninsula was better off for having him in their home patch, and he will be sorely missed. My condolences go to everyone in his family—his quite large family—at the loss.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): I rise to support the Premier's motion to recognise Arthur Mornington Whyte and in particular his long and distinguished service to the parliament. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for indicating our support to the same. Both have ably presented his contribution to our parliament and to the service in war and peace time in active service. I think it is remarkable; if I can just complement that by saying that for someone who served with distinction in active war, then to be injured, with the loss of an arm, in a training exercise, and then to serve again is really beyond the call of duty, and it stands as a testament to the contribution he made at such an exceptional level.

I just wish to add two things to recognise Mr Whyte as the extraordinary man that he was. Some years ago, I was the president of the Liberal Party. I think Mr Whyte would hold the record for the amount of correspondence that he would send to me about his ideas of how the party should operate, reform and generally be active in areas that he considered significant. I would have to say that his most outstanding attribute in relation to that is that, if I did not immediately embrace or adopt his idea, he would have the repeat action profile to ensure that I was neither ignorant of it and nor would I forget his view on the matter. So, he was persistent, he was patient, and he was prolific, there is no doubt about that, in his communication. I thank him for that and, as others have recognised, the wisdom that he had in his years of public service were extraordinary.

Finally, I just wish to compliment and place on the record the extraordinary contribution that he made to sheepdogs and their breeding and training in South Australia. My father for one would say, 'If ever you want a sheepdog get one of Arthur Whyte's. It will be obedient, it will be effective, and it will certainly serve you well.' I would have to say that one of his legacies is the many descendants of sheepdogs that he bred and trained, which he did with distinction and for which I think he is highly regarded—in fact, renowned—around the regional and pastoral parts of South Australia. May he rest in peace. My condolences to Caroline, who, of course, many of us have served with, and his widow, Mary, and his other children.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:13): The first time I met Arthur Whyte was immediately following my preselection to contest the seat of Flinders. Of course, Arthur was one of the first to congratulate me, having contested the seat of Flinders himself in 1985. Upon his retirement from the Legislative Council he attempted to unseat the incumbent National Party member Peter Blacker. Arthur was unsuccessful in that. It was the first time I had met Arthur, but, of course, Arthur was well-known right around the state but particularly around Eyre Peninsula. My father knew Arthur well, and everybody had a story about Arthur and everybody had the greatest respect for him.

Arthur was the youngest son of William and Caroline Whyte, both descendants of pioneering Eyre Peninsula families, and he spent most of his very limited schooling at Wirrigenda. It was a one-teacher school three miles from the family property of Yeltana, north of Kimba. As has already been said, he finished 12th in the state when he completed his qualifying certificate at the age of 11. He was forced to stay at school for another year because of his age and thus completed his formal schooling when he was 12. In fact, it was mentioned in the obituary that he did not achieve as good a result in his second attempt at year 7 as he did the first time around. I guess he was getting focused on other things.

He learnt from every aspect of his life and cherished that knowledge and the people who taught him, whether they were bushmen, Aboriginals, lawyers or parliamentary counsel. After leaving school, Arthur spent a few years working as a stockman, a bush jockey and a horse breaker. One of his many remarkable feats was when, at the age of 15, he rode alone with one pack horse and his dog across country from Yeltana to Moonarie Station to begin working for the McTaggart family as a jackaroo. It was a distance of about 100 miles. It took him five days and, of course, there were no telephones. Nobody thought this was unusual.

In 1939 he enlisted in the army from Moonarie and served in the 2nd/48th Battalion throughout the Middle East. He was justifiably proud to be one of the last remaining Rats of Tobruk. As has been mentioned, in 1943 he lost an arm on active service. It is a measure of the man that it did not appear to make much difference to what he did. He immediately went back to the station and very soon also began breaking in horses for extra cash. He never complained about his arm and always found innovative ways of doing things.

At the gathering after his funeral numerous tales were related of people witnessing him shoe horses, throw a beast from horseback, crack a whip on horseback, and even roll a cigarette whilst driving. This is a man with one arm. In fact, one of the stories in one of the eulogies was, as many here would know, that throughout country South Australia it is common practice and even polite to wave at the oncoming motorist. It is particularly so on Eyre Peninsula where it is obligatory to wave with one hand. The local policeman in Kimba was going around the corner one day and Arthur was coming the other way around the corner. The policeman was somewhat disconcerted to find Arthur waving at him while driving around the corner.

Consequently, his family grew up thinking all of this was quite normal and his granddaughter Kate told me the story about when she was a little girl at school and one of the tasks as a primary school student was for her class to write about somebody they knew who was disabled. She could not think of anyone and the teacher said, 'Kate, you do know somebody who is disabled,' and she said, 'No, I don't.' So that was the perception they had of their grandfather who was this man.

In 1945 Arthur Mornington Whyte married Mary Seal and so began a partnership and love affair that last 69½ years and resulted in four children—Caroline, Annette, Martin and Nola. Mary nursed Arthur when he broke his remaining arm and again when he ruptured his spleen in 1964. She taught all of the children by correspondence, cooked for working men and shearers, and supported Arthur all over the state during his parliamentary career. Theirs had been a marriage of equals which endured through both the good and the bad times of their lives.

Arthur converted to Catholicism a couple of years after their marriage and his faith, like his life, was based on a simple logic rather than a set of rules. His description of his faith was similar to his description of his membership of the Liberal Party: 'I don't know if it is the best there is and I don't agree with everything it is, but it's the closest to what I believe in so I will stick with it.'

Throughout his life Arthur was an active and committed member of his and the wider community. He served the Kimba district council, the Stockowners Association, was a foundation member of the Kimba Lions Club, president of the Kimba RSL, president of the Kimba Racing Club (he loved his horses), he was a regional representative on the SAJC, and inaugural member of the Eyre Peninsula Showjumping Club, to name just some of his contributions.

He joined the Liberal Party soon after its inception in 1946 and served in many capacities, including branch president of the State Electoral Committee and State Council. Arthur was elected to the Legislative Council of the state parliament in 1966 and retired in 1985, having served as president of the council for seven years. He was widely acknowledged as a fair and well-informed president who was respected on all sides. He was particularly proud of the work he did with the Aboriginal people to secure their rights in the Maralinga lands and they in turn loved and respected him.

Since his death, his family have been overwhelmed by the respect held for him by so many people. Most have described him as a true gentleman. He mixed with and respected both princes and paupers and was respected in return. Arthur simply judged people for who they were, never what they were. He was always ready to help people who were down.

He also loved the Kimba pub. In the book of his life, his daughter Annette described his daily pilgrimage to have a beer or a stout or red wine with his mates, a couple of bets and home again for an afternoon nap. Arthur was a legendary horseman and dog trainer. He loved animals and people, he loved his family and friends unconditionally and, although he was not a large man in stature, he was a giant of a man to all who knew him.

Along with Mary, he was forced to move to Adelaide in 2011 due to ill health but all he wanted was to go home to Kimba to the place and people he loved. He was laid to rest at the Kimba Cemetery on 19 December 2014. He leaves behind Mary, his four children and their spouses, 13 grandchildren and 13 great-grandchildren. Arthur was a good man. He was a man of conviction and it was a life well lived. I believe that a man has passed but in many ways an era has also passed.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:20): I also rise today to support the motion and offer my sincere condolences to the Whyte family. When I think of the Hon. Arthur Whyte, I think of three things: (1)

family, (2) South Australia, and (3) community. As we have heard today, it was with great sadness that we learnt of the passing of this wonderful man who was born in 1921 in the Flinders Ranges and worked as a station overseer before becoming a farmer on Eyre Peninsula.

As we have heard, he also served in the Second World War. He was one of the Rats of Tobruk. He went on to become a member of the South Australian Legislative Council from 1966 to 1985, including as President for almost eight years. He played a key role in the passage of much legislation, especially the Maralinga land rights legislation. He was a fantastic contributor to this place and certainly a powerful advocate for regional South Australia.

I believe that the best life you can lead is one spent in the service of others. I think for the Hon. Mr Whyte that was certainly the case. I have had a lot more to do with his son, Martin, and also Jeremy, his grandson, who went to school with me. One thing I will say about Jeremy is that he was extremely proud of his grandfather, and why would you not be proud of a grandfather like Arthur Whyte? He was a wonderful citizen. He was a family man, he always gave back to his community and he put his state first after those two things in that order. I pay tribute to him, I pay tribute to his life and I offer my sincere condolences to his friends and family. May Mr Whyte rest in peace.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:22): I rise today to pay my respects to Arthur Mornington Whyte. I did not know Arthur personally but I knew many members of his family and obviously the Hon. Caroline Schaefer who served in the other place. Apart from all the other contributions that Arthur made during his life, he was a charter member of the Kimba Lions Club, so he was always out there being involved or helping start something. As we have heard today, he served with the 2nd/48th Battalion with distinction as a Rat of Tobruk.

He also served here for nearly 20 years and he was the President for almost eight years. When I take people to show them the portraits of all the presidents, I ask them, 'What is different about this portrait?' No-one can work it out, and that is how well that portrait has been done, and most times I have to tell people that he was missing an arm.

As I said, he was President for almost eight years. In 1987 he was awarded a Member of the Order of Australia. I would like to read from one of the obituaries for Arthur that was in *The Advertiser* on 16 December last year:

WHYTE, Arthur Mornington. 12/03/1921-15/12/2014. Ex Second 48 Battalion, Former President of Legislative Council. Loved husband of Mary for 69½ years. Loved father of Caroline, Annette, Martin and Nola. Great friend and father-in-law of Roy, Garry, Deborah and Sam. Grandfather and mate of Tim, Angela, Natalie, Kate, Jessie, Jeremy, Lissy, Emily, Hamish, Bridie, Ellen, Matt, Joe and partners. Great grandfather of 13. You were our hero.

In my closing comments I would like to acknowledge a farmer, a soldier and a politician. Vale Arthur Mornington Whyte.

The SPEAKER (14:24): I am convinced that the town of Kimba has more political activists than any other place in South Australia. The great majority, of course, are Liberal, but it turns out they are not all Liberal. I knew Arthur Whyte. He was, as has been said, President of the other place. There was a day in the upper house when Frank Blevins was behaving badly and Arthur, as President, had cause to name him. A motion was moved that he be suspended from the service of the house, but then it was not carried and Frank remained in the house. Arthur, of course, felt he should resign and offered his resignation, but the upper house unanimously said, 'Well, don't be silly, Arthur'—an excellent precedent. Vale Arthur Whyte.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:26 to 14:36.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

South Australian Government Response to the Citizens' Jury Report on Sharing the Roads Safely—Report

By the Minister for Ageing (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Office for the Ageing—Annual Report 2013-14

Ministerial Statement

CYCLING CITIZENS' JURY

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:36): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Ever since assuming the position of Premier, I have asserted the importance of involving everyday people in decisions that affect their lives. One way this government has sought to do this is through the establishment of citizens' juries. A few weeks ago, I released the government's response to the report of our state's second citizens' jury.

Based on the jury's advice, the government will make a number of changes to help all road users to get home safely, including two changes to the law—minimum overtaking distances and riding on footpaths—that will be presented to this parliament. It is a great credit to our citizens' jurors that they have responded so constructively to the challenge that was presented to them to put aside their first impressions, to deliberate carefully and to reach considered judgement about what was in the collective interests of their fellow citizens.

I also note and look forward to the outcomes of a similar process that has been established by the South-East Natural Resources Management Board where 26 randomly selected citizens have formed a community panel to consider the fairest method to share the cost of maintaining the drainage network in that region.

I can assure the South-East community and the members of that panel that the government will assign an equal level of respect to your report as it has reports from the first two citizens' juries that have been more focused on the metropolitan area. Indeed, the responsible minister in the other place has committed to tabling the panel report in the parliament.

Whether it is the nature of the taxation system, the role nuclear industry will play in the future of our state, or what time zone South Australia should have, this government is committed to involving everyday South Australians in decisions that will affect their lives. We accept that it is the government's role to lead but also to facilitate informed debate.

On behalf of the government, I extend my thanks to the 37 jurors who participated in our most recent citizens' jury. I assure them that this government is committed to finding more ways that people like them can have genuine opportunities to influence government decision-making at all levels.

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER CENTRE FOR EXCELLENCE

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:39): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am pleased to announce that the chair of The Repat Foundation will lead a panel of experienced veterans' representatives and clinical experts to advise on the location and model of the new Post-Traumatic Stress Centre for Excellence. Associate Professor Susan Neuhaus CSC will lead the input of the veteran community, which is vital to the successful planning of the new \$15 million centre. Professor Neuhaus is a reservist who has been on active service in deployments to Afghanistan, Bougainville and Cambodia.

Ward 17 at the Repat provides a high quality and valued post-traumatic stress treatment service for veterans. However, the quality of the building does not match the quality of the service,

which is why, as part of Transforming Health, we have allocated \$15 million for a centre for the treatment of post-traumatic stress to replace Ward 17.

The knowledge and experience of the veterans' representatives and the clinicians who work in the service will ensure that the new centre for excellence provides the same high level service in an appropriate location for veterans. The staff at the Repat's Ward 17 have led many of the national advances in the treatment of post-traumatic stress. With the input from the new panel of veterans' experts, the government is confident that South Australia's reputation as a leader in this field will continue to be improved by the development of the new centre, wherever that may be.

The Veterans Advisory Panel will be co-chaired by Associate Professor Susan Neuhaus and Professor Dorothy Keefe, Clinical Ambassador, Transforming Health, and the first meeting should be held next month. The first members of the Veterans Post-Traumatic Stress Centre for Excellence Expert Panel will include:

- Associate Professor Susan Neuhaus CSC and Dorothy Keefe, as I have said;
- David Everitt, who is chair of the Veterans Health Advisory Council;
- Brigadier Laurie Lewis, member of the Veterans Health Advisory Council;
- Professor Sandy McFarlane, director of the University of Adelaide Centre for Post-Traumatic Stress Studies and an acknowledged world expert in this particular field;
- Associate Professor Tarun Bastiampillai, who is the director of Mental Health Strategy for the Department of Health and Ageing; and
- Dr Taryn Cowain, Clinical Head of Unit, Ward 17, Department of Psychiatry.

There will be more members added to the group in the coming weeks, and this will likely include a veteran consumer and care representative as well as representatives from other veteran groups and other front-line emergency workers.

SAMPSON FLAT AND TANTANOOLA BUSHFIRES

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:42): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: In January two major bushfires broke out at Sampson Flat and Tantanoola. The ferocity and danger of those two bushfires have been well documented elsewhere, including in this place. I am sure that all members are grateful for the excellent work of our emergency services personnel, both paid and volunteer, during those horrible days when it looked like South Australia was facing a crisis not seen here for many, many years.

Today I would like to inform the house that the government has provided 1,500 complimentary tickets to the Clipsal 500 to be spread amongst the volunteers who provided support and helped during the Sampson Flat and Tantanoola fires. The Clipsal 500 is one of South Australia's premier sporting events, recognised around Australia as one of the best—if not the best—V8 races of the season.

This is just a small gesture of appreciation from this government to those men and women who supported and helped their communities. Whether they were CFS volunteers bravely fighting the fire or Red Cross people helping prepare lunches, everyone of them had a role to play during the bushfires. Some of the other community groups and non-government organisations which supported the effort included, amongst many others:

- Kersbrook Community Sports Club;
- One Tree Hill Sporting Club;
- Nairne Sporting Club;
- Gumeracha Football and Cricket Club;

- South Australian Veterinary Emergency Management (SAVEM);
- the Salvation Army;
- BlazeAid;
- St John; and
- South Australian Ambulance Service volunteers.

There are still many organisations helping with the clean-up and providing assistance to those with destroyed and damaged homes. Yesterday I met with the CFS and the SES volunteer associations and it was agreed that the allocation and distribution of the tickets would be handled by them.

The government has had ongoing discussions with the Governor about how we can formally recognise the volunteers once the fire danger season is over. Once again, I place on record the appreciation of the government for all their efforts during these recent bushfires.

Question Time

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm that senior staff members at the Repat Hospital have already been informed that the hospital will close?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:44): No, I can't confirm that.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): Supplementary, sir: has the government made its final decision regarding the closure of the Repat Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:44): No, it hasn't.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): Can the minister inform the house why senior staff members would have made these statements to people today?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:45): Well, if that's true, I can't explain why they would say that.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): Supplementary, sir: have the staff been gagged from speaking to the media under threat of being fired?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:45): It sounds like whatever attempt might have been made it hasn't been particularly successful, but look, this has been put to me. I have made very clear to my department that I will not tolerate any attempt to gag any member or any staff member of SA Health from speaking to the media. I welcome it. This whole process, from the very beginning, has been about engaging clinicians. We've had 600 people, including many of them clinicians from SA Health, in fact probably the majority, at a summit late last year. We've engaged them at every point. Certainly, it would seem, frankly, ridiculous to me for any attempt to be made for staff members expressing their opinion on this very important document, but if any evidence can be put to me of anyone attempting to be gagged I will take the appropriate action.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary, sir: is the minister suggesting that he would be happy for a press conference to be called and senior staff be authorised to speak to the media about the plans that the government has to close the Repat?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:46): Yes, of course. We've had Dr Tideman yesterday who had a lot to say about Transforming Health and about the response of the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: You've forgotten? Well, I haven't got it in front of me, I'm afraid, but there are some particular points that stick to mind. From memory, he said words along the line that the opposition's response to Transforming Health was completely inadequate, that they were lazy and that they should all resign and make way for some Liberal politicians who might come into this place and do something constructive. He made some remarks about the fact they had been in opposition for 13 years and it was little wonder that they'd been in opposition for 13 years because they had been unable to respond to any proposals put forward by the government in any sort of adequate way.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think that's probably enough from one staff member. Could we move on to another?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am happy to. Professor Dorothy Keefe has been a little bit more restrained in what she has said about the opposition, but one need only read the transcript of her interview this morning where she—a very experienced clinician. I would rather have my life in the hands of Professor Dorothy Keefe than any of the mob opposite. Professor Dorothy Keefe articulated why these reforms were so important. We've had a panel of over—three panels, in fact: a panel of doctors, a panel of nurses and a panel of allied health.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I know they want to try to shut me down. They just don't like hearing it, but nonetheless we have around 60 clinicians from across SA Health and across our health service, people who spend their lives day in, day out looking after the most vulnerable South Australians who have helped develop these proposals, who developed the clinical standards, and that's why it's so important. So, of course, anyone who wants to have a say on this, I absolutely welcome it because I know that, unlike those opposite, the majority of clinicians in SA Health realise that there is a strong case for change. We can't stick our heads in the sand. Things need to change. We need to be able to deliver health in a far better way than we have been.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before we go to the supplementary, I call to order the member for Kavel, the deputy leader, Chaffey, Morialta, leader, Schubert, Newland, Taylor. I warn the member for Hartley for the first time, in addition to calling him to order. Supplementary, if it be a supplementary.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): Is there any point in veterans, war widows and members of the public actually putting in a response to the Transforming Health report? Will the minister's decision regarding this facility be swayed?

The SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary; that is just another question.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:49): Yes, of course there is, and I welcome feedback from anyone in the public, but let me be quite clear. We have clinical standards that have been developed in the most consultative process ever undertaken with SA Health.

An honourable member: Three weeks!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: No, nine months. Thousands of clinicians have been involved in this process. Thousands of clinicians have provided their feedback. We have had the three clinical groups working for months, giving freely of their time to develop these clinical standards.

We have had a summit, and if the Leader of the Opposition had bothered to turn up, he would know. Happily, his health spokesman was there and sat there through the day and I am very happy that he did that. Nonetheless, this has been an extensive process. Many thousands of people have been involved from the very beginning. The standards that were developed were unanimously endorsed at the summit of over 600 people, and that provides a strong mandate for change.

I welcome feedback. We have to be quite clear: what we are asking for through this feedback process is for people to look at the clinical standards, to look at the proposals and to provide feedback on the basis of whether the proposals help or do not help us achieve those clinical standards. That is the basis upon which this consultation is proceeding and I welcome feedback from anyone, whether they be a veteran, the family of a veteran, a nurse, a doctor, an allied health worker or any other consumer on any of the proposals.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Before the leader asks the supplementary, I warn the members for Schubert and Hartley for the second and final time. I warn the leader for the first time and I call to order the members for Morphett and Finniss. Leader.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Is the minister swayed by the 13,500 signatures on the savetherepat.com petition and, if not, what will it take for the minister to change his mind about saving the Repat?

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): A signature is not a click of a mouse on a keyboard from someone when you do not know where they live, you do not know who they are and you do not know whether they understand the issues. If you provide me 13,000 signatures, I would be prepared—

The SPEAKER: No, if the leader provides—

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I beg your pardon. If the Leader of the Opposition can provide 13,000 signatures, of course that would carry some weight, but 13,000 clicks on the mouse or the keyboard is not 13,000 signatures. Give me a break.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Will the minister keep the Repat open if we can provide 13,000 hard copy signatures?

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:52): The Deputy Premier just said, 'Well, maybe the member for Hartley has been busy on his mouse clicking away 13,000 times.' I acknowledge that there are very strong feelings about the Repat. It has an important place in the hearts of all South Australians, particularly our veterans' community, but let's be real. Most parts of the Repat Hospital were built in the 1940s. They are quickly approaching the stage where they are no longer fit for purpose. We will not be able to continue safely to use those facilities for hospital purposes. This is the reality. We are approaching that date.

The second thing is, the needs of our veterans' community are very quickly changing. After the Second World War, we had thousands of young men and women return to South Australia with serious physical injuries that needed to be treated. Thank God, Australia will not be involved again, or in the near future, in those sorts of conflicts where thousands of young men and women are conscripted to serve overseas. The modern conflicts are smaller conflicts, which still have serious injuries, but I am happy to say our Army does an excellent job in tending to those physical injuries.

The missing gap is those who live with psychological trauma for decades: people who have returned from the Vietnam War who, 40 to 50 years later, are still suffering from the psychological trauma of their experience in the conflict and veterans from Afghanistan and Iraq. I have heard terrible cases of young men in their 20s who have served in Afghanistan suffering terrible psychological trauma from their experiences in that conflict.

We as a parliament have a responsibility to those people, and that responsibility is not to put them into a facility that is run down and decrepit. I want to improve that facility. I want to rebuild a new Ward 17 so that those returned servicemen and women can continue to receive the excellent services they have but in a new building, not be treated in a building that is many decades old and is run down and, quite frankly, no longer fit for purpose.

The SPEAKER: Before the leader rises again, the member for Unley is called to order and warned for the first time, the member for Finniss is warned, and I call the members for Hammond and Adelaide to order. Leader.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Health. Has the government sought or received any valuations of the land currently occupied by the Repat or the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:55): Not that I am aware of and, if we have, it certainly has not formed part of my considerations with regard to Transforming Health.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): Will the minister confirm with his department that no valuations have been sought from Renewal SA or any independent body and come back to 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) (14:56): I will check with my department but I can make something quite clear, that valuations of those properties have not formed a part of these deliberations. The sole consideration in all of these proposals is: how do we get better health care for South Australians?

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): Supplementary, sir: does the government plan to sell the Repat and the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre land?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:56): Moving off the Hampstead site is something that has been talked about for a very long time. I remember my predecessor, John Hill, talking about the state government decommissioning the Hampstead site. There are issues with it, there are particular clinical—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Listen to me. There are particular clinical reasons for us continuing not to provide rehab services on the Hampstead facility site. We will obviously have to have some discussions about what happens to that site. Of more importance and more sensitivity, of course, is the Repat and what happens to that site. What I have undertaken to do, and what I will do, is have a conversation with veterans' groups and veterans about what happens to that site. I think that site has enormous potential in the aged-care and health space. We have ViTA on that site; they will continue offering services there. The Flinders University have a presence on that site and, in conjunction with ViTA, I assume that will continue.

I can give an undertaking that we will have a conversation with veterans about the future use of the Repat site and, certainly, I have given a guarantee that the important parts on that site—the memorial garden and the chapel—will be protected, regardless of what happens with regard to the

future of the Repat. We will look after the chapel and we will look after the memorial garden. There are also heritage buildings on that site and, obviously, consideration needs to be given to that. While no firm decisions have been made, I will consult with veterans because I think that that site has enormous potential to continue operating in the healthcare space.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm that rehabilitation patients at St Margarets Hospital will be moved to the Hampstead centre as early as next week, ahead of the completion date for consultation on the Transforming Health report?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:58): I can, because this is a separate decision that was made last year as a result of extensive consultation both with staff there and consumers. This is something that has been long anticipated. St Margarets will be used for care of patients who we have in our acute hospital system who are only there because they are waiting for an aged-care place. That will be the new purpose of St Margarets. But this has been part of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network planning for, I think, roughly 12 months, so there is nothing new.

The SPEAKER: Arising from before the leader's last question, I warned the deputy leader and, apparently, I warned the member for Schubert a second time when I had not warned him a first time, so I withdraw the second warning.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: A fair punishment for what he got away with last time, sir.

The SPEAKER: There is that, as the member for Newland says. The member for Elder.

CRICKET WORLD CUP

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the ICC Cricket World Cup and Adelaide's role in hosting the Indian cricket team in the lead-up to the tournament?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:59): With pleasure, Mr Speaker. I thank the honourable member for her question. As members of this house would be aware, this weekend marks the official beginning of the 2015 ICC Cricket World Cup hosted across Australia and New Zealand over the next six weeks. Adelaide was selected as the official training base for the reigning world cup champions, the Indian cricket team, and that did not happen accidentally, sir, because we went after this match. We decided that it was the great game of the tournament to get. While everybody was off looking at the quarter-finals, we were looking at this India-Pakistan match.

We also have had two practice matches here at the Adelaide Oval against Australia and Afghanistan in the last week. The build up to this tournament reaches its climax on Sunday, when India plays its arch rival Pakistan at the Adelaide Oval in front of a sold-out crowd and a global audience of over one billion people. I understand this will make it the most watched live event in our state's history. While other states, as I say, pitched for other matches, we had our eyes firmly on the prize.

The match itself is predicted to deliver a direct economic benefit of \$10 million to South Australia and an indirect benefit of many times more. I am informed that 10,500 people just from India will be in Adelaide over the course of this weekend, and that represents the whole of the annual visitor population from India over the course of the year, so it is extraordinary. Over one weekend 10,000, when we only get about 10,000 over the course of the year.

SA Tourism has been working hard to promote the great experiences our state offers to these visitors. I understand that many of them are extending their stay over a number of days. This is a great result for hotels, our restaurants and retail businesses who no doubt are looking forward to a bumper weekend. Last night, I had the great pleasure of officially welcoming the Indian cricket team in Adelaide at the Telstra Plaza outside the magnificent Adelaide Oval. I must say, I have never

received a cheer like this at any time during the whole of the course of my political career and it is unlikely ever—

Mr Gardner: What about when you went to Mount Gambier?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Oh, yes; it was similar. It had a similar volume, although they were saying different words. Around 1,000 people, including the Swami Army and many others from Adelaide's Indian community were in attendance to welcome their heroes. The love they have for their cricketing heroes is extraordinary. I also hosted an official welcome reception for the team, where captain M.S. Dhoni remarked upon the wonderful hospitality that he and his players have received in South Australia since arriving.

The India versus Pakistan match also presents a wonderful opportunity to promote cultural and business links between South Australia and India. The government has sought to make the most of its opportunities, including to build on the recent trade missions to India by myself and other cabinet ministers, including the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Investment and Trade. We have been out there promoting South Australia to India over this period. There is a heightened awareness about Australia at the moment in India because of the excellent visit by Prime Minister Modi recently, so there is a heightened sense of awareness about Australia, and South Australia has stepped right into that space and is able to capture the attention here of the world.

Dozens of leading businessmen and women from India will be in attendance to learn more about investment opportunities in South Australia, so we've packed around this important business forums. We also have done something which I am incredibly proud of. As a gift to the people of India we invited 15 young school-aged boys to come here and participate in the Dream Team 15. They came from all over India. Hundreds and hundreds of them competed for this opportunity to actually be part of this training session in the lead-up to the match on the 15th. They will go back and tell their families and, indeed, the Indian community of South Australia's deep friendship for the people of India for our mutual benefit, including the many wonderful economic opportunities for our state.

LAND TAX

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier rule out that his government will put a great big land tax on the family home before the next election?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:04): The government has released our State Tax Review Discussion Paper and we are seeking comments from the South Australian public about our own source revenue and what we want the public to give us feedback on is what kind of taxation system they want.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Obviously whenever you have a discussion about taxation you get a lot of vested interests talking about their preferred options and there have been a number of independent assessments and modelling done about what some very efficient systems of taxation would be.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Indeed, there have been accounting firms and the most recent Henry review that remarked on a whole series of options from changing the way payroll tax is collected to the way you charge land tax to the way you tax transactions. In having a detailed approach to tax reform, if the government had not modelled options that had been publicly canvassed across the country and had simply ignored some aspects of state-owned revenue and said, 'Look, that is just too hard, so we are not even going to talk about that,' we would have been ridiculed by the opposition. They would have said this is not a thorough assessment of state-based taxation.

So what we have done is included models on what it would look like if, through the consultation, the public of South Australia said we would prefer to pay no conveyance duty on property and we would prefer to replace that with a broad-based tax. That does not mean the government wants to introduce a broad-based tax. We want to have a mature debate, but

unfortunately at the first hurdle the opposition has fallen over. Before they have even read the report, they are ruling things in and out—before even reading it.

Members interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: the minister is now talking about opposition policy. He is clearly debating.

The SPEAKER: It is a bit hard to answer the question if the Treasurer cannot compare and contrast the opposition's position with the government's so I will listen carefully to what the Treasurer has to say.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The government has a whole series of priorities that we have talked about through the Governor's opening of the parliament. We want to investigate new industries for South Australia. We want to look at the nuclear fuel cycle. We want to talk about whether we are in the right time zone. We want to talk about investigating new technologies and we want to talk about our tax system.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have to say that, when you have a government that has cut probably \$4.5 billion of revenue out of the tax system and if we had kept tax rates as they were when we first came to office, we would be charging South Australians out of our economy a billion dollars more per year in taxation. I think it is prudent that every now and then we stop and consider our tax system. Is it efficient? How can we encourage business to invest? What are the transactional inhibitions that we put in place to stop business from investing? What can we do to encourage entrepreneurs and start-ups? How can we provide those services that South Australians deserve and South Australians have come to know and expect from our hospitals, from our schools, from our police, and the infrastructure we provide? It is time for a mature debate about this issue, and at the first hurdle the opposition fall over because of playing blatant populist politics.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I think the Treasurer has made his point. The deputy leader is warned for the second and final time, the members for Stuart, MacKillop and Mitchell are called to order, the members for Morialta and Hammond are warned for the first time, and the member for Schubert has got his second warning back.

Mr WILLIAMS: Excuse me, Mr Speaker. I have been quietly sitting here reading from my iPad for the whole of question time. Is that out of order?

The SPEAKER: No, you were not called to order for reading. You were called to order for interjecting.

Mr WILLIAMS: Sir, I have not interjected.

The SPEAKER: Well, you have.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier wishes to adopt the member for MacKillop's call to order and accordingly it is withdrawn from the member for MacKillop and added to the member for Mount Gambier's column.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): My question is to the Premier. Now that our unemployment rate has reached 7.3 per cent, officially the highest in the nation, does the Premier stand by the government's promise to create 100,000 new jobs by 2016?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:09): Repeating in a loud and angry voice the nature of the challenge does not illuminate the issue. If this had been a persuasive tactic, the Leader of the Opposition would be standing here and I would be sitting over there—or probably not sitting over there actually, I would probably be up the back. So, this obviously has not been a persuasive tactic. Loudly repeating the nature of the challenge, and I think—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. The Premier has just gone on and on about the nature of the questions asked.

The SPEAKER: Yes, going on and on is not a breach of standing orders.

Ms CHAPMAN: It is completely irrelevant to an answer.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health is called to order. What is the point of order?

Ms CHAPMAN: Failing to address the substance of the question at all.

The SPEAKER: That is always a hard one to get up. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I was just getting warmed up. If this was a persuasive point of view, it would have attracted more support for the Leader of the Opposition because that is frankly all that has been offered—that is, very loudly articulating the nature of the problem. That is not sufficient. In fact, if the Leader of the Opposition is not prepared to take my advice about advancing positive ideas for the future of South Australia, he should at least listen to his mentor and former premier of Victoria Jeff Kennett, who just yesterday said:

I trust that if I am criticised for supporting Labor's Jay Weatherill, those who launch such criticism will understand that I am not turning Left, just embracing good and necessary policy.

Those remarks were about our efforts to be able to generate ideas which are about the future prosperity of South Australia. Indeed, if he wants to go further, I don't necessarily think that Nigel McBride is a mentor of the Leader of the Opposition, but generally speaking he would be regarded as a supporter—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. Statements about those who are allegedly giving advice to the Leader of the Opposition are nothing to do with the question about the government standing by its commitment to create—

The SPEAKER: And the point of order is?

Ms CHAPMAN: Absolute relevance.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I hope the Premier will join up his remarks.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will join up my remarks in due course, sir. Nigel McBride is asking the Leader of the Opposition to 'keep his powder dry' and suspend judgement on a number of these important positive ideas about the future of South Australia.

Mr PISONI: A point of order, Mr Speaker. This question was about the government's promise to create 100,000 jobs.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and the Premier is addressing economic policy which I think is related to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Well, look, the member for Unley has been warned up to the maximum. He has continued to interject, not just on this occasion but before. He is very close to leaving the house again. His point of order is not valid. The Premier is talking about economic policy which is germane to the creation of jobs and he is quoting certain people who he thinks support his side of the argument. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We do not need the monthly unemployment figures, which do fluctuate from time to time, to know that we face very substantial challenges here in this state. We do not need the Leader of the Opposition to repeat the bleeding obvious for us to understand the gravity and the urgency of what we are grappling with. That is why we have laid out 10 economic priorities for the future of South Australia. Our project is always about

the creation of jobs, and when we seek to advance ideas about the creation of jobs, such as building 12 new submarines here in South Australia, what we get from those opposite is the supine, lickspitting that goes on in favour of the federal Liberal government. If they would just raise their voice, if they would just stand with us once—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Before I take the member for Morialta's point of order, I warn him for the second time for interjection. I also warn the leader for the second and final time, and the member for Mitchell for the first time. Member for Morialta?

Mr GARDNER: Sir, accepting your previous ruling, the Premier is clearly debating as we have strayed into an area that is well beyond 2016, the time frame about which the question was asked.

The SPEAKER: I hope the Premier's remarks can be perhaps a little more contemporaneous.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: My remarks are directed at the projects this state is advancing on behalf of itself so that it can grow jobs and our economy now. All of the initiatives that we are promoting for our 10 strategic priorities are about growing our economy, and every time we advance a positive idea for the future of South Australia what we have from those opposite is derision and barriers that are put in our way of achieving these things. Just simply accept the advice of almost every commentator that now exists in South Australia. Get on board and engage in a positive debate about the future of our economy.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Get out of the way.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

MINING EMPLOYMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:15): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his promise of 13 November last year to create an additional 5,000 jobs in the mining and resources sector by 2017 and, if so, how many mining and resources sector jobs have been created since making that promise?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:15): What we did—and I know those opposite have derided the fact that we have established 10 priorities for the future of South Australia, but we just remind those opposite of how it was achieved. Thousands and thousands of South Australians, businesspeople from across every sector—the community sector, academia, leaders from across our Public Service—came together, after the last election, to come up with a plan, a vision for the future of South Australia. We know that we face many challenges. Ten priorities emerged.

The government took it upon itself to actually call itself to account by publishing targets over the course of the life of this government, so that by the time we get to the next election we have set targets for ourselves. Now, they are stretch targets. We accept that. Whether we achieve them or not will largely depend on our capacity to mobilise every resource in this state for that purpose. Some of them may not be able to be achieved. I notice that there is this little finesse, that everything that is advanced as a target for the future of our state now gets turned into a promise, so they are going to try to erect some argument—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, he's talking about something that was published late last year—I think you need to compare your notes—after the election. I don't think they compare question time strategies here. This was a document that was published late last year, the 10 areas that we published. We said we would publish targets that we were going to strive to as a state. What we need to do is everybody in this state needs to work together to achieve those objectives. One of the difficulties we have is that half of the political equation is kelp on the keel, is dragging us, not prepared to participate in this endeavour.

Members interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: If the point of order is that the Premier is not responsible for the opposition, yes, the member for Morialta is right, but I would be far more—

Mr GARDNER: I would add unparliamentary language to it as well, sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, I would be far more likely to uphold the point of order and sit the Premier down if there wasn't a torrent of interjections from my left-hand side—far more inclined to uphold the point of order. What is the point about parliamentary language?

Mr GARDNER: Kelp on the keel, sir.

The SPEAKER: Erskine May prohibits members referring to one another as animals. I am yet to be convinced that there is a precedent that one member cannot call another member a plant.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Flora is in, fauna is out.

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland summarises it correctly. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I can solve the problem for the opposition. Come the end of 2017—we published these targets. We know the risk we took when we did that. We are going to hold ourselves—

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I ask you to ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question, which included giving progress on what has been achieved to date against the target.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I do recall the question. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The one piece of progress that we have actually made was roundly criticised by those opposite, that is attracting OZ Minerals to set up their head office here. One of the key objectives we set ourselves was to set up three new head offices in the mining industry, and when we achieved one of those head offices it gets roundly criticised.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: So, we are working away at the objectives we set ourselves in that plan. We are holding ourselves to account; every public servant in this state knows that they're to be held to account. Every minister who has a responsibility for this area is going to be held to account. But we would be assisted in this endeavour if those opposite could get on board with the overwhelming majority of South Australians who just want them to come up with a single positive idea to advance South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The members for Adelaide and Mount Gambier are warned for the first time. The member for Stuart.

MINING EMPLOYMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:20): My question is again to the Premier. At the rate of \$10 million paid to OZ Minerals for approximately 30 new jobs to be based in South Australia—which he just referred to in his last answer—how much will it cost our taxpayers to achieve the government's 5,000 new jobs which have been promised?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:20): Of course, the member for Stuart, I think, is more intelligent than the question he asks, because he knows that it's a cheap shot to simply do the tabloid trick of saying \$10 million, 60 jobs—

Mr Marshall: Well, release the details of the contract.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We explained them at the time, and the investment is to permit OZ Minerals to invest in research to unlock the challenges associated with getting at our very deep mineralogy here in this state. They are obliged to share that for the whole of the state, for the benefit of the whole of the state. It's not proprietary information, it's something that will be available for all miners.

If we are able to unlock the technological challenges of getting at these ore bodies, it not only will create incredibly large numbers of jobs associated with that particular company but it will also unlock opportunities for other companies. So, it is obviously a cheap debating point to actually compare the \$10 million with the 60 jobs associated with the movement of head office.

Having said that, the head office itself means that if OZ Minerals, as a very large—I think it is a company that is capitalised in the order of \$1 billion—a top 200 ASX company, is successful in its operations in Australia and around the world and it grows, that growth will happen here in South Australia. Of course, there is also the question of critical mass. There is the accumulation of head offices here in South Australia which all interact with each other and create important synergies. That is why we placed that as a strategic objective.

When we published these things, we heard no cogent criticism of the targets that we set for ourselves. There is just a complaint that, 'We don't think you're going to get there.' Well, they are a bit like the complaints that we heard coming from those opposite year after year. Every year I have been in this role, every year those opposite said that we didn't grow. They trot out some statistic, always finding the worst-available statistic, to say that this economy is not growing. Every single year of the time I have been in this office and, indeed, of the previous, every one of the 13 years we have been in this office, this state economy has grown—sometimes not at the rate that has been able to provide all of the jobs for the citizens we would like, but nevertheless we have grown every year.

Please stop talking down South Australia, and if you can't avoid stopping talking down South Australia, at least offer some positive ideas about how you think it should be different.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: A supplementary question, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg is right. The supplementary, member for Stuart.

MINING EMPLOYMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:23): Given the Premier's answer, can he advise the house whether there is any specific obligation or agreement with OZ Minerals for a specific number of new jobs to come to South Australia for the shifting of their head office, and if so, what that number is?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:23): I think it is important when we look at head offices like OZ Minerals, to have a look at what the capability is we want to have here in South Australia. In last week's *Financial Review*, OZ Minerals had a series of adverts in the paper looking for a brand-new chief financial officer that was previously based in Victoria. That chief financial officer will now be based here in South Australia. The chief operating officer. The chief executive will be moving here to South Australia, but of course—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Here we go—it's the old game, just count the number of jobs. I say this—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I say this to members opposite: there is a very good editorial in *The Advertiser* by the business editor, Chris Russell. He said that the OZ Minerals announcement had been viewed too simplistically by critics. Mr Russell, like us, understands the value of the research we have invested in. The \$10 million that we have invested leverages \$18 million, a total of \$28 million, into researching how to unlock uniquely South Australian assets.

One of the reasons our mining boom here in South Australia is so difficult is because our ore deposits are at depth, they are at depth and they have uranium. That uranium is expensive to extract. Our commodities are of high grade, they are world class, our regulatory regime is seen by the rest of the world as being one of the best in the world, and they want to invest in South Australia—but there are technical inhibitions in getting their capital here and investing in our markets.

What OZ Minerals has offered the state is an investment in new technologies, partnering with our universities and our graduates, to unlock the key to removing uranium and copper from our ore bodies in a cost-effective way and making mining more cost effective. However, what do they do once they have unlocked it? Do they keep the IP for themselves? No, they do not. They make it freely available to every other South Australian mining company. There is only one group of people in this state who says that is a bad idea, and it includes the Leader of the Opposition.

There have been many reforms in this parliament that many people have criticised that later on have been seen to be very valuable. I think with the royal commission into the fuel cycle, this will be seen by future generations as a good deal, and they will not remember the small-minded people who opposed it.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I think the Treasurer has finished, and that may obviate the need for the member for Stuart's point of order.

An honourable member: He still hasn't answered the question.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, is it?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop gets his call to order back, and the member for Stuart is warned for the second and final time.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:27): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier or any of his cabinet ministers participated in any capital-raising presentations regarding the ACP Gillman development? In asking this question I am not asking him to identify with whom he may have made those presentations, if there were any.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:27): I am not going into detail about the—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am going to answer the question in the way I choose. I am not going to go into any detail about steps I take on behalf of companies, either in the broad or the specific, about advancing their interests. It is the routine business of economic ministers in this government to make presentations about the general economic circumstances that exist in South Australia for the benefit of companies. If we are invited to make presentations about our regulatory regime, our excellent assets or government policy, we are available to do that whenever and wherever we possibly can. We do it overseas, we do it to people who visit here. This is the routine business of the Premier and economic ministers. We will continue to do that on behalf of specific companies on request or generally, where there is no specific opportunity that exists.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:28): A supplementary: leaving aside, then, the regulatory and other presentations which the Premier is called upon to make, and which he indicates he does, in respect of capital raising and in respect of this project have you or your ministers made any presentations?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:28): I am not going to detail any of the steps we take on behalf of individual companies in relation to these matters, except to say that the only information we provide, that it is proper to provide, is about the benefits that South Australia has, the attributes we have as a state, government policy and how it supports particular enterprises. We will always and forever continue to do that, because it is about growing jobs in our state.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:29): A further supplementary: then why was it made a term of the agreement, the option deed, that government and its ministers be available to assist in the compliance obligations, including finance, of the agreement?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:29): It's a very easy obligation to meet because it's no more or less than what we would offer for any company that's seeking to grow jobs and opportunities here in South Australia.

NYRSTAR

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:30): My question is to the Minister for State Development. Can the minister inform the house of any significant milestones at Nyrstar's Port Pirie redevelopment project and any impediments to securing this major investment in regional South Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:30): Can I thank the member for Colton for his keen interest in the Port Pirie region. It is fair to say there has been substantial progress in the \$514 million redevelopment of the Port Pirie smelter, an investment secured by funding and a support package agreed between Nyrstar and the South Australian government, and the member for Frome played a very large role in securing that package. Major contracts have been awarded, demolition work is underway and construction of a new workshop and oxygen plant has begun.

Mr Speaker, excitement is building. Only last week, Paris-based Air Liquide announced a long-term agreement with Nyrstar to invest in a new state-of-the-art air separation unit as part of the redevelopment project. This is an \$85 million project that has been leveraged from this government's support for Nyrstar's redevelopment project. This brings the total investment in Port Pirie to almost \$600 million, a major flow of capital into regional South Australia that is creating jobs and opportunities for local suppliers.

The expanded agreement allows Air Liquide to supply oxygen and nitrogen to the new industrial process to be used by Nyrstar at Port Pirie. I hope I pronounce this correctly, sir—François Venet, Air Liquide's vice-president, Asia Pacific, said, and I have translated this myself:

With this investment, Air Liquide is reinforcing its presence in Australia.

He goes on to say:

We are also proud that this project both contributes to reducing the environmental footprint while strengthening the industrial foundation of South Australia.

As a partner in this project, we are very proud. Proud of the international investment secured for this state and proud that the redevelopment will deliver a better environment for the residents of Port Pirie. This was not an easy deal to secure, but the alternative was not standing with Nyrstar to secure this investment and that was too bleak a future to contemplate.

Port Pirie's future would have been one of mass social dislocation. There would have been huge legacy issues from a smelter that has operated on that site for more than 125 years. We would have had to deal with the flow-on effects to the small businesses, contractors and retail and service industry workers in Port Pirie and the Mid North that rely on the workforce at the smelter, let alone the dramatic decrease in property values. Confidence in the community, region and state would have been shattered.

We began our discussions with Nyrstar with a Labor government in Canberra which understood that without the investment in Port Pirie, Port Pirie would be on its knees. We found that with the change of government there was a distinct lack of enthusiasm to support an EFIC guarantee for this project. I spoke with Andrew Robb, a man who I have a great deal of respect for and who I believe has a great deal of integrity. He was in charge of EFIC and he was clear that there would be no guarantee under an Abbott government. His words were, to quote, 'This is near impossible.'

So, the South Australian government had to go it alone. We had to go it alone to secure this much-needed investment, and we did it because we believe in the people of Port Pirie and we know that in South Australia the best outcomes are achieved when we work with business, the community and the parliament to meet the challenges that we face. It is in the DNA of the Australian Labor Party to stand up for working families and it is in our DNA to stand up for Nyrstar.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:34): My question is to the Minister for Road Safety. Minister, can you advise the outcomes of funding applications from the Motor Accident Commission local government road safety initiatives program?

The SPEAKER: Minister. I was just giving the member for Schubert time to check.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:34): Check the website? I am just about to announce it, so I am not sure he is going to find it on there. First of all, I would like to thank the member for Giles for his strong advocacy, not just for his electorate but for regional South Australia in general. I am pleased to announce that 41 projects across the state have received funding for road safety initiatives.

Last year the government approved the allocation of \$47.7 million for a range of road safety initiatives recommended by the road safety initiatives advisory group to be delivered across the 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 financial years. This formed part of the \$100 million funding from the Motor Accident Commission announced in the 2013-14 state budget for road safety infrastructure to improve our roads. Included in the \$47.7 million was \$4 million to assist local government to undertake road safety infrastructure initiatives.

Applications for the local government funding closed in September last year and 50 submissions were received from local councils. The projects selected were assessed by the road safety initiatives advisory group. I am pleased to announce that 25 councils, both regional and metropolitan, will receive money for vital road safety projects. Each of these projects improves safety on our state's roads, and the investment by MAC, in partnership with local government, demonstrates the state's commitment to road safety and addressing local safety concerns.

I, like all South Australians, have been left devastated by the number of deaths on our roads already this year. Sadly, rural and regional drivers continue to be overrepresented in our state's road toll and this worrying trend unfortunately continues. In 2014, 67 per cent of all fatal crashes occurred on rural roads, an increase of 6 per cent from 2013.

In this allocation, 14 regional councils will receive over \$1.3 million from the Motor Accident Commission's Road Safety Fund, which means that over half of this initial funding allocation will be spent on regional road safety projects. It will be used for works such as shoulder widening and sealing, increased signage, and installation of safety and guardrails, and will provide invaluable safety upgrades to those rural roads and their communities. Factoring in council contributions, the 41 projects see an investment of over \$3 million in road safety infrastructure across the state.

Initiatives from this fund will see an investment of \$250,000 on an S-bend at Proper Bay Road, Tulka, on Lower Eyre Peninsula. The safety improvements at this location include shoulder sealing and wire rope safety barriers. The intersection of St Kilda Road and Robinson Road at Waterloo Corner will be improved through a \$174,000 investment, with new and improved traffic management signage and road widening works to occur.

In the Hills, \$100,000 will be invested to install a protected right turn and pedestrian refuge on Morphett and Walker streets, Mount Barker, in partnership with the local council. In the APY lands, \$100,000 will be invested to install a wombat crossing and speed humps in Mimili and the creation of a 25 km/h school zone and installation of traffic controls in Ernabella.

A call for further local government projects is being undertaken to enable local governments to apply for up to \$500,000 per project for the remaining unallocated \$1.74 million to ensure that every dollar allocated is spent on road safety infrastructure. I would urge all councils to make a submission for the next round. A full list of the successful projects will be available online later and I

congratulate all the successful councils who will receive the funding. I also take this opportunity to remind all road users that we are all responsible for one another on our roads.

SAMPSON FLAT BUSHFIRE

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:38): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on the government's efforts to repair critical road infrastructure and reopen roads following the Sampson Flat bushfires?

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) (15:38): I thank the member for Newland for his question and his obvious interest in the subject, given that his electorate was affected by the recent Sampson Flat bushfires. The member for Morialta has expressed a keen interest in this area for similar reasons.

There are of course many who should be recognised for their substantial contribution to the Sampson Flat bushfire effort, and the Minister for Emergency Services made reference to them earlier: our CFS and SES volunteers, South Australia Police, volunteer groups such as the Red Cross and the Salvation Army and, of course, all the local community and sporting clubs who assisted the community to recover.

However, one aspect of the bushfire recovery effort was the works undertaken to reopen the roads. This year's fires had a substantial impact on the road network in the fire-affected area. As soon as it was safe to do so, the CFS and SAPOL gave the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure officers access to the roads. These staff, and contractors assisting these staff, were out in the local area to survey the damage and commence the significant task of repairing the fire-affected road infrastructure that was necessary before reopening the roads.

The fires caused sections of roads to become impassable with fallen trees, as well as the risk of burnt-out trees at the roadside collapsing. The fires also damaged road infrastructure such as signage, guardrails, delineators (reflectors), line marking and, in some areas, pavement surfaces. Overall, over 35 kilometres of road was cleared in an effort by DPTI, local council and contractor staff.

The first task was the removal of debris and trees. Arborists and tree removal specialists were engaged to individually inspect trees, literally walking down each of the roads inspecting each tree on the roadside for potential risks that they might pose to the road area and marking for removal those with the potential to collapse and cause hazards to road users. These arborists were followed by teams of tree removal contractors, who removed those marked trees.

The work to repair the road network involved 56 of these tree removal specialists, with the assistance of 44 often very heavy pieces of machinery, 20 arborists, as well as management staff to provide direction and assessments during these works. The very substantial amount of wood from the pruning and felling has been stockpiled and is being managed by council officers.

The roads are all open to traffic and, as of 7 February, have an 80 km/h speed limit while reparatory works continue along these roads. Some of these works include replacing guardrails and other minor tasks, and that will necessitate speed restrictions during the time that these works are undertaken. I am advised that most signs and guardrails have, however, been replaced and that the task to complete all this work will be done in the coming days. New signage had to be sourced from manufacturers, which caused some of the delay in reopening these roads. At the current time, it is estimated that the cost just for the road network recovery is nearly \$3 million.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank transport and council staff, as well as the contractors, for their extraordinary round-the-clock efforts to get these roads reopened. I know that there was very understandable and significant frustration from landowners within the fire-affected area regarding the time it took to provide access to these roads, to make these roads safe, so that people could attend to their properties. However, as I am sure all can imagine, safety is paramount in these considerations and I know that CFS and SAPOL officers, as well as all the road recovery teams, worked as quickly as possible to provide access to these roads.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LEVY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:42): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister inform the house whether all tickets for the Liverpool F.C. game at the Adelaide Oval later this year will be hit with the new public transport levy or, as it is referred to by the Tiser, the 'fun tax'?

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) (15:43): I do not believe it is referred to by *The Advertiser* by that name. I think it is only one particular member of parliament who refers to it in that manner, Mr Speaker. I have explained to the member for Mitchell, and explained to this chamber, time after time after time, and I am happy to avail the house of a couple of soft puppets, if that would assist the opposition understand how this works. We will sit down—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: And I am sure the Leader of the Opposition needs some sort of rudimentary explanation, as he would when it comes to most issues of transport policy given that he has never shown any interest in it whatsoever. But that is alright: he is re-establishing his image of being interested in social issues, once again. He has engaged the support of members of the other chamber to do that, and that is a good thing.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order because there has been a torrent of interjections which enables the minister to surf on those interjections.

Mr PISONI: In response to the minister being out of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I have explained to this chamber previously, now that the legislation has been passed and, of course, passed with the full support of the member for Mitchell and those opposite, we will go through the process that that legislation provides for us to do. We will talk to the Stadium Management Authority, which is, of course, the body responsible for managing the events at the Adelaide Oval about how that might be applied, and we will do it in a open, transparent and consistent manner.

Mr WINGARD: Supplementary, sir?

The SPEAKER: Question time has expired, I'm afraid.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Well, that's the second day in a row that the member for Adelaide has missed out, this time because of the member for Unley's point of order.

Grievance Debate

RED HOUSE GROUP

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:45): It is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak about Gallery M and their recent *300* exhibition by the Red House Group at Marion Cultural Centre. The Red House Group was formed in 1994. It is an artistic-managed, not-for-profit organisation that acts as a focus for art and cultural activities for all individuals and groups in the community around my electorate of Mitchell.

One of the strengths of the Red House Group is the continued involvement over many years of quite a few members. There have been over 1,400 artists in the group over the past 20 years, with 300 to 400 members in any one year. Gallery M is managed by Julie Prichard and a great team of volunteers. The *300* title in this exhibition centres on the highest cost of any one piece of art on display. All the works in this exhibition are priced at \$300 or below, so there are some brilliant, affordable pieces on offer to the community.

There are works in a variety of mediums, including painting, drawings, photography and a range of 3-D work in glass, textile, clay and timber. As someone with a strong sporting background I

have always admired and marvelled at artistic talent, mostly because I do not have any. It is wonderful to see so much on display from people in our local community. While there were so many fabulous artists on display in the recent *300* exhibition, I would like to mention a couple of people, if I may.

The first one is a young lady who I met on the night, Jessica Olijynk. Her work caught my eye. She had just finished year 12 and been accepted into university to study health science, but she is keen to pursue her artistic side as well. Jessica's grandparents also had works on display, and it was clear to see where her talent has come from. Her grandpa gave her a camera, and her very first work was on display, one of the first photos she had ever taken. Clearly, Jessica is a natural.

John Hamilton also had a piece in the exhibition. His oil painting was titled *Waiting for David, Florence*. It appealed to me, and the price was \$300. John's work usually sells for much more, but in the spirit of the *300* exhibition he offered up a real bargain for one lucky person. John is an award-winning artist, graphic design teacher and workshop instructor. He joined the Red House Group in 2003, when he was living in Sydney. He and his wife Rosie moved back to Adelaide in 2005, where John got actively involved in serving on the board and the exhibition committee. John now paints full-time from his Oaklands Park studio, and he is always on hand to offer advice to young upcoming artists.

Ian Willding was another highly credentialled artist who had an acrylic on canvas painting titled *White Chrysanthemum* on display. It was also under the price of \$300 and great value for any purchaser. Ian joined the Red House Group in 1995 and has also served on the leadership group on the board and exhibition committee. Ian has become a well-known Australian painter with an Indigenous background, who works in an abstract style. Ian's paintings are vibrant and colourful, and while he uses acrylics, he also dabbles in multimedia. Ian works from his own studio in Adelaide Central Studios in the city. Ian has also been an art teacher at Suneden Special School, Mitchell Park, since 1999.

As you can tell, there is a great variety of experience in the Red House Group, and encouragement is always given to those embarking on their art career. Members with a wealth of experience share with newer members, and many worthwhile connections have been created over the years. For more information about the Red House Group visit my website coreywingard.com.au and you can link through to gallerym.net.au.

As I continue, I would like to add to my question. I felt a little bit ridiculed there by the Minister for Transport as he said that I keep asking him the question; but I do keep asking him the question about the fund tax, or public transport levy—call it what you will. I do keep asking that question because people ask me what is going on with this tax. I keep asking the question and he keeps refusing to answer the question.

He says he wants to be transparent with the people of South Australia, so I say come forward and let the people of South Australia know which events are going to be hit with this levy or fun tax and then they will know. It is just called being upfront, honest and transparent with the people. So I do take umbrage when he says, 'Stop asking the question.' I will stop asking the question when he gives the answer. I think it is only fair to South Australian people that they do get that answer. Liverpool is a very big team and they are coming here to play against Adelaide United. If when people get the tickets it says that there is a transport levy, the minister just needs to come forward and say that and fess up and tell the people of South Australia, 'This is what we are doing. The levy is on the tickets. Here it is for all to see.'

Time expired.

FEDERAL MINISTER FOR WOMEN

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:50): I rise to speak about our federal Minister for Women, Tony. Not Toni with an 'i' that might suggest that this person holding this office is appropriately a woman, but no, Tony with a 'y', a man who is the minister for the women of Australia. Interesting and troublesome and, given his thoughts on women and the disadvantage he has caused to women through his cruel cuts and failure to understand how to secure gender equality, disturbing.

Why indeed would our Prime Minister not understand that in a modern, educated nation which purports to advance the rights of women that it is crucial for women to have control over their own lives and be advanced into significant positions like the Minister for Women to strengthen our collective women's voice?

I share some thoughts from the Minister for Women about the women he purports to represent. He expressed his disbelief that women will ever achieve equality with men, apparently backed by some strain of scientific evidence, when he said:

I think it would be folly to expect that women will ever dominate or even approach equal representation in a large number of areas simply because their aptitudes, abilities and interests are different for physiological reasons.

On sex he said:

I think there does need to be give and take on both sides, and this idea that sex is kind of a woman's right to absolutely withhold, just as the idea that sex is a man's right to demand I think are both, they both need to be moderated...

On whose responsibility are household chores he espoused:

What the housewives of Australia need to understand as they do the ironing is that if they get it done commercially it's going to go up in price and their own power bills when they switch the iron on are going to go up.

Perhaps this is what underpinned his recent nomination of repealing the carbon tax as his greatest achievement as Minister for Women saying women are particularly focused on the household budget. During his election campaign, he described a female candidate as having sex appeal and encouraged *Big Brother* contestants to vote for him as the guy with the not bad looking daughters.

The Minister for Women's words come from a time far away and disturbingly from a deep-seated place of assumption and judgement about how women should be viewed and what they should engage in. His actions in relation to women unfortunately affirm his negative beliefs. He has done nothing to advance our cause and everything to see women take a giant step away from equality.

With violence perpetrated against women by a partner now the leading cause of death, disability and ill health amongst Australian women aged between 15 and 44, it is astonishing the Minister for Women has cut \$44 million from homelessness services. The low income superannuation contribution for workers earning less than \$37,000 a year is cut, negatively impacting 2.1 million women or the retirement savings of almost one in two women.

On the question of income, the previous Labor government wholeheartedly supported equal pay for community workers, but the Minister for Women has unfortunately backed away from similar provisions for childcare workers, the majority of whom are women. If you are a girl in the developing world your first step into education is a doorway to a better life—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey has already been called to order.

Ms HILDYARD: —a doorway made possible through Australian aid. With the cruel 20 per cent cut in Australian aid that chance has been taken away. Plan International identifies girls in developing countries as the biggest losers, with a projected 220,000 fewer girls enrolling in school.

Australian Opals star, Lauren Jackson, called out the Liberal government about its cuts to the ABC which will result in the cutting of their coverage of women's basketball and soccer. Lauren voiced her fears when budget cuts to the ABC of \$254 million were made saying women's sport had become a 'sacrificial lamb'—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell already has one warning.

Ms HILDYARD: —and that it was a 'very dark day for women's sport'. She also said, 'The Liberal government doesn't really put sport ahead of anything else, especially women's sport.'

We need a minister for women who stands up for women and does not speak or act in a way which diminishes us. That person should be a woman. Tony Abbott is not my minister for women,

and there are millions of Australian women who feel the same way. I wholeheartedly congratulate National Australian Young Labor Women's Officer, Hannah MacLeod, and Senator Penny Wong on organising the launch on behalf of the women of Australia of the new organisation, Not My Minister for Women, last week.

WORLD VISION AUSTRALIA

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:55): During the summer break I had the privilege of being able to travel to Zimbabwe as a guest of the South Australian office of World Vision. The purpose of this trip was to look at World Vision—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned for the first time.

Mr SPEIRS: —coordinated projects which South Australians have had input into and which are supported by World Vision Australia and federal government agency AusAID. Travelling with World Vision staff and me was a small delegation from Edge Church International, which has its south campus close to the southern end of my electorate and which the member for Mitchell and I have regular interactions with.

Our trip to Zimbabwe was challenging in many ways. The country is a live example of what happens when the systems of government totally fail. Everything in Zimbabwe is in decline, decaying. Unemployment rates are hard to reliably calculate but, if subsistence farming is excluded from the definition of employment, the rate of people out of work could be in excess of 80 per cent. Of those in actual employment, a huge proportion are employed by NGOs meaning that, in effect, they are part of a necessary but false economy.

There is barely any commerce and free enterprise in Zimbabwe. I took \$US400 with me as spending money and came back with \$US300. There was little to spend money on. Everything in Zimbabwe is more difficult than it ought to be. Immediately upon our arrival we struggled to get camera gear through customs and had to pay an official bribe or deposit of \$US1,000 to get the equipment through. It was the beginning of a web of bureaucracy which we were tangled in for most of our trip.

It was obvious that so disempowered is Zimbabwean society that anyone who has a semblance of personal power—a customs officer, a police officer, a national park ranger, an NGO worker—would inflate their power, complicating life and slowing everything to a standstill. What was most startling for me was the way that fear coursed through the country. The government has the populace right where it wants it—paralysed by fear, entirely apathetic, disempowered and broken. In fact, those who are most depressed and completely trapped by government are those who stay most loyal to the despotic Mugabe regime.

After only a couple days in the country, I felt that fear spread like a cancer into our thinking and our actions. Our conversations became filtered and we began to walk on eggshells. The real tragedy of all this is the needlessness of the situation befalling Zimbabwe. It should be a prosperous country. Its climate is amazing, warm and mild, with decent levels of rainfall. In fact, in 2011 Zimbabwe was rated as having the best climate in the world on the Quality of Life Index. Zimbabwe has fantastic agricultural soils and rarely experiences the natural disasters which often befall Third World countries. It all comes down to leadership or a lack thereof and the great brokenness of the Zimbabwean government, the power wielded by ZANU-PF and its ageing leader, Robert Mugabe.

Despite this difficulty, our trip was good. I had a good time and I enjoyed spending time with warm, welcoming, energetic Zimbabwean people. I enjoyed their smiles and their enthusiasm for life. We spent most of our time in Zimbabwe's second largest city, Bulawayo—a city which has traditionally been seen as Zimbabwe's industrial capital—but mass departures to South Africa in search of employment have hollowed it out and left it a shadow of its former self.

World Vision's approach to development in Zimbabwe is based around area development programs (ADPs). ADPs are established for the long term with World Vision connecting with and supporting a community through its ADP for 15 years. Two years are spent planning how support programs can be rolled out, then over the ensuing decade a sustained effort is made to improve food

security, access to clean water, create economic development solutions and develop local leaders. We visited a range of projects across those categories both in Bulawayo and in the country. On one occasion we visited a village where we sheltered under a tree and listened to the villagers' dream of building a new school so that their children did not need to walk a round trip of 30 kilometres—that is 30 kilometres—every day to get to school and back. Their vision to build a school will hopefully be supported later in the year by Edge Church International's Ride for Hope appeal.

We talk a lot about federal cuts in this place, sometimes too much, but I think it is worth mentioning the disappointing reduction of \$11.3 billion over five years in our foreign aid program. I have heard people say phrases like 'Charity begins at home' and that we should be getting our own situation in order before helping others. To me, this attitude is at best naïve and at worst idiotic. We need to look at our foreign aid budget and look at ways we can help the most vulnerable overseas as well as at home.

ELDER ELECTORATE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (16:00): I rise today to highlight the inspirational work of students, staff, parents and all volunteers of the school communities in my electorate of Elder. It is probably impossible to overstate the role our schools play in nurturing, developing and realising the potential of our children. To paraphrase what I have previously said in this place, South Australia can only benefit as a fairer and more productive society when we invest in our youngest citizens.

In support of families, our teachers and school staff reinforce the values and learning that first happens at home. For children who face extra challenges to their development, our school communities bear an even weightier responsibility. Good quality, accessible education should be a right, not a privilege, in Australia. It is the most important foundation on which our young children can build successful and productive lives, and I am proud to be part of a Labor government which, since being elected in 2002, has almost doubled its funding for our public schools on a per student basis.

Engaging with the school communities of Elder is one of my most treasured opportunities as the local member. I have met some wonderful people of all ages from the public primary schools, the public high school, the two special education schools, the non-government schools and the many kindies and early learning centres in the electorate. From meeting with school principals to attending acquaintance nights at the start of a school year, and end-of-year graduation and awards presentation ceremonies, as well as Book Week events and Battle of the Band rehearsals, I have seen firsthand the hard work and dedication of these vital and vibrant mini communities.

Another highlight has been the opportunity to present students at the schools in my electorate with my citizenship awards, recognising outstanding achievement and exceptional public spirit. I want to acknowledge those students who received this award for exceptional contribution to school life. From Ascot Park Primary School, Maddison Payne and Julianne Pamintuan; from Christ the King School, Ryan Morris and Sinead Donaghey; from Clovelly Park Primary School, Azalia Tanbunan and Winton La; from Edwardstown Primary School, Jade Fitzpatrick; from Forbes Primary School, Mikala Thorpe and Reem Bou Ghader; from Marion Primary School, Chrysi Katsionis and William Golding; and from Sacred Heart Middle School, Luke Wormald. Congratulations to all these worthy award winners.

In addition, I wish to acknowledge and thank all students who strive each day to be their best. Whether in academic, sporting, arts, social or extracurricular activities, your efforts are appreciated. Thank you, too, to our teachers and principals for whom guiding our young people is not just a job, trade or profession, it is a vocation, a great calling and commitment which goes way beyond school hours, school terms and school years. To the many volunteers who donate their time and talents to our schools, your contributions are invaluable and often have a profound impact on the students.

CADELL FERRY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:04): I want to take my first opportunity to speak in parliament in this year to talk about the very important Cadell ferry. Members who have been here for a while will know how the government tried to close it down a few years ago and the community, with passion, pride, integrity and local knowledge, fought that, and they got support from all over the

state in that fight. I attended a meeting at Cadell very recently, along with Mid Murray Council's mayor Dave Burgess, several councillors and other community members, including people who require the ferry for heavy agriculture vehicle transport across the Murray River at Cadell.

At that meeting, there were also departmental officials who came to explain a very concerning issue to us, and I thank them for their openness and honesty in the way they described the fact that they need to downgrade the load rating at the Cadell ferry from 50 tonnes to 16 tonnes. We understand that safety imperative; there is nobody in the community who wants to take any risks with regard to the Cadell ferry. But there is nobody in the Cadell community who wants to lose that ferry either.

The downgrading of this ferry is because it is one of the four remaining wooden ferries left on the Murray, so there are three other ferries also at risk. My particular interest is the Cadell ferry, and it is clear that the internal metal skeleton structure, which is cased by wood, is actually starting to deteriorate very seriously and is not safe for large vehicles. The community is very concerned though that this might lead—either deliberately or not deliberately—to the removal of the Cadell ferry in the long run.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am grateful, and I appreciate the transport minister's assurances that that is not the case. We left the meeting with a very responsible position. Essentially, what I said and what other community members said is, 'Look, we understand the safety requirement. If the load rating needs to be downgraded for a limited known period of time until another newer, high-capacity ferry can replace it, we can live with that. We understand that it needs to be replaced.'

The government has funded the building of two new ferries. There are actually two or three more ferries that still need to be funded. So, the reason for me speaking today is to say that the community understands. If we get a guarantee in the relatively near future of when another ferry will come into service at Cadell to replace the existing one and that time is not too far away, we can live with that and we understand that is the process the government needs to go through. But we need that assurance soon.

If we do not get that assurance soon we will start to wonder what is going on. Our fears will be heightened, and the community will step forward again in a very forceful way to defend its ferry and its community because the ferry is necessary, obviously, for heavy agricultural machinery. It is very important for tourism. It is very important for schoolchildren to get to school, for emergency services, for Meals on Wheels—for a whole range of needs.

I thank the departmental staff led by Mr Paul Gelston on the day who said that in around about August he would be able to tell us when a new ferry would be coming. And let me be very clear: he made no specific commitment on the date. That was his estimated timeframe. I am not trying to put words in his mouth, but we welcomed and appreciated the fact that he was able to give us that date. He said that he would get back to us as soon as possible, and if sometime later in the year we are going to have a new ferry that would be fantastic—we will live with the downgrading in the load rating in the interim.

I say to the Minister for Transport, the Treasurer and the Premier, the ferry must be replaced, and one of the very important steps to secure the replacement of this ferry and, of course, the other three wooden ferries that are at risk on the Murray, is to ensure that in the upcoming budget there is money made available to build an additional two, or ideally three, new ferries for the entire river. That would then give the transport department all of the ferries it needs, which is 14, for the entire river including two at Mannum plus the two spares they need so they can always have two out of service for maintaining and upgrading. It is the department's own internal guideline or assessment that they always need to have two spares. We need two or three more ferries to be funded in the next budget and we also need the Cadell community to be told exactly when their replacement ferry will arrive.

COUNTRY ROAD FATALITIES

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:09): For most of us, the Christmas/New Year period is a time of celebration, a time when family members and friends gather, and a time when we look to the coming

year with refreshed hope. For some families in our northern communities, all that good cheer and hope for the new year was shattered, torn apart, by a spate of fatal crashes on our country roads.

On the Lincoln Highway between Port Augusta, Whyalla, and Cowell, seven people died and a number were seriously injured over a 27-day period. There had been no fatalities on that stretch of road for the previous 10 years. All the people killed were from regional South Australia. All lived in Whyalla or Port Pirie, with the exception of one young man who had moved to Adelaide to study and work. This senseless loss of life is deeply felt in our communities. Those lives are not statistics. They were sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, mums and dads.

On 29 December two young people, Natasha Turnbull and James Moore, had their lives cut short. Their friends, Amy Jones and Jason Bristow, were injured. The driver of the vehicle that caused the fatalities survived, and is now facing manslaughter charges as result of his alleged suicide attempt. On 22 January Michael, Leigh and James Camporeale died following a head-on collision outside Whyalla. The father and two sons had been working in Whyalla and were returning to Port Pirie. It looks like fatigue might have played a role in the accident. Two days later a Whyalla couple, Jan and Peter Ashby, died outside of Cowell after their car was hit by a truck. Charges have been laid, and it looks like fatigue might have been a contributing factor in that accident as well.

As a community Whyalla was shocked by so many deaths in such a short period of time. The deaths added impetus to the call for overtaking lanes, even though the presence of overtaking lanes would not have made a difference. The stretch of road, over previous years, had not met blackspot criteria, and there are roads and other parts of the state and in the electorate of Giles with a pattern of ongoing fatalities and serious injury. I will always advocate spending money where it will do the greatest good when it comes to reducing road fatalities, and allocating the money on the basis of clear evidence-based priorities.

Statistics from 2013 indicate that South Australian rural roads accounted for 16 per cent of all crashes with a staggering 54 per cent of fatal crashes, going up to 67 per cent in 2014. Speed is a contributing factor but not necessarily the cause. I am not convinced that reducing the speed limit from 110 to 100 on our main country roads will do much to reduce fatalities.

It is worth noting that in the 2013 compilation of South Australian accident statistics 63 per cent of fatal crashes were single vehicle crashes, and of that 63 per cent 56 per cent occurred in rural areas. We need to keep investing in our road infrastructure to improve safety, but we also need to invest in changing attitudes when behind the wheel, and that is often the hardest one. Infrastructure investment is a lot easier.

All the lives lost on our roads will be remembered by their families and friends. The family and friends of James Moore have set up a memorial scholarship to honour his passion and dedication for his chosen field of palaeontology. The James Moore Memorial Scholarship in Palaeontology will offer a funded opportunity for regional young people to participate in palaeontology expeditions as well as additional work experience. I encourage all members, especially country members, to make a contribution to the scholarship.

I offer my condolences to all those who have suffered due to lives cut short on our roads. As a dad, my heart goes out especially to parents who have lost sons and daughters.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BOARDS AND COMMITTEES - ABOLITION AND REFORM) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (16:15): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the abolition or reform of various boards, committees and other bodies; to streamline processes relating to various boards, committees and other bodies; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (16:15): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Mr Speaker in July 2014 the South Australian Government proposed major reforms to all government boards and committees in order to make government more accessible, simpler, and efficient.

We indicated that all Government board and committees would be abolished, unless it could be demonstrated that they had an essential purpose that could not be fulfilled in an alternative way.

At the heart of this reform was the intention to involve more people and organisations in government decision-making. Too often, I have found that the views provided to government are confined to a group of select people.

I want to ensure that we change this, so that more South Australians have the opportunity to be involved in the decisions that affect them and that are important to them.

While these changes will assist agencies to meet budget savings targets, I have also made it clear that I expect resources to also be reinvested in alternative community engagement activities.

The large number of boards and committees currently in existence also contribute to duplication, unnecessary complexity and inefficiency within government.

The Bill I introduce today is the culmination of a reform process that will reduce a significant amount of government red tape and contribute to the efforts of our Modern Public Service policy.

Of the 429 boards and committees in scope for this reform, the government has decided to retain 90 outright.

Of the remaining boards and committees, 107 will be abolished, 17 will be merged and 62 are subject to other reform efforts that are currently underway.

We have also identified 120 boards and committees that should not be considered government boards and committees, and we are reclassifying these.

Options for reform are still being considered for the remaining 33 boards and committees.

The final report on the outcomes of this reform has been produced and provides additional information on each of these boards and committees.

As part of this omnibus Bill we are amending 43 pieces of legislation to abolish, merge or simplify 56 boards and committees.

This includes abolishing 28 boards and committees, merging 8 and simplifying a further 20.

Through both abolitions and simplification measures, 32 fewer boards and committees will require Governor appointments – this equates on average to 96 fewer appointments for consideration by Cabinet and Executive Council each year.

This will save many hundreds of hours of work by many public servants.

Boards to be abolished as part of this Bill include the board of the South Australian Tourism Commission, Community Benefits SA Board, the Natural Resource Management Council, and the Minister's Youth Council to name a few.

The Community Benefits SA board is an example of how more South Australians can be given the opportunity to be involved in government decisions.

The Government intends to replace this board with a participatory budgeting model called 'fund my community' where the public identifies, discusses and prioritises how funds should be allocated. We will consult further on how this works in the coming months.

Another example is the replacement of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee with new community engagement models.

Previously this Committee has provided advice to the Minister on all aspects of animal welfare. As part of these new arrangements advice to the Minister will be developed following consultation and engagement tailored to the specific issue under consideration.

Mr Speaker, we are undertaking these changes because the expectations of businesses and communities have changed, and the way government works needs to change with them.

Today, businesses and citizens expect to be involved in decision-making, and are much less deferential to traditional voices of authority.

They also expect us to be much more open. That is why as part of this reform process we intend to report more regularly about appointments to Government Boards and Committees rather than just tabling in parliament each year the annual report of the Boards and Committees Information Systems (BCIS).

As part of consultation about this reform process, the Government received letters from a number of boards and committees. In the interests of openness, we will also be publishing these letters online.

Mr Speaker these reforms will also deliver a significant reduction in red tape. In this Bill, we simplify how a number of remaining boards and committees will operate.

For example, this Bill will abolish the Selection Committee for the Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia.

This is not an advisory or decision-making board itself, but a statutory body whose sole purpose is to decide who sits on the industry board. Industry bodies do not want to be forced to jump through bureaucratic hoops like this to get their work done and they have told us as much.

This reform frees industry and community boards from time consuming red tape, and lets them get on with their work.

Mr Speaker, these reforms will not only make government more efficient, they will also simplify it, because when used in the wrong context, boards and committees can act to defuse responsibility and confuse people about who the ultimate decision-maker is.

This point was made in the 2003 Commonwealth Review of these matters by John Uhrig.

For example, Uhrig found that, in circumstances where a minister retains powers and responsibilities, a board may add a layer of obstruction to a Minister seeking to ensure that the CEO is acting in a way consistent with government policy.

This Bill supports improved accountability and governance. The clear example of this is the abolition of the board of the South Australian Tourism Commission.

The Commission will be led by a Chief Executive Officer, who will be directly accountable to the Minister.

Current arrangements place the Board administratively and operationally between the Chief Executive and the Minister.

The new model will have the Commission led by a Chief Executive Officer, who will be directly accountable to the Minister. The CEO will take on sole responsibility for the Commission and thus improve the Commission's accountability and ensure the State can quickly respond to tourism issues.

Mr Speaker, this Bill fundamentally is about supporting the South Australian Government's efforts to build a more modern government.

Since the election we have renewed our Cabinet with five new Ministers.

We have renewed the leadership of the public sector with five new chief executives.

And we are now renewing our structures through the reform of boards and committees.

We have challenged every government board and committee to demonstrate what value they provide to the community.

For those who have not been able to do this, we are now implementing new ways of fulfilling these roles.

This Bill is the next stage in the process that will make government more accessible, simpler, and efficient.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Act 2005*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of *ADS Advisory Board* which is being abolished under this Part. This clause also inserts a new definition of Parks and Wilderness Council being the *Parks and Wilderness Council* established under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*.

5—Amendment of section 9—Administration of Act to achieve objects and objectives

This clause substitutes reference to the ADS Advisory Board with reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is consequential on the abolition of the ADS Advisory Board and gives the functions of the Board to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

6—Amendment of section 11—ADS Management Plan

This clause substitutes reference to the ADS Advisory Board with reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is consequential on the abolition of the ADS Advisory Board and gives the functions of the Board to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

7—Amendment of heading to Part 3 Division 3

This clause substitutes reference to the ADS Advisory Board with reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is consequential on the abolition of the ADS Advisory Board and the transferring of the functions of the Board to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

8—Repeal of sections 12 to 16

This clause abolishes the ADS Advisory Board by repealing sections 12 to 16 (inclusive) which provide for the establishment and membership of the ADS Advisory Board.

9—Amendment of section 17—Functions of Parks and Wilderness Council under this Act

This clause substitutes reference to the ADS Advisory Board with reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is consequential on the abolition of the ADS Advisory Board and gives the functions of the Board to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

10—Repeal of sections 18 to 21

This clause repeals sections 18 to 21 (inclusive) which provide for the committees, procedures, staff and annual reports of the ADS Advisory Board which is being abolished under this Part.

11—Amendment of section 22—ADS Fund

This clause substitutes reference to the ADS Advisory Board with reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is consequential on the abolition of the ADS Advisory Board and gives the functions of the Board to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

12—Amendment of section 55—Regulations

This clause inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

13—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the ADS Advisory Board ceases to hold office on commencement of the clause.

Part 3—Amendment of *Animal Welfare Act 1985*

14—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of *animal ethics committee*, to be an animal ethics committee established under section 23 of the principal Act or a body approved as an animal ethics committee for the principal Act by the Minister. This clause also deletes the definition of *the Committee* which is being abolished under this Part.

15—Repeal of Part 2

This clause abolishes the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee by repealing Part 2 of the principal Act.

16—Amendment of section 23—Animal ethics committees

This clause amends section 23 of the principal Act to provide that animal ethics committees, which may be required to be established or consulted as a condition of a license, are to be established, and members appointed, by a licensee instead of by the Minister as is currently provided for.

17—Amendment of section 24—Procedure

This amendment is consequential on the appointment of animal ethics committee members by a licensee and provides for the quorum of an animal ethics committee established under the principal Act.

18—Amendment of section 25—Functions of animal ethics committees

This amendment is consequential on the appointment of animal ethics committee members by a licensee and deletes reference to the Minister such that animal ethics committees will be required to furnish annual reports in accordance with the regulations.

19—Amendment of section 44—Regulations

This clause inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

20—Transitional provisions

Subclause (2) ensures that a member of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee ceases to hold office on commencement of the subclause. Subclause (3) provides that an animal ethics committee in existence immediately before the commencement of clause 16 continues as an animal ethics committee for the purposes of the principal Act until a date determined by the Minister.

Part 4—Amendment of *ANZAC Day Commemoration Act 2005*

21—Amendment of section 6—Membership of Council

The role of the Governor in the appointment of Council members is removed and given to the Minister instead. This clause also reflects the proposed change in administration of the principal Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

22—Amendment of section 7—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the matters referred to in clause 21.

23—Amendment of section 8—Presiding member

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the change in administration of this Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

24—Amendment of section 10—Remuneration

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the removal of the role of the Governor in the appointment process of Council members.

25—Amendment of section 11—Functions of Council

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the change in administration of the principal Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

26—Amendment of section 13—Staff

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the change in administration of the principal Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

27—Amendment of section 14—Annual report

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the change in administration of the principal Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

28—Amendment of section 18—Restriction on public sports and entertainment before 12 noon on ANZAC Day

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the change in administration of the principal Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

Part 5—Amendment of *Aquaculture Act 2001*

29—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 to delete the definition of *Aquaculture Advisory Committee*.

30—Amendment of section 12—Procedure for making policies

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 12 which is consequential on the abolition of the Aquaculture Advisory Committee.

31—Repeal of Part 10 Division 2

This clause repeals Division 2 of Part 10 which relates to the Aquaculture Advisory Committee.

32—Transitional provision

This clause provides that a member of the Aquaculture Advisory Committee ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Part 6—Amendment of *Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978*

33—Amendment of section 7—Constitution of Board

The role of the Governor in the appointment of Board members is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Board.

34—Amendment of section 8—Terms and conditions on which members of the Board hold office

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the proposed role of the Minister, rather than the Governor, in the appointment process.

Part 7—Amendment of *Classification of Theatrical Performances Act 1978*

35—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of *the Board*, and inserts definitions of *Council* and *Registrar*, which are consequential on the key measure of this Part which is to replace the Classification of Theatrical Performances Board with the South Australian Classification Council.

36—Repeal of Part 2

This clause removes Part 2 of the principal Act which established the Classification of Theatrical Performances Board.

37—Amendment of section 10—Application for classification

This clause changes references in section 10 from 'Board' to 'Council' and are consequential on the key measure of this Part.

38—Amendment of section 11—Criteria to be applied by Council

This clause changes references in section 11 from 'Board' to 'Council' and are consequential on the key measure of this Part.

39—Amendment of section 12—Classification of theatrical performances

This clause changes references in section 12 from 'Board' to 'Council' and are consequential on the key measure of this Part.

40—Amendment of section 13—Conditions in respect of theatrical performances

This clause changes references in section 13 from 'Board' to 'Council' and are consequential on the key measure of this Part.

41—Amendment of section 14—Powers of Council

This clause changes references in section 14 from 'Board' to 'Council' and are consequential on the key measure of this Part.

42—Amendment of section 15—Notice

This clause changes a reference in section 15 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

43—Amendment of section 16—Penalty for breach of condition

This clause changes a reference in section 16 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

44—Amendment of section 17—Places where restricted theatrical performances may take place

This clause changes a reference in section 17 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

45—Amendment of section 19—Certain actions not to constitute offences

This clause changes a reference in section 19 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

46—Amendment of section 20—Evidentiary provision

This clause changes a reference in section 20 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

47—Amendment of section 21—Power to enter and view performance

This clause changes a reference in section 21 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

48—Transitional provisions

This transitional clause enables a request for classification made to the Board to be dealt with by the Council after the commencement of clause 36 of this measure. It also preserves and continues—

- classifications, or decisions of the Board to refrain from assigning a classification to a theatrical performance, under section 12 of the principal Act, as classifications or decisions of the Council; and
- conditions imposed by the Board under section 13 of the principal Act, as conditions imposed by the Council; and
- approvals by the Board of theatres under section 17(1) of the principal Act, as approvals by the Council.

Subclause (7) ensures that a member of the Board ceases to hold office on the commencement of the subclause.

Part 8—Amendment of *Coast Protection Act 1972*

49—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause makes an amendment to the definition of *appointed member* which is consequential on clause 50 removing the Governor's role in appointing members of the Coast Protection Board.

50—Amendment of section 8—Membership of Board

The role of the Governor in the appointment of certain members of the Coast Protection Board is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Board. The Minister will also appoint the presiding member, fix the terms and conditions of office of appointed members, appoint deputies and remove appointed members from the Board.

51—Amendment of section 11—Allowances and expenses

The role of the Governor in determining the allowances and expenses of appointed members of the Coast Protection Board is removed and that role is given to the Minister.

52—Repeal of sections 15, 16 and 17

This clause deletes sections 15, 16 and 17 which provide for the constitution, terms of office of members and duties of consultative committees.

53—Amendment of section 18—Advisory committees

This clause amends section 18 to require that the Coast Protection Board must, in acting under the section to appoint an advisory committee, comply with any guidelines issued by the Minister.

54—Amendment of section 37—Regulations

This clause which is consequential on clause 52, deletes reference to consultative committees.

Part 9—Amendment of *Correctional Services Act 1982*

55—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This amendment is consequential.

56—Repeal of Part 2 Division 2

This amendment repeals the Division of the principal Act which established the Correctional Services Advisory Council.

57—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Correctional Services Advisory Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 10—Amendment of *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*

58—Amendment of section 12—Composition of Board

The role of the Governor in the appointment of the members of the Dog and Cat Management Board is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Board.

59—Amendment of section 13—Deputies of members

The role of the Governor in the appointment of deputies of members of the Dog and Cat Management Board is removed and that role is given to the Minister.

60—Amendment of section 14—Conditions of membership

The role of the Governor in determining the terms and conditions of appointment of the members of the Dog and Cat Management Board is removed and that role is given to the Minister. This clause also proposes that the Minister may remove a member of the Board from office after consultation with the Local Government Association of South Australia.

61—Amendment of section 16—Remuneration

The role of the Governor in determining the remuneration of the members of the Dog and Cat Management Board is removed and that role is given to the Minister

Part 11—Amendment of *Dog Fence Act 1946*

62—Amendment of section 6—Members of the board

The role of the Governor in the appointment of the members of the Dog Fence Board is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Board. A reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation Inc is updated to Primary Producers SA Incorporated. A reference to the Natural Resources Management Council is removed which is consequential on its abolition in clause 156.

63—Amendment of section 11—Casual vacancies

This amendment is consequential on clause 62 and substitutes references to the Governor with references to the Minister.

64—Amendment of section 12—Dismissal of member

This amendment is consequential on clause 62 and substitutes references to the Governor with references to the Minister.

Part 12—Amendment of *Emergency Management Act 2004*

65—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of *appointed member* and is consequential on the key measure of this Part which is to simplify the appointment process for the SEMC.

66—Amendment of section 6—Establishment of State Emergency Management Committee

This clause sets out the key measure of this Part which is to simplify the appointment process for the SEMC. The Minister is required to prepare and publish guidelines (to be known as the *SEMC membership guidelines*) that govern matters relating to the appointment of members of the SEMC. The role of the Governor in the appointment of members is removed. Most of the members will hold office *ex officio*, as per proposed section 6(4), however, the presiding member of SEMC will be responsible for appointing at least 2 but not more than 4 members (to be known as *appointed members*) to SEMC.

67—Substitution of section 7

This clause substitutes section 7 with a new section.

7—Application of Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act

This new section ensures that the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995* will apply to members of SEMC as if the committee were an advisory body and the Minister responsible for the administration of this Act were the relevant Minister. This means that the provisions of that Act will apply, requiring members to act honestly, to avoid conflicts of interest and to be otherwise subject to more stringent penalties for breach of standards of conduct than would otherwise apply.

68—Amendment of section 38—Regulations

This amendment inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

Part 13—Amendment of *Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005*

69—Amendment of section 71—State Bushfire Coordination Committee

A reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation Inc is updated by substituting Primary Producers SA Incorporated.

A reference to the Natural Resources Management Council is amended to 1 officer of the administrative unit of the Public Service primarily responsible for assisting the relevant Minister in the administration of the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*, nominated by the Chief Executive of that administrative unit. This is consequential on abolition of the NRM Council in clause 156.

70—Amendment of section 73—State Bushfire Management Plan

A reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation Inc is updated by substituting Primary Producers SA Incorporated.

A reference to the Natural Resources Management Council is amended to the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*, this is consequential on abolition of the NRM Council in clause 156.

Part 14—Amendment of *Fisheries Management Act 2007*

71—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 to delete the definition of *Fisheries Council*.

72—Amendment of section 7—Objects of Act

This clause amends section 7 to remove a reference to the Fisheries Council.

73—Amendment of section 10—Delegation

This clause amends section 10 to remove a reference to the Fisheries Council

74—Repeal of Part 3 Division 2

This clause repeals Part 3 Division 2 to remove provisions relating to the Fisheries Council.

75—Amendment of section 20—Establishment of committees

This clause amends section 20 to remove references to the Fisheries Council.

76—Amendment of section 42—Preparation of management plans

This clause amends section 42 to transfer the responsibilities of the Fisheries Council in relation to the preparation of management plans to the Minister.

77—Amendment of section 43—General nature and content of management plans

This clause amends section 43 to remove references to the Fisheries Council and replace them with references to the Minister.

78—Amendment of section 44—Procedure for preparing management plans

This clause amends section 44 to remove references to the Fisheries Council and replace them with references to the Minister.

79—Amendment of section 49—Review of management plans

This clause amends section 49 to remove references to the Fisheries Council and replace them with references to the Minister.

80—Transitional provision

This clause requires the Fisheries Council to prepare a final report on its operations and submit it to the Minister, and requires the Minister to table the Council's final report in Parliament. Subclause (4) ensures that a member of the Fisheries Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of the subclause.

Part 15—Amendment of *Gaming Machines Act 1992*

81—Amendment of section 73B—Charitable and Social Welfare Fund

This clause removes the requirement of the Minister to establish a board for the purpose of giving direction to the Treasurer as to the application of the Charitable and Social Welfare Fund to assist charitable or social welfare organisations. That direction is proposed in future to be made by the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Family and Community Services Act 1972*. The clause removes the provisions relating to the constitution and procedures of the board.

82—Transitional provisions

This clause ensures that a member of the board referred to in clause 81 ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 16—Amendment of *Gas Act 1997*

83—Amendment of section 16—Technical advisory committee

This clause provides that the technical advisory committee under the *Gas Act 1997* is to be the same committee as the committee of that name established under the *Electricity Act 1996* and that the committees' respective functions are combined.

Part 17—Amendment of *Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004*

84—Amendment of section 9—Membership of Advisory Committee

The role of the Governor in the appointment of Advisory Committee members is removed and given to the Minister instead.

85—Amendment of section 10—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause makes a minor amendment which is consequential on the removal of the role of the Governor in the appointment process of Advisory Committee members.

Part 18—Amendment of *Health and Community Services Complaints Act 2004*

86—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of *Council* which is consequential on the key measure of this Part which is to abolish the Health and Community Services Advisory Council.

87—Repeal of Part 8

This clause repeals Part 8 of the principal Act which established the Health and Community Services Advisory Council.

88—Amendment of section 75—Preservation of confidentiality

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 75, consequential on the key measure of this Part.

89—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Health and Community Services Advisory Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 19—Amendment of *Health Care Act 2008*

90—Amendment of long title

This clause amends the long title of the principal Act to remove the reference to the establishment of the Health Performance Council. This amendment is consequential on the key measure of this Part, which is the abolition of that Council.

91—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of *HPC* from section 3 of the principal Act. This amendment is consequential on the key measure of this Part, which is the abolition of the HPC.

92—Repeal of Part 3

This clause repeals Part 3 of the principal Act which established the Health Performance Council. This amendment is the key measure of this Part, namely the abolition of that Council.

93—Repeal of section 101

This clause repeals section 101 of the principal Act, which deals with reporting requirements by the Health Performance Council.

94—Repeal of Schedule 1

This clause repeals Schedule 1 of the principal Act, which deals with procedural matters relating to the Health Performance Council.

95—Amendment of Schedule 2—Health Advisory Councils

This clause makes a minor consequential amendment to Schedule 2.

96—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Health Performance Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 20—Amendment of *Health Services Charitable Gifts Act 2011*

97—Amendment of section 24—Advisory committees

This clause removes the requirement of the Board to establish an advisory committee to advise in relation to the application of funds for clinical equipment or research.

98—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the advisory committee so established ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 21—Amendment of *Heritage Places Act 1993*

99—Amendment of section 5—Composition of Council

The role of the Governor in the appointment of the members of the South Australian Heritage Council is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Council, designate a member to chair meetings of the Council and appoint deputies to act in the absence of a member.

100—Amendment of section 6—Conditions of membership

The role of the Governor in determining the terms and conditions of appointment of the members of the South Australian Heritage Council is removed and that role is given to the Minister. This clause also proposes that the Minister determine the term of a member and may remove a member from office in specified circumstances.

101—Amendment of section 7—Proceedings of Council

This amendment is consequential on clause 99 and substitutes references to the Governor with references to the Minister.

102—Amendment of section 7A—Committees

This clause amends section 7A of the principal Act to require that the South Australian Heritage Council must, in acting under the section to appoint a committee, comply with any guidelines issued by the Minister.

103—Amendment of section 9—Remuneration

This amendment is consequential on clause 99 and substitutes references to the Governor with references to the Minister.

Part 22—Amendment of *Local Government Act 1999*

104—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This amendment is consequential.

105—Amendment of section 11—General provisions relating to proclamations

This amendment is consequential.

106—Amendment of section 12—Composition and wards

This amendment is consequential.

107—Substitution of heading to Chapter 3 Part 2

This amendment is consequential.

108—Repeal of Chapter 3 Part 2 Divisions 1 and 2

The primary purpose of the amendments proposed to the principal Act is to abolish the Boundary Adjustment Facilitation Panel. To that end, Divisions 1 and 2 of Chapter 3 Part 2 are repealed.

109—Amendment of section 26—Principles

This amendment is consequential.

110—Amendment of section 27—Council initiated proposals

These amendments are consequential.

111—Amendment of section 28—Public initiated submissions

These amendments are consequential.

112—Substitution of Division 6

This clause substitutes Division 6 (and is consequential on the abolition of the Boundary Adjustment Facilitation Panel):

Division 6—Submissions of proposals to Governor

29—Submissions of proposals to Governor

Proposed section 29 provides for the action the Minister may take following publication of a report under Division 4 or 5.

113—Amendment of section 30—Report if proposal rejected

This amendment is consequential.

114—Amendment of section 31—Report if proposal submitted to poll

These amendments are consequential.

115—Amendment of section 32—Provision of reports to councils

These amendments are consequential.

116—Amendment of section 34—Error or deficiency in address, recommendation, notice or proclamation

This amendment is consequential.

117—Amendment of section 303—Regulations

This amendment inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

118—Amendment of Schedule 1A—Implementation of Stormwater Management Agreement

Two of the amendments in this clause provide for the Minister to appoint the members of the Board of the Stormwater Management Authority (instead of the Governor). The third amendment is consequential on the amendments to the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004* relating to the Natural Resources Management Council.

119—Amendment of Schedule 5—Documents to be made available by councils

These amendments are consequential.

120—Transitional provisions

This clause sets out various transitional provisions for the purposes of the amendments to the *Local Government Act 1999*.

Part 23—Amendment of Marine Parks Act 2007

121—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause substitutes a new definition of Council to refer to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is proposed to be established under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972* (see clause 135).

122—Amendment of heading to Part 4 Division 2

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the substitution of the Parks and Wilderness Council for the Marine Parks Council of South Australia.

123—Repeal of sections 24 to 28

This clause abolishes the Marine Parks Council of South Australia by repealing sections 24 to 28 (inclusive) of the principal Act.

124—Repeal of section 30

This clause repeals section 30 of the principal Act, which is consequential on clause 123.

125—Amendment of section 63—Regulations

This clause inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

126—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Marine Parks Council of South Australia ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Part 24—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

127—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause amends section 5 to delete the definition of *review committee*.

128—Repeal of section 98Y

This clause repeals section 98Y which provided for the appointment of the review committee.

129—Substitution of section 98Z

This clause substitutes section 98Z:

98Z—Review by Registrar

The substituted section provides for reviews of the decisions of the Registrar of Motor Vehicle under Part 2, 2A, 3, 3A, 3C or 3D to be conducted by the Registrar instead of the review committee.

130—Amendment of section 98ZA—Appeal to District Court

This clause amends section 98ZA to remove references to the review committee.

131—Transitional provision

This clause provides for the review committee to continue in existence after the commencement of this Part for the purpose of determining applications for review referred to the committee before that commencement.

Part 25—Amendment of *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*

132—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause substitutes a new definition of *Council* to refer to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is proposed to be established under clause 135.

133—Amendment of section 11—Wildlife Conservation Fund

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the substitution of the Parks and Wilderness Council for the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council.

134—Amendment of section 12—Delegation

This clause deletes a reference to advisory committees, which are proposed to be abolished under clause 135.

135—Substitution of Part 2 Division 2, 2A and 2B

This clause abolishes the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council by repealing Part 2 Division 2 which establishes and maintains the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council.

This clause also abolishes the establishment of advisory committees and consultative committees under Part 2 Division 2A and Division 2B which are to be repealed.

In substitution, this clause inserts provisions that establish the Parks and Wilderness Council. These provisions provide for the establishment of the Parks and Wilderness Council and the appointment of members by the Minister according to criteria listed in the clause. The clause also provides for the terms and conditions of membership of the Council, remuneration and allowances, the proceedings of the Council and its functions (which include functions in relation to the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*, the *Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Act 2005*, the *Marine Parks Act 2007* and the *Wilderness Protection Act 1992*). The Council is to be subject to the direction and control of the Minister.

136—Amendment of section 38—Management plans

This clause substitutes a reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council for the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council, an amendment which is consequential on clause 135.

137—Amendment of section 45A—Interpretation and application

This clause deletes the definition of *General Reserves Trust* which is to be abolished under clause 145.

138—Amendment of section 45B—Development Trusts

This makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the General Reserves Trust.

139—Repeal of section 45BA

This makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the General Reserves Trust.

140—Amendment of section 45F—Functions of Trust

This makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the General Reserves Trust and which simplify the provisions of section 45F.

141—Amendment of heading to Part 3A Division 2

This makes an amendment which is consequential on the renaming of the General Reserves Trust Fund as the General Reserves Fund in clause 142.

142—Amendment of section 45M—Establishment of Fund

This clause renames the General Reserves Trust Fund as the General Reserves Fund and places it under the management and control of the Minister instead of the General Reserves Trust which is to be abolished. The clause amends section 45M of the principal Act to clarify which funds that the fund consists of, such as, fees paid for

entrance to reserves other than reserves in relation to which a specific Trust has been established and determined that it is to retain such fees. The clause also makes other amendments consequential on the abolition of the General Reserves Trust and the renaming of the General Reserves Trust Fund.

143—Amendment of section 45N—Investment of the fund

This make an amendment which is consequential on the vesting of the control and management of the General Reserves Fund in the Minister.

144—Section 45O—Accounts and auditing

This makes amendments which are consequential on the vesting of the control and management of the General Reserves Fund in the Minister.

145—Insertion of Schedules 12 and 13

This clause inserts 2 Schedules into the principal Act:

Schedule 12—Dissolution of General Reserves Trust

Provisions in this Schedule abolish the General Reserves Trust which was established by proclamation under section 45B of the Act on 30 November 1978 and all members of the Trust holding office immediately before the commencement of this clause cease to hold office. All assets, rights and liabilities of the Trust will be vested in the Minister.

Schedule 13—Transitional provision relating to *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*

Provisions in this Schedule allow for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

146—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Part 26—Amendment of *Native Vegetation Act 1991*

147—Amendment of section 8—Membership of Council

The role of the Governor in the appointment of the members of the Native Vegetation Council is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Council and appoint deputies to act in the absence of a member. This clause also makes an amendment consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

148—Amendment of section 9—Conditions of office

The role of the Governor in determining the terms and conditions of appointment of the members of the Native Vegetation Council is removed and that role is given to the Minister. This clause also proposes that the Minister may remove a member of the Council from office in specified circumstances.

149—Amendment of section 10—Allowances and expenses

The role of the Governor in determining the remuneration, allowances and expenses of the members of the Native Vegetation Council is removed and that role is given to the Minister.

150—Amendment of section 16—Staff

The role of the Governor in determining the staff of the Native Vegetation Council is removed and that role is given to the Minister.

151—Amendment of section 25—Guidelines for the application of assistance and the management of native vegetation

This clause changes a reference to the Pastoral Board to a reference to the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*, which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board under clause 189.

152—Amendment of section 29—Provisions relating to consent

This clause changes references to the Pastoral Board to references to the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*, which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board under clause 189.

153—Amendment of Schedule 2—Transitional provisions

This clause inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

Part 27—Amendment of *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*

154—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council to delete its definition and amend the definition of the NRM Plan. This clause also updates references to the *Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000* and Primary Producers SA Incorporated.

155—Amendment of section 10—Functions of Minister

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council by giving 2 of its previous functions to the Minister, being:

- (a) to prepare and maintain the State NRM Plan, and to keep under review the extent to which regional NRM plans and policies and practices adopted or applied by NRM authorities are consistent with the State NRM Plan; and
- (b) to convene forums on a State-wide basis to discuss natural resources management issues, and to promote public awareness of sound natural resources management practices.

156—Repeal of Chapter 3 Part 2

This clause abolishes the Natural Resources Management Council by repealing Chapter 3 Part 2 of the principal Act which establishes and provides for the composition and functions of the Council.

157—Amendment of section 22—Establishment of regions

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

158—Amendment of section 23—Establishment of boards

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

159—Amendment of section 25—Composition of boards

The role of the Governor in the appointment of the members of Regional Natural Resources Management Boards is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of such Boards (including a presiding member) and appoint deputies to act in the absence of a member. This clause also makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

160—Amendment of section 26—Conditions of membership

The role of the Governor in determining the terms and conditions of appointment of the members of Regional Natural Resources Management Boards is removed and that role is given to the Minister. This clause also proposes that the Minister may remove a member of such a Board from office in specified circumstances.

161—Amendment of section 27—Allowances and expenses

The role of the Governor in determining the fees, allowances and expenses of the members of Regional Natural Resources Management Boards is removed and that role is given to the Minister.

162—Amendment of section 29—Functions of boards

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

163—Amendment of section 30—General powers

This clause makes a correction.

164—Amendment of section 35—Committees

This clause inserts an example for clarification of the power of the Minister to issue guidelines in relation to the establishment of committees by a regional NRM board.

165—Amendment of section 39—Specific reports

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

166—Repeal of section 40

This clause deletes section 40 of the principal Act which provides power for the Minister to appoint an administrator of a regional NRM board.

167—Amendment of section 45—Establishment of areas

This clause updates a reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated to Primary Producers SA Incorporated.

168—Amendment of section 48—Composition of NRM groups

This clause updates a reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated to Primary Producers SA Incorporated.

169—Amendment of section 74—State NRM Plan

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council and gives responsibility for the preparation and maintenance of the State NRM Plan to the Minister.

170—Amendment of section 75—Regional NRM plans

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

171—Amendment of section 79—Preparation of plans and consultation

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

172—Amendment of section 80—Submission of plan to Minister

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

173—Amendment of section 81—Review and amendment of plans

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

174—Amendment of section 95—Imposition of levy by councils

This clause updates a reference to the *Local Government Act 1999*.

175—Amendment of section 122—Special provisions relating to land

This clause updates a reference to the *Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005*.

176—Amendment of section 129—Activities not requiring a permit

This clause deletes a reference to the repealed *Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Act 2002*.

177—Repeal of section 228

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

178—Amendment of Schedule 1—Provisions relating to regional NRM boards and NRM groups

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

179—Amendment of Schedule 4—Repeals and transitional provisions

This clause makes amendments to Schedule 4 of the principal Act dealing with transitional provisions. This clause amends the power to make regulations of a transitional nature to apply in the case of any Act amending the principal Act.

180—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Natural Resources Management Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Part 28—Amendment of *Office for the Ageing Act 1995*

181—Amendment of long title

This clause amends the long title of the principal Act to remove the reference to the establishment of the Advisory Board on Ageing. This amendment is consequential on the key measure of this Part, which is the abolition of that Board.

182—Repeal of Part 3

This clause repeals Part 3 of the principal Act, which established the Advisory Board on Ageing. The clause reflects the key measure of this Part.

183—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Advisory Board on Ageing ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 29—Amendment of *Opal Mining Act 1995*

184—Amendment of section 43—Registration of agreement

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board in clause 189 and replaces a reference to that Board with a reference to the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*.

Part 30—Amendment of *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*

185—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board to delete the definition.

186—Amendment of section 5—Duty of the Minister

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

187—Amendment of section 9—Pastoral Land Management Fund

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

188—Amendment of section 10—Power of Minister to delegate

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

189—Repeal of Part 3 Division 2

This clause abolishes the Pastoral Board by repealing Part 3 Division 2 of the principal Act which establishes and provides for the composition and functions of the Board.

190—Amendment of section 19—Grant of leases

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

191—Amendment of section 20—Assessment of land prior to grant of lease

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

192—Amendment of section 22—Conditions of pastoral leases

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

193—Amendment of section 23—Rent

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

194—Amendment of section 24—Term of pastoral leases

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

195—Amendment of section 25—Assessment of land

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

196—Repeal of sections 25A and 25B

This clause deletes sections 25A and 25B which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board. Sections 25A and 25B provide for the Minister to provide assistance to lessees in dealing with the Pastoral Board by providing access to registered members of a pool of persons suitable for that purpose.

197—Amendment of section 26—Extension of term of pastoral leases and variation of conditions

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

198—Amendment of section 31—Alteration of boundaries

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

199—Amendment of section 31A—Variation of land subject to lease

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

200—Amendment of section 33—Abandonment of land

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

201—Amendment of section 35—Penalties for late payment of rent

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

202—Amendment of section 36—Waiver

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

203—Amendment of section 37—Cancellation of lease or imposition of fine on breach of conditions

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

204—Amendment of section 38—Cancellation of pastoral lease obtained by false statement

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

205—Amendment of section 40—Notice of adverse action to be given to holders of registered interests or caveats

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

206—Amendment of section 41—Property plans

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

207—Amendment of section 42—Verification of stock levels

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

208—Amendment of section 43—Notices to destock or take other action

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

209—Amendment of section 44—Reference areas

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

210—Amendment of section 45—Establishment of public access routes and stock routes

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

211—Amendment of section 52—Powers and procedures of the Tribunal

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

212—Amendment of section 58—Notice to be given of cattle muster

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

213—Amendment of section 59—Right to take water

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

214—Amendment of section 61—Powers of entry etc

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board and deleting other reference to the Board.

215—Amendment of section 66—Certain debts are charges over leases

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

216—Amendment of Schedule—Transitional provisions

This clause makes amendment to existing transitional provisions which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

This clause also ensures that a member of the Pastoral Board ceases to hold office on the commencement of clause 189.

This clause also provides for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

Part 31—Amendment of *Phylloxera and Grape Industry Act 1995*

217—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of *Selection Committee* from section 3 of the principal Act. This amendment is consequential on one of the key measures of this Part, namely the abolition of the Selection Committee.

218—Amendment of section 5—Constitution of Board

This clause transfers functions relating to the selection and appointment of members of the Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia from the Selection Committee to the Minister and to organisations that the Minister considers have significant involvement in grape growing or winemaking.

219—Repeal of Part 2 Division 2

This clause repeals Part 2 Division 2 of the principal Act, which established the Selection Committee.

220—Amendment of section 26—Report

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 26 consequential on the abolition of the Selection Committee.

221—Insertion of section 28

This clause inserts a new section into the principal Act.

28—Power of delegation

This section will enable the Minister to delegate his or her functions or powers under the principal Act.

222—Amendment of section 30—Regulations

This amendment inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

223—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Selection Committee ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 32—Amendment of *Public Employees Housing Act 1987*

224—Repeal of section 5

This clause repeals section 5 of the principal Act, which established the Public Employees Housing Advisory Committee.

225—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Public Employees Housing Advisory Committee ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 33—Amendment of *SACE Board of South Australia Act 1983*

226—Amendment of Schedule 1—Designated entities

This clause removes a reference to the Minister's Youth Council from the principal Act, as a result of the abolition of that Council. The opportunity is also taken to update the outdated reference to 'Non-Government Schools Registration Board' to 'Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board of South Australia'.

Part 34—Amendment of *South Australian Forestry Corporation Act 2000*

227—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends section 4 by redefining director so that it includes an acting director.

228—Amendment of section 9—Common seal and execution of documents

This clause amends section 9 to enable the affixing of the common seal of the Corporation to be attested by 1 or more directors.

229—Substitution of section 10

This clause substitutes section 10:

10—Establishment of board

The new section provides for the board of directors which is the governing body of the Corporation to consist of up to 5 members appointed by the Governor. A person will be eligible for appointment as a director if, in the Minister's opinion, the person has appropriate qualifications, experience or expertise to effectively perform the functions of a director of the Corporation. The section provides for the Governor to appoint a director of the board to chair meetings of the board and for the appointment of acting directors, whose terms and conditions of appointment will be as determined by the Governor.

230—Amendment of section 11—Conditions of membership

This clause amends section 11 to ensure that its provisions regarding the terms and conditions of appointment of directors of the board do not apply to the appointment of acting directors (which is covered by the new section 10).

231—Amendment of section 14—Board proceedings

This clause amends section 14 to provide that the quorum of the board is to consist of a majority of the directors in office for the time being. If a director has been appointed by the Governor to chair meetings of the board, that person will preside. If no such appointment has been made, or if the appointed director is absent, the directors present at the meeting will choose a director to chair that meeting.

Part 35—Amendment of *South Australian Housing Trust Act 1995*

232—Amendment of section 18—Committees

The first amendment in this clause deletes subsection (1)(a) which requires the South Australian Housing Trust to establish the South Australian Affordable Housing Trust Board of Management. The other amendments are consequential.

233—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the South Australian Affordable Housing Trust Board of Management ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 36—Amendment of *South Australian Motor Sport Act 1984*

234—Amendment of Long title

It is proposed to amend the long title of the principal Act so as to omit any reference to the body corporate the South Australian Motor Sport Board (the *Board*) which is to be abolished (and its functions are to be conferred on the South Australian Tourism Commission (the *Commission*)). The long title will provide that the Act is to facilitate the promotion of motor sport events in the State and for other purposes.

235—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The proposed amendments remove definitions that will no longer be required as a result of the abolition of the Board and insert a definition of the Commission. The majority of the amendments to the principal Act that follow are consequential on the abolition of the Board and on conferring on the *Commission* the functions and powers relating to the promotion of motor sport events in the State currently exercised by the Board.

236—Substitution of heading to Part 2

The new heading will be 'Functions and powers of Commission relating to motor sport events'.

237—Repeal of Part 2 Division 1

This Division (which made provision for the establishment of the Board) is to be repealed.

238—Repeal of heading to Part 2 Division 2

This heading is to be repealed as Part 2 will no longer need to be divided into Divisions.

239—Amendment of section 10—Functions and powers of Commission

240—Amendment of section 10AA—Non-application of *Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act 1996*

241—Repeal of section 10A

242—Amendment of section 11—Commission may control and charge fee for filming etc from outside circuit

243—Repeal of section 12

244—Repeal of Part 2 Divisions 3 and 4

245—Amendment of section 20—Minister may make certain declarations

246—Amendment of section 21—Commission to have care, control etc of declared area for relevant declared period

247—Amendment of section 22—Commission to have power to enter and carry out works etc on declared area

248—Amendment of section 23—Commission to consult and take into account representations of persons affected by operations

249—Amendment of section 24—Certain land taken to be lawfully occupied by Commission

250—Amendment of section 25—Non-application of certain laws

251—Amendment of section 26—Plans of proposed works to be available for public inspection

The amendments proposed by clauses 239 to 251 (inclusive) are consequential.

252—Amendment of section 27—Power to remove vehicles left unattended within declared area

One of the proposed amendments to this section is consequential and the other updates a reference.

253—Amendment of section 27AB—Application of sections 27B and 27C

This amendment is consequential.

254—Repeal of section 28

This section is to be repealed as it is no longer required.

255—Amendment of section 28AA—Declaration of official titles

This amendment is consequential.

256—Amendment of section 28A—Special proprietary interests

These amendments are consequential.

257—Amendment of section 28B—Seizure and forfeiture of goods

One of the proposed amendments to this section is consequential and the other updates a reference.

258—Repeal of section 29

This section is to be repealed as it is no longer required. Schedule 1 (to be inserted in the principal Act by clause 260) makes provision for the transfer of assets and liabilities of the Board.

259—Amendment of section 30—Regulations

These amendments are either consequential or update the penalty that may be imposed for breach of a regulation.

260—Insertion of Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

Proposed Schedule 1 makes provision for transitional arrangements consequent on the abolition of the Board, including as to the transfer of staff, assets and liabilities.

Part 37—Amendment of *South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980*

261—Amendment of section 6—Constitution of Commission

The role of the Governor in the appointment of Commission members is removed and given to the Minister instead. This represents the key measure of this Part.

262—Amendment of section 7—Remuneration of members

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 7 consequential on the key measure of this Part.

263—Amendment of section 8—Removal from and vacancies of office

This clause makes minor amendments to section 8 consequential on the key measure of this Part.

Part 38—Amendment of *South Australian Tourism Commission Act 1993*

264—Amendment of section 3—Object

It is proposed to amend this section of the principal Act to reflect that the South Australian Tourism Commission (the *Commission*), as part of promoting South Australia as a tourist destination, also undertakes, on behalf of the State, the promotion of events, festivals and other activities.

265—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Definitions that will be otiose following the passage of this Part of the measure are to be deleted. In addition, a definition of *promote*, in relation to an event, festival or other activity, is to be inserted.

266—Amendment of section 5—Establishment of Commission

It is proposed to insert that the Commission has all the powers of a natural person that are capable of being exercised by a body corporate. This and another amendment proposed to this section are consequential on the Commission taking on the functions of the South Australian Motor Sport Board (to be abolished by the amendments proposed under Part 36 of this measure). The other amendment makes provision in relation to the common seal of the Commission.

267—Substitution of Part 2 Divisions 2, 3 and 4

A purpose of the amendments proposed to the principal Act is to abolish the board of directors as the governing body of the Commission and replace the board with the Chief Executive Officer (the *CEO*). This is achieved by repealing Divisions 2 to 4 of Part 2 and substituting them with appropriate provisions as follows:

Division 2—Constitution of Commission

6—Constitution of Commission

The Commission will be constituted of the Chief Executive Officer (*CEO*) of the Commission. The CEO will be appointed by the Governor, on the recommendation of the Minister, on terms and conditions determined by the Governor and is, for the purposes of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*, a senior official.

7—Acting CEO

The Minister may appoint an Acting CEO to act in the office of the CEO if the CEO is temporarily absent or unable to perform official functions. While so acting, the Acting CEO has all functions and powers of the CEO and will also be a senior official for the purposes of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*.

8—Ministerial control

This section is substantially the same as current section 7 and provides that the Commission is subject to control and direction by the Minister.

Division 3—CEO

9—Conditions of appointment

This section provides for the conditions relating to the appointment of the CEO and is similar in terms to current section 10 except that it applies to the CEO rather than to a member of the board.

10—Saving provision

This section provides that an act of the Commission is not invalid by reason only of a defect in the appointment of the CEO or Acting CEO.

11—Delegation

This section provides the CEO with power to delegate his or her powers or functions and is drafted in the usual terms.

12—Staff and resources

This section provides that the CEO is responsible for managing the staff and resources of the Commission.

268—Amendment of section 19—Functions of Commission

The proposed amendment to this section clarifies that the functions of the Commission include the promotion of such events, festivals or activities of the State as are consistent with the object of the principal Act. A further amendment is consequential on the amendments proposed to the *South Australian Motor Sport Act 1984* under Part 36 of this measure.

269—Amendment of section 20—Powers of Commission

This amendment is consequential.

270—Amendment of section 25—Protection of names

271—Amendment of section 26—Regulations

The proposed amendments in clause 270 and this clause update the penalty provisions.

272—Transitional provisions

This clause provides that a member of the board of the Commission holding office immediately before the commencement of this clause ceases to hold office on that commencement. In addition, the person holding office as the Chief Executive Officer under the principal Act immediately before the commencement of this section will, on that commencement, be taken to have been appointed as the CEO to the Commission under Part 2 of the principal Act (as amended by this measure) on the same terms and conditions, and for the balance of the term of appointment, applying to the Chief Executive Officer immediately before that commencement.

Part 39—Amendment of *South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act 1992*

273—Repeal of section 29

This clause abolishes the Eight Mile Creek Water Conservation and Drainage Advisory Committee by repealing section 29 of the principal Act.

274—Amendment of section 31—Advisory committees

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Eight Mile Creek Water Conservation and Drainage Advisory Committee.

275—Amendment of section 32—Terms and conditions of office

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Eight Mile Creek Water Conservation and Drainage Advisory Committee.

276—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Eight Mile Creek Water Conservation and Drainage Advisory Committee ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Part 40—Amendment of *State Lotteries Act 1966*

277—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

These amendments are consequential.

278—Amendment of section 4—Constitution of Commission

The primary purpose of the amendments proposed to the principal Act is to replace the multiple members who form the governing body of the Commission with the Commissioner. To that end, the amendments to section 4 provide for the Commission to be constituted of the Commissioner.

279—Amendment of section 5—Term of office of Commissioner

One of the proposed amendments to this section is consequential and the other provides that the Commissioner is, for the purposes of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*, a senior official.

280—Substitution of sections 6 and 7

This clause deletes sections 6 and 7 of the principal Act and inserts new section 6:

6—Removal from office

Proposed section 6 ensures that the Governor has power to remove the Commissioner from office on the recommendation of the Minister on any ground that the Minister considers sufficient.

281—Amendment of section 8—Vacancy in office of Commissioner

These amendments are consequential.

282—Substitution of section 9

This clause deletes section 9 and inserts new section 9:

9—Acting Commissioner

Proposed section 9 makes provision for the appointment of an acting Commissioner in the event that the Commissioner is temporarily absent or unable to perform his or her official functions.

283—Amendment of section 11—Validity of acts of Commission

This amendment is consequential.

284—Repeal of section 12

This amendment deletes section 12 and is consequential.

285—Insertion of section 18C

This clause inserts section 18C:

18C—Tax and other liabilities of Commission

Regulation 4 of the *Public Corporations (Lotteries Commission—Tax and Other Liabilities) Regulations 2012* provides that section 29 of the *Public Corporations Act 1993* applies to the Commission (such that the Commission is liable to pay various taxes and other liabilities as if it were not an instrumentality of the Crown). On the Commission being reconstituted of a single member (rather than multiple members) it is necessary to enact an equivalent of section 29 of the *Public Corporations Act 1993* in the *State Lotteries Act 1966* because it is not envisaged in the *Public Corporations Act 1993* that section 29 would be applied to a single member body corporate.

286—Amendment of section 19—Offences

This amendment deletes a reference to Chief Executive and substitutes it with a reference to Commissioner.

287—Amendment of section 20—Regulations

This clause inserts a new power to make regulations of a saving or transitional nature consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

288—Transitional provision

This clause inserts a transitional provision that ensures that a member of the Lotteries Commission of South Australia ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 41—Amendment of *Supported Residential Facilities Act 1992*

289—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This amendment is consequential.

290—Repeal of Part 3 Division 2

This clause repeals Part 3 Division 2 of the principal Act which establishes the Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee.

291—Repeal of section 19

This clause repeals section 19 of the principal Act which establishes the panel of assessors to sit with the District Court when the Court is exercising its jurisdiction under the principal Act.

292—Amendment of section 25—Matters to be considered in granting a licence

This amendment is consequential.

293—Amendment of section 29—Licence conditions

This amendment is consequential.

294—Amendment of section 57—Regulations

This amendment removes the power to make regulations that may incorporate, adopt, apply or make prescriptions by reference to any document prepared or published by the Advisory Committee or any other body or authority.

295—Transitional provision

This clause inserts transitional provisions that ensure that a member of the Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee and a member of the panel established under section 19 of the principal Act cease to hold office on the commencement of the relevant amendments.

Part 42—Amendment of *Training and Skills Development Act 2008*

296—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of *reference group* from section 4 of the principal Act. This amendment is consequential on one of the key measures of this Part, namely the abolition of reference groups under the principal Act.

297—Amendment of section 10—Functions of Commission

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 10 consequential on the abolition of reference groups.

298—Repeal of Part 2 Division 3

This clause repeals Part 2 Division 3 of the principal Act, which required the Minister to establish reference groups. This amendment represents one of the key measures of this Part.

299—Repeal of section 68

This clause repeals section 68 of the principal Act, which required or enabled the Industrial Relations Commission to sit with assessors and experts (selected in accordance with Schedule 1 of the principal Act) in certain proceedings. This amendment reflects the other key measure of this Part.

300—Amendment of section 79—Regulations

This amendment inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

301—Repeal of Schedule 1

This clause repeals Schedule 1 of the principal Act, which required the Minister to establish panels of assessors, and enabled the Minister to establish panels of experts. This amendment is related to the measure referred to in clause 299 (above).

302—Transitional provisions

This clause ensures that a member of a reference group and a member of a panel will cease to hold office on the commencement of the respective subclauses.

Part 43—Amendment of *Urban Renewal Act 1995*

303—Amendment of section 7—Committees and subcommittees

This clause removes the requirement of the Minister to establish a housing and urban development industry advisory committee and a residents and consumers advisory committee.

304—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of an advisory committee so established will cease to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 44—Amendment of *Wilderness Protection Act 1992*

305—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee which is being abolished under this Part. This clause also inserts a new definition of Parks and Wilderness Council, being the Parks and Wilderness Council proposed to be established under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*.

306—Amendment of heading to Part 2 Division 2

This clause amends the heading to Part 2 Division which is consequential on the abolition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee and the ongoing performance of its functions by the Parks and Wilderness Council.

307—Repeal of sections 8 to 10

This clause abolishes the Wilderness Advisory Committee by repealing sections 8 to 10 (inclusive) of the principal Act which establish and provide for the composition and functions of the Committee.

308—Amendment of section 11—Functions of the Parks and Wilderness Council under this Act

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee and gives the functions of the Committee to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

309—Amendment of section 12—Wilderness code of management

This clause provides for the Wilderness Code of Management to continue and be varied or substituted by the Minister, instead of by the Wilderness Advisory Committee, as may be required. The Parks and Wilderness Council will assume the functions of the Wilderness Advisory Committee in assisting the Minister with variation or substitution of the Code.

310—Amendment to section 13—Appointment of wardens

This clause updates a reference to the *Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000*.

311—Amendment of section 22—Constitution of wilderness protection areas and wilderness protection zones

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee and which give the functions of the Committee to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

312—Amendment of section 28—Control and administration of wilderness protection areas and zones

This clause amends section 28 of the Act to provide that the Minister may direct that money paid under a lease or licence be paid to the Minister in addition to the option of being paid to a Trust established under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*.

313—Repeal of section 30

This clause repeals section 30 of the principal Act.

314—Amendment of section 31—Plans of management

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee and which give the functions of the Committee to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

315—Amendment of section 33A—Co management of wilderness protection areas or zones

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee and which give the functions of the Committee to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

316—Amendment of section 38A—Entrance fees etc for wilderness protection areas or zones

This clause makes an amendment to section 38A of the principal Act which is consequential on the abolition of the General Reserves Trust and the vesting of the responsibility for the General Reserves Fund in the Minister (see clause 142 and clause 145).

317—Amendment of section 41—Regulations

This clause provides for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015*.

318—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Wilderness Advisory Committee ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr van Holst Pellekaan.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:16): I will resume my comments. I think I was just about to touch on some of the trade initiatives that we have seen the current government undertaking. It has been very sweet and very cordial in the way the government has embraced both the Chinese industry, Chinese trade partners, and we see the Indian embrace at the moment, particularly with the World Cup and the cricket. I was at a function with the Premier and the Attorney about a week ago and I would like to endorse the program of bringing over the Dream Team 15: 15 young cricketers from India, to sponsor them and to give them an experience in Adelaide with the cricket hierarchy within SACA. I think it was a great acknowledgement of what South Australia can do to hold out an olive branch, in particular with these 15 young Indian cricketers.

It is a good initiative because those young cricketers will come here and they will have an experience that will probably last them a lifetime. They will go home and they will be good ambassadors for South Australia. They will talk of their experience, they will talk of the beautiful country they have just visited and they will talk of the friendly people. I spoke to a number of those young cricketers and they were in awe of how they had been embraced and the attitude that people had towards them. They were absolutely in awe of the remodelled Adelaide Oval, and I think it was a great initiative.

Another great thing was that the Premier pulled out the winning ticket for a draw to win tickets to the cricket world cup match at Adelaide Oval between India and Pakistan and it just happened to be me. I want to put on the record that I have not indulged; I have donated those tickets to the Indian temple in Glossop in the Riverland. The person who will be the winner of those two tickets will make a substantial donation to the church. So, I hope that those tickets are put to good use and someone in the electorate of Chaffey will be the successor of the tickets and go along and enjoy themselves at the cricket on Sunday.

Again, I did touch on the trade strategies in South Australia with our free trade partners. Japan and Korea have been signed off and are moving along. The agreement with China is soon to be fully agreed to and put in place. One question I would like to ask is: where is the strategy with our free trade agreements? We have all the warm and fuzzy press releases from the Minister for Trade and the Premier, but where are our strategies to assist businesses in South Australia access new FTA markets?

We are all giving the pat on the back to the people who come and visit from India and China, but what are we doing for the businesses in South Australia to help them embrace a culture so that they can go over there, present their products, present what they are manufacturing or growing, and be part of this free trade agreement? To date, I do not see a really clear strategy.

We do have a Gateway Program that has been a dismal failure and I know that the Minister for Trade made mention of that in budget estimates last year. Just recently, he has said that he has overhauled that Gateway Program, but we have not actually seen all of that money or all of that expertise hit the ground and make a difference.

Our exporters need to have readiness training. They need to understand the culture of the country they are sending their products to. They need to have that preparedness and be ready, so that they can actually produce, process or grow a product that will fit the needs of that country, and it has to be a product in demand. We cannot have products or goods and services just put on a ship or a plane and sent over to these free-trade countries.

We actually have to understand their packaging and the presentation that they require. We have to understand the numbers. A lot of Asian cultures rely on lucky numbers; they rely on all sorts of colours. In my previous experience as an exporter, until I made a cultural trip over to China, I did not actually quite understand or realise the importance of the lucky numbers and the unlucky numbers, the lucky colours and the unlucky colours.

It is important when we are putting a product into certain packaging that we know what the numbers are on there for and what reasons. We need to understand that and we need to be much better prepared. For these markets I think that is where this state government is falling down. They are not providing adequate support preparing our businesses, our producers, our manufacturers and our processors in the best possible way in terms of readiness.

There are some groups that have been over there and they have had a very rude awakening, so I say to the government that preparedness support needs to be much more available to our businesses and to our producers, particularly to our agricultural sector with our growing and our packaging, because we need to do more than just fill up a truck, a ship or a plane and send our product away. We have to value-add, and I think that is critically important.

I look at some of the commodities in my electorate and in the electorate of Flinders where industries are doing great things with promoting their product but also having the right product, so they can put it on the shelves over in those new markets. I would like to just touch on some of the commodities that are making adjustments and change.

In the citrus industry, it is a long transition from going to a nursery, asking for a tree, getting that tree propagated and getting it to the property. That takes about three years, sometimes four. To get it in the ground, get it growing and get it producing is another four years and, to do that, we have to produce and grow something that is in high demand for some of these new markets.

In citrus, we are growing smaller fruit. We are growing easy-peel fruit and fruit with low acid. We are growing fruit with high sugar—something that really appeals to the taste and the eye particularly of many Asian countries. They like bright colours and very sweet products. I think the industry has recognised that and they have stepped up to the plate, so I congratulate them.

When we look at the almond industry, we are now pasteurising almonds and that makes them much safer. For those of you who do not know the way almonds are harvested, the tree is shaken, they drop to the ground and they are swept up, put on a conveyor and then taken away for cracking and processing. Sometimes, we get pathogens and bacteria in the nuts which can spoil them during a journey to an export destination. The pasteurising is a great process that gets rid of any pathogens and bacteria. It smooths the nut and makes it very presentable, and it is very much admired by every country around the world.

Stone fruit is another great example. Many of the stone fruit breeders are trialling varieties that, again, are pleasing to the eye, particularly the Asian eye. They are a sweet and compact fruit with very intense flavours, and that is something that will capture the imagination of, particularly, our free trade partners that are looking for that small pocket of impact—the colour and flavour. Again, they are doing a great job.

The wheat and barley industries, particularly malting barley: I have had many millers, brewers and exporters in my electorate looking for a consistent, high-quality product and I think that we are positioned beautifully to present high-quality products. I think the way of the future might not just be the big multinational companies. A lot of the exporters are getting very sick of irregular quality. They are getting that quality which is at the very bottom of the scale that they are looking for, and I think growers can work collaboratively and put a good quality product into a market and cut out a lot of these marketers' agents that are clipping the ticket along the way and, inevitably, the grower has to get a better return.

We look at the potato, carrot and onion industries. They are producing new styles, which is a great initiative, particularly for shelf life, and particularly here, domestically. I am sure that many people have seen some of the new varieties of potatoes and onions on our shelves. They have much better flavours and a much more intense flavour, and they are more purpose-ready for our export markets. In relation to olive oil, we are looking at producing high-end olive oil not just a medium quality oil that comes out of Europe in shiploads. We are going to send the most premium, pristine virgin oils of all types.

Also, hay. Hay is something that has widely been grown in high rainfall areas. That is not the case, these days. We are growing varieties of hay that can be grown in low rainfall, which reduces disease, but can be irrigated. We are seeing a lot of intense farming, particularly in the Asian countries where they have feed lots but not the feed, so they are looking to import the hay and feed and nutrition, and that is something we in South Australia can do exceptionally well with our low pest and low disease rates.

That has been touted as being very appealing, because you can imagine that no country wants to import anything that is going to have bugs or disease or any unwanted items in a sealed bale of hay. Most members would know that the one-tonne bales have been ultra compressed and then wrapped in plastic so they can get overseas in pristine condition.

That is touching on just some of it. I will speak about the seafood. We have some of the best seafood in the world. Our tuna industry is reaping the rewards of the trade partnerships they have had with Japan for many years, but markets in those destinations are opening up further. There are agreements now in place with China. I know that some of the ASEAN countries are looking at high-end seafood products. I am sure the member for Flinders has his eye firmly on that industry in his electorate and making sure that they are harvesting some of the best product in the world to fetch a premium price.

We look at just exactly how South Australia can benefit from those trade destinations. The Asia strategy is about to be launched, but sadly the current government previously closed our trade offices in Jakarta and Bandung in Indonesia, Kuala Lumpur in Malaysia, Singapore, and Ho Chi Minh City in Vietnam. We are going to have to reopen them. I fail to see their strategy. As I said in the first part of my contribution, this government has rested its economic goldfield in the resource sector, and it is clearly not happening in South Australia. The big miners have shied away. We are seeing jobs being lost at the moment, we are seeing mines being scaled down, and we are seeing some mines being mothballed. Again, we are looking at relying on a renewable resource, and that is agriculture.

We continue to improve the quality of our crops, and that is where the energy of the government needs to be focused, on something that is renewable and something that can be improved every year. Again, I call on the government to stop turning its back on the grassroots of agriculture and stop focusing on the shiny bits and backslapping, hopping on a plane and telling the rest of the world how wonderful we are without solid benefits. We have to become better prepared for our export markets. We have to produce better products so that we are leaders in the world and not just followers.

I see that with the wine industry. For many, many years South Australia has produced the majority of premium wine in this country. The Riverland in particular is the engine room of the wine industry in Australia, producing 26 per cent of Australia's wine, 51 per cent of South Australia's wine. Yes, it is not ultra premium, but it produces some fantastic entry-level wine and some fantastic alternative varieties. In the ASIAN region, particularly Japan, they are picking up some of these new, alternative varieties, and they like them. They like the style.

They are not ready as yet for the big, bold, beautiful Barossa shiraz or the inclement Coonawarra cabernets that just melt in your mouth. They are looking for affordable entry-level wine, and I think the Riverland is beautifully positioned to supply that; but we have to be able to market and sell our wine. We cannot be price takers. We cannot just keep loading the ship without thinking about the markets our commodities are headed to. We cannot just keep loading the truck and hoping we are going to get paid for our product. We have to have that expertise around how we sell our product. We have to be proud, because all the other continents in the world are now producing wine, with a lot of Australia's expertise.

We need to be competitive. We have rested on our laurels for too long. I call on the wine industry to look beyond, to look at new styles, new varieties and new marketing skills. We are being plagiarised with some piracy, particularly in China. We need to look at how we can chip our bottles. We can put on labels that cannot be easily counterfeited. We need to continue the ownership of those premium and iconic brands that we have been so proud to own and ship all over the world.

We look at how we can promote our export businesses. Regional South Australia produces over 50 per cent of our overseas exports, but with only 30 per cent of the population. They are doing it with fewer people and fewer resources, because they have to, because that is the country culture. Regional South Australia does more with less, we produce more with less, and we grow more with less. That is the way we have remained competitive and that is why we are still on the land. If we had a government running agriculture, believe you me, it would have died long ago.

We also hear the government talking about establishing a new body solely focused on attracting investment. Is this not just another layer of bureaucracy? We already have some of these investment bodies. We already have Invest SA, Education SA, Food and Wine SA, and now we hear the government talking about establishing another body, another layer of bureaucracy. Is this just propping up another government department? I hope not because I look at the defunding of those very important R&D programs and R&D bodies that continue to be shunned by a government that is relying on our expertise in R&D.

I will just touch on interstate migration. On average almost 3,000 South Australian residents leave the state on an annual basis. Why are they leaving this state? Is it because running a business is so expensive here in South Australia? Yes. Is it because young ones cannot get a job here in South Australia? Definitely.

I have three children and all of them have considered leaving to find a job interstate. I have a son who has just entered the construction industry and he almost gave up on South Australia and

I urged him to stay. If it were not for the goodwill of a good South Australian family company, he would have left South Australia and moved on.

My daughter has just finished year 12 and she is wondering where she should go for her career. The message she is getting from her peers and her friends is that there is no work in South Australia and she should look interstate because that is the only place you are going to get a job. That is a sad indictment of South Australia.

We do have to build growth and we do have to build job opportunities. We cannot just keep getting the spin from the Premier and the Treasurer that everything is fine. We cannot just believe that we are going to pull jobs out of thin air. We actually have to create jobs. We have to make robust policy. We have to make this state attractive. We cannot just keep saying we are going to and ask people to believe us. We have to have the runs on the board and we have to make this state great once again.

We are at the bottom of the tree with employment. We are at the bottom of the tree with investment and yet we have a government that keeps criticising the opposition for not believing in this state. We are only stating the facts, and the facts are that people are walking away because they have a lack of commitment to and a lack of confidence in South Australia.

Again, we look at unemployment. Tasmania has a better employment record. The figures are out today and it is embarrassing for South Australia that we are bottom; we cannot go any lower. We now have to build on our employment strategy and the government has to build real policy rather than feeding the people of South Australia spin.

Since 2002 South Australia's population growth has achieved just half the national average, with more than 38,000 net interstate migrants under this current government. The average number of South Australians leaving for interstate per annum has grown by 9.8 per cent since 2002. That is a sad indictment of exactly what South Australian is all about—we need family business and entrepreneurs coming over here. It was once a state of opportunity. It is now a state where people are leaving and migrating elsewhere. Those figures are staggering and extremely concerning, considering the state government has no plans to arrest the decline.

Again, we heard the Premier today, and it is all spin and we do not believe in him. We do not believe in him because he is not putting anything credible on the table. He wants to change time zones and close hospitals. They want to walk away from our servicemen's hospital. It is not about spending \$19 million on a new service; that is rubbish. That is not going to provide the care they need and it is not going to provide the service they need. That establishment is there for them for serving our country. It was a gift, originally, so I think it is a sad indictment once again of the government. The Governor said in his speech:

Investors and business leaders, and perhaps most importantly young people deciding where to best pursue their dreams, intuitively judge a state by the energy, vitality and values expressed by its capital city.

If that is the case, many South Australians are pursuing their dreams elsewhere, and that is something that must change. I want my children to remain in South Australia, to be great South Australians and to contribute to a great state.

I will touch quickly on attracting events. We have seen a number of events attracted to South Australia. The government has to work harder, the ministers have to work harder, on attracting world events. We cannot just rely on an India-Pakistan cricket match. We have to give our fans something, and our fans are partly Indian, we have a part-interested crowd, but we have to give our Aussie fans something. Again, we had a Rolling Stones tour but we need Australian content.

Time expired.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (16:40): I welcome the opportunity to take on the role of Minister for Education and Child Development but, before I turn to a discussion of what I expect to see in that portfolio over the next year and respond to the Governor's excellent speech, I would like to acknowledge the two people who have joined this house since we last met. The member for Davenport I have not yet had an opportunity to spend much time with; however, he is representing

the area where I grew up and where my parents still live, so I will be keeping a somewhat watchful eye on how he represents his area.

I also welcome and know far better the new member for Fisher and her extremely moving speech yesterday which was not only personal about her own experiences but also clearly evocative of who she is—an honest, clearly spoken person who is ultimately driven by her values. I am sure many people have said to her on coming in that she should not change. That is often what is expected of politicians, sadly, in our community. Of all of us, the new member for Fisher will not change as a result of this job, other than to grow and become even better as a representative of her area.

I turn now to my role as the education and child development minister. I would like to say that I am delighted to have been given this role, although admittedly quite sorry to farewell my previous portfolio which I enjoyed very much and which was extremely important to my electorate. However, the opportunity to have anything to do with young people is precious and I am genuinely delighted to be given this opportunity. Young people, it is a truism and it is tedious to say, are our future. That is not only because of time passing because they grow and therefore become the adults who run the place but because when they are young they have the opportunity to develop the skills, the knowledge and the values that will carry them through for the rest of their life.

I said at the SACE graduation the other day that the generation who are graduating from school now are brilliant. I see in them not only high capability and excellent performance in their academic world, but they seem to have a value base that might have been missing in older generations, not older than me but perhaps around my age or a little younger. The people who are coming through now seem to be so driven by making the world a better place, and I find it extremely refreshing to be with them and I look forward very much to their taking over this society and economy of ours.

I am also a parent of children who are in the state system. I am a graduate of the state system myself and an extremely proud advocate of the state education system. I will in this portfolio be unashamedly proud to talk about our state system and to make its quality and the improvement of its quality central to everything I do. I believe that you can have no better institution in society for the future than an excellent and strong state education system, and that is what I will be dedicating the education side of my portfolio time to.

Although I probably draw too much on my experience as a parent in this first week of being a minister in coming to grips with it, I have also had the privilege over the last three years of spending a lot of time in local schools in and next to my electorate. My practice has been, as I am sure it is with many members here, to embrace the schools that might sit just outside my electorate boundaries but which are the schools where children from within my electorate attend. So, I have had the very great fortune of attending a number of graduation ceremonies, too numerous to count, over the last three years, of going to governing councils, of spending time with principals.

My job, I think, as a brand new education minister is to get out to many of those schools beyond my electorate now and understand what it is that they wish to see. The best way to know what is happening and what can happen is to take advice from people who experience the issue every day, in this case, principals, teachers, SSOs, administrative staff, the students themselves, and the parents, grandparents and caregivers, all of whom have such an enormous investment in our education system.

One of the important values that the education system brings to us is its capacity to support families who are in a more vulnerable position. We know there are families for whom life is harder, and in those cases life is harder for the children in those families. What I want to see is the power of the school system being used to help those children to have an opportunity at a better and brighter life. What I want to see is that the few hours of the day when children who are in distressed or vulnerable families are at school are the best hours of their day, where they are nurtured, valued and recognised for the potential that they have, and I will carry that desire and that value with me. That is one of the reasons that I personally think keeping the portfolio of education and child development, including Families SA, together is a good idea, although I will, of course, be interested to hear what the royal commission has to say.

I carry with me from my previous time as the minister for manufacturing and innovation and also the minister for automotive transformation a much better understanding than I had previously about the enormous change that our economy not only is going through but, more importantly, will go through. It has become extremely clear to me that, for children who are just going into school now and even for children who are in late primary and getting into high school, the jobs they will have in the future will be nothing like the jobs we are now aware of. Therefore, the kind of skills we need to give those children need to be ones that are transferrable, translatable and broad.

I have said in a couple of media interviews, when people ask me what I want out of the education system, that I believe very much in the basics. I come as a parent in particular, and a child of people who taught at university. I come with a bias for the basics. I like good grammar. I appreciate good spelling, although I must admit I was not a good speller as a child and had to work extremely hard at that, and I value numeracy. However, the basics are a lot more than that now. The basics now need to encompass not only additional skills such as digital literacy, which I have to admit our children seem almost born with, but also, as you go into high school, an increasing emphasis on science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM).

The basics also have to be about how you learn and how you think, because if we do not equip children with the capacity to be creative, to be problem solvers and to be able to think critically, then we will hamper them in their capacity to embrace the jobs as they emerge, as those new careers and those new jobs become reality. One of the great challenges with the digital era is that it is so easy to slip into what people call an echo chamber, where you are on the internet where theoretically you have access to a huge range of ideas, opinions and facts, but in fact very quickly and easily you can fall into just looking at the sites that conform to your own pre-existing prejudices and ideas, which feed you facts, even if they are facts that only support your pre-existing assumptions.

So, even more than before when teachers would often be the mediator of knowledge, when students are capable of gaining knowledge themselves directly through the internet—which is largely a fantastic thing to happen—we need to equip those students, those children and us as adults with the capacity to think critically about what they are being presented with, to have the tools to question what is before them. I know our education system is very much focused on doing that, and I will be absolutely insistent on seeing that continue and expand. It is one of the very great qualities that we can give our children. Other personal qualities, of course, include resilience and competence.

We used to have a world where, if you were lucky enough to get a profession, a job or a trade, you could have a reasonable expectation that that would be what you did for your life. My parents, essentially, only had one job each for their whole working lives: one workplace, one job. That is completely different now already. I have had several—constantly starting again—but I know that the next generation does not even expect to have longevity in work, and to give the level of resilience and self-confidence required to go through that is another very important feature of our education system.

I would like to note some of the announcements or plans that were articulated so beautifully by our new Governor on Tuesday on education. What he talked about was our capacity to have schools able to choose to amalgamate if they want to. While that may sound qualified and very much just about location, it really is not. It is much more about equipping schools within a community to make a decision that they might be able to better serve their community together than alone and to give them some of the financial instruments to facilitate that.

I am very keen to see our schools be the base of our education system. They already are, but where is the weight of our attention; where is the weight of our expenditure and of our decision-making? The chief executive and I have discussed this and he is, of course, already absolutely supportive of this growing trend we have seen across the world in schooling, in education, to really push the autonomy towards the school level and to push the capacity to make decisions there, not only with the offer of assisting amalgamations where schools wish to do it in providing the financial mechanisms to do that but also to look at the role that head office plays.

At the moment, we have a head office in Flinders Street that is very full. Many staff members spend a lot of time out at the schools, but the chief executive and I have discussed the absolute importance of pushing as much as possible out into the school level and, therefore, giving the power and the strength to those schools.

I would like to close by referring to the Families SA side of my portfolio. It is a difficult one because it deals with families and children who are in the most vulnerable situations. The most vulnerable, of course, are the children for whom I am now responsible. There are around 2,600 who are under the care and guardianship of the minister, and I take that responsibility extremely seriously. The government has an enormous role to play in regard to the number of families who we know have challenges in their lives and in their parenting. Of course, we do. We are asked by the community to take that role, of finding out where there are problems and supporting families, and where that is impossible, looking after the children separately from the families. It is not something that government can do alone. It is a responsibility we all share for all of our children.

The new member for Fisher referred to a role she plays as the carer of a child who has had an interesting and challenging life and for whom that story will become very important and powerful, as she said in her speech. That is one way of supporting. However we all have an obligation not to turn away, not just—even if we notify officially that there might be a problem—to leave it at that. We all have a responsibility to be deeply engaged with our neighbours and in our communities to support them in every way we can. With that, I thank the Governor for his speech, and look forward to the next three years. They will be interesting and challenging. I thank the house for its time.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:55): I rise today to contribute to the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech. The role of all the members in this place is to 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.

That is most important. I do not know His Excellency the Governor as well as some of the other members in this chamber—I have met him just the once—but it would appear that he is admirably suited to the role, and I congratulate him on his appointment and wish him well in that role in the coming years.

At the outset of this speech I would also like to take the time, as others have, to congratulate the two new members of the House of Assembly, the member for Fisher and the member for Davenport, who were both elected over the Christmas/New Year period. I welcome them to the chamber and wish them well in their time here. It is not easy to get to this place, we all know that, and both of them have earned their position. They have now been sworn in and will go down in history as members of the House of Assembly and the South Australian parliament. It is a marvellous privilege and, from her maiden speech, the member for Fisher certainly comes in admirably well prepared and well intentioned. I suppose now we will hear from the member for Davenport next week, because we are nearly at the end of this sitting week.

I would like to pick up on a couple of things that the Governor mentioned in his speech. Something I have actually spoken about today during the condolence motion, but would also like to mention in my Address In Reply speech, is to pay tribute to the Hon. Arthur Whyte AM, who was a member of the Legislative Council from 1966 to 1985, including time as president from 1978 to 1985.

I knew Arthur a little bit; in fact, everyone on Eyre Peninsula knew of Arthur. My father certainly used to speak of him. He was well known, and was a lifelong resident of Kimba—or a farm nearby—and was very active in the community of Kimba. He was 93 when he died, and was one of the few remaining Rats of Tobruk. I made the comment in the condolence motion that on this occasion a man had passed and an era had also passed, and I truly believe that. So vale Arthur Whyte.

Now to the speech proper. We have had another opening of parliament. Of course we have only just had the state election back in March 2014, so in fact we had just eight months of parliament sitting yet the decision was made to prorogue that parliament and reopen, for whatever reason that might be. It seems somewhat unnecessary to me.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. S.E. Close.

Mr TRELOAR: So, with much pomp and ceremony and, of course, cost, which has been mentioned a number of times, we have opened parliament, we have opened a new session after just eight months of sitting after the state election in 2014, for whatever reason that might be. As we have noted over the years, the Governor speaks at the opening of the parliament. He is, of course, the Queen's representative in a Westminster democracy, and it is not the Governor's speech, it is actually the government's speech and they lay out their plan, their agenda, for the coming session. In previous years we have had the seven-point plan, we have had a 10-point plan and we now have an 18-point plan. I suspect that either or of that, nothing really changes.

The member for Kavel spoke wistfully about the MFP, the multifunctionpolis, and the airy-fairy nature of a lot of this government's spin. The Leader of the Opposition and I went to New Zealand a little while ago to talk particularly with the conservative government over there and also Prime Minister Key, who has since been re-elected. The conservatives over there use a wonderful term when they describe the Labor Party—the Labor Party is in opposition in New Zealand—they use the term 'séance economics'. I guess what that really means is: we have a lot of plans, we have a lot of planning, we have a lot of consultation, but the nuts and bolts, the numbers, are never really considered in any of this and it becomes some magical figures.

The intention is, I think, that by having a plan we will suddenly become economically viable and a robust state, when in fact the Premier himself has described this state as heading towards genteel decline. I suspect we have been on that path for some time already, but from this plan I see nothing but that quest for socialist utopia, which Labor governments around the world have been seeking and have inevitably brought the economic situation to a grinding halt. I think the real difficulty with this government is its failure to meet its budget projections, and we have seen that particularly since 2005.

The deficit has blown out, we have seen the debt blow out and despite the rhetoric and the stated intention of achieving surplus and reeling back in the budget surplus, it never actually seems to come to pass. It is very simple: if you reduce waste and spend less then you can make a difference to your government budget lines. The contrary has occurred. We have seen debt spiralling. We see governments now talking about reforming the tax system. That is code for increasing taxes, I am sure. We will wait and see on that.

The member for Goyder pointed out, in his capacity as shadow minister for regional development, that the regions were left out completely from the Governor's speech, and that speaks volumes about this government and its general ignorance of the economic contribution of the regions. You will hear that many times from this side of the house. We say it over and over again, but it does not seem to be striking a chord with the government. The citi-centric attitude of this government has not changed.

I might refer to the member for Fisher's maiden speech. It was a wonderful maiden speech. I do agree with that sentiment. She put a lot of emotion and thought into her maiden speech and it was well worth listening to. However, she said at one point that:

We need to be investing in our communities, creating jobs, growth and excitement in our city.

Therein lies the problem. It is not just jobs, growth and excitement in our city, in fact it needs to be right across the state and we will continue banging on about that until the government starts to listen.

The member for Chaffey spoke about the value of our productive sector, a lot of which, at least, we find in our regions. He talked about the recently completed grain harvest. I have not had the opportunity, since coming back, to speak about the harvest but, in my electorate of Flinders, which covers almost all of Eyre Peninsula, the harvest was generally good. The farmers right across this state have been very active in their adoption of new technologies, and they have been able to achieve results in any particular season that just a few years ago would have been unthought-of and viewed as impossible.

West of Ceduna, in the 2014 cropping season, I know they had their best year ever and that is a remarkable effort because it is low rainfall country. As I said, through the adoption of new technology, timely sowing, new varieties and generally good farming practice and good farming

systems, they achieved results. It was not so good down the bottom end. It was quite wet during the wintertime, but across the state generally, once again, the grain harvest was really quite successful and is such a critical factor in this state's economy.

Also, in the agricultural sector, we have viticulture and, of course, the horticultural sectors kicking goals as well. The most important thing is for our agricultural and primary production sectors to be able to remain competitive. We also have a large fishing and aquaculture sector—seafood, let's call it—around the West Coast and along the coastline of the seat of Flinders.

Once again, the most important thing is for us as legislators and for the government to allow them to be competitive. It is not about encouraging them to be competitive, because they will be that, given their own time anyway, but it is allowing them to become competitive. It is about not burdening them with red tape, with increasing costs and also the difficulty of dealing with bureaucracy.

The Governor talked about Transforming Health and, of course, that has been very much the topic of the week despite some distractions that were attempted by the government along the way, such as time zones and electric cars. I will come to that later in this contribution. We saw a rally on the steps of Parliament House. They are becoming quite regular about one thing or another.

Mr Gardner: Paris in the spring.

Mr TRELOAR: Paris in the spring, member for Morialta, indeed. Eventually you would think the government will start taking note. Country Health, I am sure, will fit into Transforming Health somewhere along the line. I just want to talk a little bit about a situation that has arisen within my electorate. Just recently, Country Health SA set up a general practice model to serve the townships of Cleve, Kimba and Elliston.

The model placed three general practitioners, three country doctors, in the town of Cleve and they were to service Kimba, which is half an hour to the north, and Elliston, which is probably an hour and a half to the west of Cleve. Unfortunately, that model does not appear to be suited and the reason I say that is that two of the doctors have decided to leave.

I trust the minister is aware of the situation because, as of next week, we will have only one doctor servicing Kimba, Cleve and Elliston. Population indicators suggest that that could be a four-doctor demand practice, so obviously the model was not right. The model did not work. I cannot be critical of the two doctors who decided to leave. They made a personal decision but, despite their attempts to negotiate with Country Health SA, there was not a great deal of reception or flexibility, I guess, in the model that was presented.

The other thing that has occurred within Country Health in Flinders over the last little while is that, of course, we have had a \$40 million refurbishment of the Port Lincoln Hospital. That was completed late last year and I would like the minister to be aware that the lift still is not working. I have written to the minister about this. The Public Works Committee is due to visit in about two weeks, and I am very pleased about that because some of the questions that are asked will be about why something as simple and as basic as the lift that provides access to the entrance is not working after all these months. It is quite extraordinary.

I understand that a mental health ward has been fitted into the Port Lincoln hospital. It is a brand new ward and it is part of the refurbishment. The doors are locked: there is no staff. I think that is a sad indictment of Country Health SA and this government, that is, the lack of funds they put into mental health (because mental health staff should be available for a mental health ward) and the fact that they are prepared to shut away valuable bed space, a valuable ward, in a major regional country hospital is beyond me. I look forward to the Public Works Committee visiting in a couple of weeks and asking some questions about that project, in particular.

Time zones were mentioned in the Governor's speech. Most would suggest (as I would) that this is just a distraction. However, nothing raises the ire of the good residents of the West Coast like a discussion of time zones. I have done a bit of research on this and, in fact, in 2011 I asked the parliamentary library to do some research on the history of the time zone debate here in South Australia. It turns out that the time zone we are currently operating in has been in place since an act of parliament in 1898. In 1899 we clocked on to nine hours 30 minutes ahead of Greenwich Mean

Time, and that was half an hour ahead of what our true central time zone would be, but that was the decision at the time. The reason given was that it would be better for business.

Of course, communications were much more difficult in those days. Most of the communication was with both Sydney and Melbourne, but there was also another player in all this and that was the mining town of Broken Hill. Broken Hill, of course, runs on South Australian time but it is in New South Wales. It was settled from South Australia and they play Aussie Rules, it is so South Australian. The fact that they were such a major contributor to and an important source of wealth for the Australian economy at that time meant that consideration had to be given to that. So, there we go: we have been 9½ hours ahead since 1899.

A number of times since this debate has occurred—three times in the last 15 years, I am guessing, it has come up—and each and every time we have finished up remaining exactly where we are. You might think this sounds rather simplistic, but there are some maths and geography involved in this. As I said, I did some research and our true Central Standard Time zone, should we be sitting at nine hours ahead of GMT, would be taken from longitude 135°E which, in fact, runs through Eyre Peninsula. It runs through a tiny settlement called Bramfield just east of Elliston. We currently take our time zone from 142.5°E, which runs through Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland, so we are already a little ahead of where we should be.

Should we make a shift to Eastern Standard Time, which is one of the possibilities that is being floated, we would be taking our time zone from 150°E which, of course, is very close to Sydney. It is 1,400 kilometres east of Elliston. It is a bizarre situation and nobody is going to be impacted more in this state than the people on Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast. It is a distraction but it has certainly created some interest on the West Coast, and I have had numerous calls about the significance of any time change that might occur. It is as simple as children going to school in the dark and coming home in the middle of the day. It is that basic. Be careful what you wish for, I think.

Something that the government needs to look hard at is the issue of police checks. I know each and every one of us, as local MPs, would have been contacted by constituents saying they are having difficulty with the timeliness of police checks coming through. Sadly, it seems to be taking weeks and weeks, sometimes months, for people to get a police check through. It should not be that hard. Everything is available on the internet these days. All of our business is done on a computer, so surely people's records are readily accessible and readily available to those departments who need to access them. I cannot for the life of me see why people are being kept out of work in some instances because they cannot get their police check back in time.

There was a rather bizarre situation in one of my towns. I will not say which, because that would be a bit enlightening, I guess. In one of my towns there was a bus driver who was accredited and had a police clearance to drive schoolchildren. He was qualified, he was accredited and cleared to drive a school bus. On one particular day, he volunteered to drive the Probus club to the neighbouring town for a luncheon. They were all very excited, as was he. It turns out that he was not allowed to because he did not have a police clearance to drive old people. Now, this is a bizarre situation, and I urge the government to get a handle on this. It is not that hard.

Unfortunately, it is all about South Australians being overregulated and overgoverned. On emergency services reform, I can tell the parliament that the volunteers are not happy. The volunteers in my patch are not happy about the reforms that have been proposed. They are wondering why, in the first instance, they need to become one. They are concerned that they will lose their autonomy. In a conservative electorate they are really concerned about union domination and what role the unions might play in this. It is going to be a difficult one to sell, I think.

I was pleased—and I will state a personal opinion here—to hear the Governor announce a royal commission into the nuclear industry. I think one of the real opportunities for any state or entity is to make the most of their natural resources. My understanding is that in South Australia we have 80 per cent of the country's known uranium. We have 40 per cent of the world's known uranium in this state. It is an extraordinary situation, an extraordinary natural wealth. It is an incredible shift for the Premier, I would suggest, from where he once was as a member of the left in the Labor Party. No doubt it was a hard sell for him within his cabinet room.

Former governor Kevin Scarce has been nominated to head up that royal commission, and it will be interesting to see where this goes. Who knows where it will go? It is not just about the generation of nuclear power, of course; it is about a whole host of things, really. It is about the potential to store waste, it is about the potential to build a generation IV reactor, which I understand can take waste from previous nuclear reactors and use spent fuel, in effect, to generate further electricity to the point where just 1 per cent of the waste remains.

I have been doing a little bit of interesting work on this, and I certainly have a constituent who has been a passionate proponent for the nuclear industry for some 17 years, he tells me.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: I think I got a letter from him once.

Mr TRELOAR: Yes, we may all have had a letter from him, I think. I will mention his name. He is a former Labor candidate for the seat of Flinders, a former high school geology teacher: Terry Krieg. He and I have become friends—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: Indeed; I am his local MP, Deputy Speaker. We have had many discussions about this, and nobody is more pleased than Terry to see this announced. We will see where it goes. I think we have to really take seriously any opportunities we might have. Having said that, this is my personal opinion. We have not discussed this at all in our party room, so I will declare that.

The Governor talked about climate change. I am a bit sorry that the climate change debate has hijacked the environmental debate. I have spoken in this place before about the importance of a productive and stable landscape. That is my view of an environment; in fact, just today we attended a briefing, organised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, from the Wentworth Society. I think that is what they are called. They really are looking at the environment as a whole and looking to see how some hard numbers, some hard fiscal discipline, can be factored into the environmental argument. As I said, I think the climate change discussion has hijacked a much bigger and broader debate about the environment itself.

One of the things I hope for is that it can be steered back towards a more wholesome and holistic environmental discussion which would include water and, of course, there is no real discussion on water in the plan. How quickly we forget about this challenging Australian continent that we live in and there is certainly no indication, no suggestion, that our water issues on Eyre Peninsula are being considered at this stage.

There is no real talk of infrastructure either. I was speaking with the Minister for Infrastructure when the cabinet visited the West Coast and he asked about infrastructure. For me, as a country member, as somebody representing a rural and regional community, infrastructure is pretty basic. It is about our roads; it is as simple as that. Those arterial roads are the lifeblood of the nation really and, of course, all of the goods we produce in the countryside we must transport to market and export via the roads, so it is a really basic infrastructure need. Unfortunately, sadly, a lot of our country roads are crumbling, despite the fact that they are carrying more and more produce than ever before.

Sadly, the government would rather talk about cycling in the city or driverless cars. Now, they are going to come anyway. They are going to come and I know, for example, there are trains in the Pilbara that are being driven from Perth and there are dump trucks operating in mines in northern Western Australia that are being operated from Perth. There are tractors in the field in this state that are almost driving themselves. The technology is available now for those tractors to be driverless, and once the cost of that comes down, then I am sure we will see people investing in that.

I do not think it is the big things that are going to be necessary to change in this state. It is not the big plans that are going to rescue this state and get the economics of this state back on line; it is actually the little things. If we do the little things everything else will follow—the administration costs in this state, the effort to reduce waste and the effort to reduce costs.

In many ways I think the best thing—and I do not mind saying this, I am not embarrassed about this—governments can do anywhere is to get out of the way and let people get on with it. Finally, what I would say is my opinion is that a good government is one that people do not notice. A

good government is one that people do not even realise is there and I have to say that this government is certainly not that.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (17:23): First of all I would like to thank the Governor, Hieu Van Le, for his fantastic speech. I think it was such a special day when he became our governor and I really value that time when South Australia stood out as the first state to put forward an Asian-born governor. I think it shows a great journey that he and his lovely wife have made in their commitment to Australia, and most importantly their commitment to multicultural affairs and welcoming people of different communities to South Australia.

I would also like to congratulate the new member for Fisher and the new member for Davenport. It was only just three years ago that I was sworn in and gave my first speech in this house and it is such an honour to represent and advocate for the people of South Australia in the parliament. I rise today to speak in support of some of the initiatives outlined in the Governor's speech. To be part of a progressive, consultative and forward-looking government is indeed a privilege, and I relish the opportunity to work with the community, my department and my parliamentary colleagues to help deliver this bold agenda outlined in the Governor's speech.

I note the references in the speech to South Australia's capacity to rise to a challenge, evident in spades in the recent Sampson Flat bushfire. Having seen firsthand how the community rallied to the aid of those affected by the fires assures me that we can achieve anything in this state when driven by a common purpose.

From the very beginning, I had a strong role as a member of the Emergency Management Council and, as the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, I had responsibility for the relief centres. I would like to thank the volunteers and those members of the department who looked after the people in those relief centres. We ran them for 24 hours a day in the first week or so, and it was the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion staff and a lot of the Housing SA staff who put their hands up to look after the people in those centres.

What really stayed with me—and I visited the centres at Golden Grove and Willaston many times—was how every time I walked into the relief centre, there was a sense of calm. People who had to evacuate very quickly from their homes who were unsure about what had happened to their home and about when they could return to their home while the bushfire continued were able to come into the relief centre. They were greeted by the Red Cross who talked to them about their needs and then people from the department were able to talk to them about the emergency payment that the government could offer to them. We also had at those relief centres people from the pastoral ministries of the Uniting Church and they were able to provide for people some immediate counselling and to talk through about how they were feeling.

We have now moved from relief to recovery and, as we did that, we also had more people provide services at the relief centres. Centrelink was there. While we had 1,200 people registered through the relief process, and we gave about 800 grants out to families, Centrelink then came in to support people who were hardest hit, who had houses that were lost and damaged. I also thank the Insurance Council of Australia which had a representative at the relief centre and continues to have people contactable at the recovery centre. We also had the RAA which came to talk to people about their car insurance. I remember one time when I was there a Bowen therapist had come in to offer free massages to people who were obviously under a great deal of stress.

We know that the recovery centre is now in Gumeracha at the Torrens Valley Community Centre. We have St Vincent de Paul offering services. Red Cross continues to have volunteers there. People from numerous government departments are there to help, and I thank Karlene Maywald for the great job she is doing as the local recovery coordinator.

Over the past week we have held four community meetings, the last one being tonight. I attended the first meeting at Inglewood along with the local member, the member for Newland. About 16 different service providers were there to answer questions for people as they go about this recovery process. I will mention some of those volunteer groups who are not only at the relief and recovery centre but they have also been at these community meetings: SAVEM, who are the

veterinary group helping people with their animals; BlazeAid have come in to look at the repair of fences; and conservation volunteers, talking to people about how they can start the regrowth on their property. I have mentioned St Vincent de Paul. We have also seen Habitat for Humanity offer their services, as did people from the planning industry. Summit Health were there to help people who are finding it difficult to move forward.

Bushfires are very traumatic, everyone reacts differently, and I think we need to continue to talk about this and how we can support the community. History SA have come along because they are doing a project about recording history now and are asking people to put forward their photos and detail their experiences during the bushfires. Samaritan's Purse is a group that organised people to go around and clean up properties. There was also the Salvation Army. Within the relief centres we had both the Rotary Club and the Lions Club cook barbecues for several nights when the fire was still going. It was a great way to support people, and I thank the Rotary and Lions clubs for their support. The CWA also provided immediate support for people, not only financially but also being there to talk to people.

I would like to acknowledge Volunteering SA & NT. We have an agreement with them about spontaneous volunteering. It is something that we saw happen after the Queensland floods when people very generously offered their time. However, we need to organise those people. We need to connect the volunteers at the right time with the people who need help. I thank Evelyn O'Loughlin for her leadership and the great work she did handling the more than 1,500 people who indicated that they wanted to volunteer.

Above all else, it was the CFS, the SES and SAPOL who were there fighting the fire, and we thank them very much. The other departments that helped out were the Department of the Premier and Cabinet; the Emergency Relief Functional Service through Housing SA; the Department for Education and Child Development; the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, which was providing support; the Environment Protection Authority; the Department for Health and Ageing; and the Local Government Association. I have had the opportunity to meet and work quite closely with the councils impacted—Adelaide Hills particularly, and Playford council as well as Tea Tree Gully. I want to thank Tea Tree Gully for going out of its way for us to use the Golden Grove Recreation Centre as the relief centre when we needed to do so.

I applaud the Premier for having the political courage through the Governor's speech to address big issues affecting South Australia, including energy security, climate change and tax reform. I also welcome the Premier's commitment to continue to make Adelaide a vibrant and energetic city, one which is attractive to our young people and visitors alike, no more so than we will see this weekend when we host the India versus Pakistan world cup event.

I had the opportunity yesterday to go along as the Indian cricket team was presented to the community. It was a public event and I got to meet many members of the Indian community, many of whom I know through my role as Minister for Multicultural Affairs, and they were ecstatic to get that close. It is an opportunity that they do not get back home. So many of them told me that family and friends are staying with them, some on the floor and some in rooms. They have all come to Adelaide because they want to see the cricket. It is a really exciting weekend for us. We can put South Australia on the map.

This vibrant city is really coming alive. We have seen the upgrade of Adelaide Oval, and the Riverbank redevelopment which marries that is coming along. There has been the installation of the laneways and creating activities within the laneways, which invites you in to spend time in the city. If you look around, you see increasing levels of public art, which I think is really exciting, and of course there is the upgrade of Victoria Square. We know we are into Mad March soon. It is probably a favourite time of the year for me. We have the Fringe and the Festival, not to mention the Clipsal. It is a time that is really lively. We have something for everyone.

Our commitment to renew all Housing Trust stock predating 1968 will see more than 4,500 old homes renewed by 2020. This provides a welcome economic boost to our domestic construction industry. Not only has the construction industry welcomed this news but so have community organisations like Uniting Communities that work on the front line with the most vulnerable South Australians.

Recently, I brought to the house a triennial report about our housing, and one of the key things it emphasised was the current mismatch between our tenants and our homes. I know that 60 per cent of Housing SA tenants are the only person living in their home, but they are often living in three-bedroomed homes with quite large yards, front and back, which require significant maintenance. I welcome the focus on public housing. We have seen significant changes in who are living in our public housing. We know that public housing in South Australia is part of our economic story.

When we invited migrants here in the 1950s we said to them, 'Come to South Australia, come and work in our factories, come and be part of our car industry,' but also, 'There is public housing that's available for you.' That is what our public housing was. That was the story there. What we see now is more of the people who are in public housing are more vulnerable, they have high levels of need, and I think that by renewing stock and giving support not only supports the industry but it gives people the kind of housing they require. You will have universal access, so as people age and have mobility situations the housing will suit them. So, I really welcome our focus in housing.

One of the great parts of my portfolio is to be the Minister for Ageing and I am really glad we spoke about ageing. We want South Australia to be the place where you age, but you do not grow old. Our plans are to make South Australia a place where older people can maintain an active interest in their communities into their 80s and 90s. This is an important objective. By assisting people to maintain meaningful roles working, caring and volunteering, we will make South Australia an even better place to age than it is today.

One of the key things we have here is a triumph of civilisation. It is a great problem to have. I do not even think it is a problem. It is just something we have to consider. We are now living longer than we ever imagined, and I think we are only at the start of talking about what will be our encore career? What will we do when we finish the full-time job that we have had? For some people it comes earlier, for some people it comes later. But how are you going to continue to be engaged for longer where your health and wellbeing, and being included as members of our community, continues to be important at every age?

One of the things we look at—and we have had some real innovations in looking at baby boomers and their roles from the ageing perspective—is talking about people wanting to have meaningful roles in their community at any age. What they also want to see is that their age does not define who they are. Age is just a number. Who you are, how you look at the world, the way you see your place in the world, is more about your wellbeing, your resilience and your interests than it is about the age you are.

One of the ways we see ageing as a challenge and an opportunity is also to support our businesses to seize opportunities to develop assistive technologies, medical devices, smarter housing, retirement living options and innovative products both for consumption in Adelaide and abroad. Jane Mussared from the Council of the Ageing is among those in the ageing space who have welcomed our focus on making our state friendlier for people of all ages.

I also look forward to working with our remarkable multicultural communities to help promote South Australia overseas. One of the greatest joys in my role is being Minister for Multicultural Affairs, and what I really enjoy doing is talking to people about their journey to Australia. Many people came to Australia for safety and security. Others made the choice to come here for better work opportunities. Some even moved because they fell in love with Australians. What we want to do when they come here is engage them as much as possible, to welcome them here, but also to understand the knowledge and expertise of these communities, and we want to draw upon them to help promote South Australia—their trade, arts and education from their countries of origin.

The Governor touched a little bit on where we see the future of multiculturalism, and what we see is a change and a movement from acceptance to understanding. We know that South Australia is a small market, and we need to look beyond our borders to uncover further opportunities. This is an ideal way that we can support our migrant communities as they thrive here in South Australia. Through a greater understanding of our migrant communities, we want them to help us thrive. Knowing the customs and cultures of different communities enables us to know the customs and cultures of our trading partners.

The Governor mentioned our focus on our LGBTIQ strategy, and I would like to note that the Rainbow Advisory Council, which reports to me as Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, has done a lot to look towards addressing the discrimination that is still there. However, as noted, some individuals and families are still unable to fully participate in our democracy simply because they are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender.

Discrimination against anyone due to sexual orientation is unjust, and I continue to work closely with this community to find real solutions to existing issues of abuse and discrimination. What really motivates me to help people who face discrimination is, at the heart of it, for me, wellbeing and resilience. We want people to flourish in South Australia, to be confident in their life and confident in their choices.

In closing, I would like to urge my colleagues in the parliament, in the public sector and our community organisations, to join the government in realising these goals and ambitions for our great state. We must seize the moment of opportunity. Now is the time to recreate South Australia.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (17:42): It gives me pleasure to rise late this Thursday afternoon to give my Address in Reply response to the Governor's speech. First, I would like to spend a moment congratulating the newest members of the House of Assembly here in South Australia, the member for Fisher and the member for Davenport. I look forward to working closely with both those members and their electorates of Fisher and Davenport, particularly the electorate of Fisher, which has quite close synergies with my own electorate, especially down in the southern parts of Bright around Hallett Cove which stretch over towards the seat of Fisher.

During my year in this place, I guess in many ways the seat of Fisher has been vacant. Certainly there has not been a member of parliament actively representing the residents of Fisher in this place, so I do look forward to continuing my close working relationship with Corey Wingard next door in the seat of Mitchell but also working with the new member for Fisher as she takes on that role. I am sure she will represent that seat with a real heartfelt commitment, which we saw demonstrated in her maiden speech in this place yesterday.

I would also like to congratulate the new member for Davenport for attaining his role in this place, and I really look forward to working with him as well. He extends the renewal and regeneration of this side of the house, and I think it is really worthwhile having someone like the member for Davenport, with his financial services background, joining us here as part of the opposition team.

I would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate minister Close, the Minister for Education, on her promotion within the government. I think she is someone who will bring a new approach, I hope she brings a new approach, to managing the education portfolio and I look forward to being able to work with her in perhaps a less adversarial way than her predecessor had become used to dealing with members of this side of the house. I think that portfolio will benefit from a different approach. Minister Close is one of the ministers on the other side who I have quite a bit of respect for and I look forward to being able to work with her in her new portfolio.

I was also heartened to see that she was able to retain the role of Minister for the Public Sector, an area which members of this house would know I have quite a significant interest in, given my previous career in the public sector. Again, I have been able to work with minister Close in the past in her role as Minister for the Public Sector and I look forward to continuing that. I would also like to congratulate my neighbouring member to the south of my seat, the member for Reynell, for her elevation within the government's ranks as well. She will be missed, I am sure, from the Economic and Finance Committee which I serve on, but I look forward to being able to work with her in her new role as well.

I listened with great interest yesterday to the Governor's speech. I felt that the Governor was able to deliver that speech with a great sincerity. I think Mr Le and his wife Lan have taken to that role with great honour and significance over the past few months since he became South Australia's Governor. He is someone I did have a personal relationship with prior to me becoming a member of parliament and he becoming Governor. Our paths crossed quite regularly when I worked in the Premier's department and he was someone I had a great deal of respect for in his previous role and I am sure I will continue to have that respect for him in his current role as Governor of South Australia.

What I liked about his speech yesterday was his ability to inject some of his personal heritage and background into it, particularly his statements about the connections between South Australia and South-East Asia, obviously his background in Vietnam and his real interest in helping forge those links, cultural and economic links, and his mention of the South Australian South East Asia Engagement Strategy, which is something I think is very important for our, not just cultural but also economic development in this state, particularly tourism, as well as other traditional forms of trading commerce as well.

The government promised us, going into the period of consideration prior to the Governor's speech, that this was going to announce a bold legislative agenda and there was going to be a considerable amount of boldness in the speech, lots of new ideas and perhaps confronting ideas, perhaps controversial ideas. The Premier did make a couple of statements in the media prior to the speech that that was something that South Australians had better get used to. I think give credit where credit is due, and that is something I hope I do while I am privileged enough to serve in this place, because I think there were quite a few ideas in that speech which do push the barriers a bit more, certainly more than the first year of the government's fourth term.

I am really interested in being a part of the debate around those ideas because I think that that is what we are here for, on both sides of parliament, to pitch ideas out into the South Australian community, to work through ideas in this place and to actually come up with ideas that will help prosper and develop the state of South Australia. I am interested in being a part of the government's agenda, supporting good policy along the way and speaking up for good policy and good ideas and being part of a scrutineering opposition as well which looks to hold the government to account and tries to suggest ideas where the government's agenda might be made a bit better along the way.

I acknowledge that the government sits on that side of the house. It has been able to form government and so it certainly has the right to have the opportunity to put forward those ideas. I look through the list of ideas that were in this speech of the Governor and I think some have more merit than others. I think some were a bit overplayed but there are ideas in there that certainly have merit. I look forward to seeing how they unfold and how the government takes the South Australian community on a journey over the coming months and is able to work through some of those ideas, particularly the ones that I think have merit.

I just want to cover off on a few of those ideas. In particular, one that was mentioned was donations to political parties and I think that is something we should look at. I know the government has already done quite a bit of work on that and there are new laws coming into effect with regard to donations to political parties on 1 July this year. I have a personal belief that the reform in that area may not go far enough. The legislation that has been passed is very complex and very messy. It creates a system that could very well leave political parties vulnerable to making mistakes.

I think we should have further campaign finance reform in this state and move further towards public funding. I know there will be public funding as part of the government's package of reforms, but I would like to see that go further because I think the only way you can create an entirely squeaky-clean political system is to really clear out the influence of political financial donors along the way. Tied in with that is the government's desire to reform lobbyists and the influence of lobbyists. Again, personally, I have an interest in seeing what their ideas are and looking to advance anything that creates that open transparency that is so important to give people confidence in our political system.

The Governor's speech talked quite a bit about engagement and the importance of genuine community engagement. It talked about citizens' juries, which some might say are a little bit of an obsession with the Premier. I think the jury is out on the citizens' juries in many ways. I am not sure how effective they have been to date. I was heavily involved in the first citizens' jury on Adelaide's nightlife in my previous role in the public sector. It cost a lot of money—about \$150,000—and had very little in the way of outcomes. I think it was a complete waste of time.

However, they can be much cheaper, and if they are done in the right way, as I understand the current citizens' jury was—the one to which the government's response 'Sharing the road safely' was tabled in the House of Assembly today—I think they might have some merit. This afternoon, I have been looking through the government's response to the jury's report on this idea of how cyclists and motorists can work a bit better together on our roads, particularly in Adelaide. Quite a lot of those

ideas are things I support. The citizens' jury does appear to be able to come up with quite innovative ideas. They seem to be more innovative ideas than perhaps the government can come up with at times, so I am quite interested in seeing how the Premier wants those to evolve in the future.

I was very interested in the concept of tax reform put forward in the speech. Again, it is a conversation that is very worthwhile having, but I think it needs to result in tax relief. We cannot increase the taxation burden on the average citizen in this state anymore. When I speak to members of my community, particularly in the southern half of my seat, I come across people who are really struggling with cost of living matters and with that increasing burden of taxation that is being put on them by state, federal and local government.

I think any reform to the taxation regime in South Australia must involve general tax relief to mainstream taxpayers in this state. That is why I am nervous about the concept of a broad-based land tax on all South Australian properties, as has been touted in the discussion paper. That is something that really concerns me, because I genuinely believe that the average South Australian householder cannot currently cope with that level of taxation on the family home. Tax relief should be the key to any tax reform, and we need to reduce the taxation burden on the mums and dads living in our suburbs in South Australia.

I was very interested in the government putting on the table the concept of developing the nuclear industry. It is something that really interests me. I think there is a huge amount of opportunity there, and I am very interested in assisting the government to have that conversation. I think a state which has uranium deposits in the way that we do should certainly be looking at broadening the industry in any way it can, and I would be delighted to support that conversation as the government takes it forward.

It is a difficult conversation and a conversation that I think scares a lot of people. Having moved here from the UK and having had a nuclear power station about 200 kilometres south of where I lived and another one 200 kilometres north of where I grew up, there was certainly not the same level of angst and fear around nuclear power generation and all things nuclear that I certainly have sensed in Australia. I do not glow green at night when I am out in the dark because I lived near a couple of nuclear power stations.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We don't know that.

Mr SPEIRS: My wife tells me I don't. I checked before I made this speech, Deputy Speaker. I think that it is definitely an area which ought to be explored and, again, we should have that really serious conversation, which I think the government is willing to have, and I look forward to seeing that unfold.

A couple of things I felt were missing from the Governor's speech that I would have liked to see fleshed out and think are real challenges and opportunities for our state include our tourism industry. I think that is an industry which, using Kangaroo Island as a launch pad, could be so much more substantial in this state, connecting in with South-East Asia.

I think we could be the continent's playground, and I would love to see us invest more, try to innovate more in our tourism sector and talk a lot more about what South Australia has to offer the world. As someone who came here as a migrant, I never stop raving about how great this place is and I do not think we do enough in the way of promotion. I think we are getting better at it but there is still a huge amount of opportunity. We have got Kangaroo Island, one of the most significant tourism attractions in Australia, as part of our state, and I am not sure we are leveraging quite enough.

Another area that I would have loved to see some boldness in in the Governor's speech is local government reform. The minister is here at the moment and I know he is going to be opening up the Local Government Act—later this year, I think—and I think that is an area that is really ripe for reform. I think people get scared at the idea of amalgamations. I would not necessarily say amalgamations, but I think there are a lot of council boundaries that do not necessarily make sense, including some that run through my electorate, and I think there is a real opportunity to create councils which are economic drivers as opposed to economic inhibitors.

I come across councils in the way they approach their planning and the way they do not necessarily put economic development at the forefront of their operations, and I would really love to

see the government tackle local government in this state and look at the opportunities to take on some of those ideas from Greg Crafter's report and make local government in this state the very best that it can be. I think there is huge opportunity for reform around planning, which the government has canvassed. I think there is a real opportunity to do local government reform alongside planning reform. We do have planning reform on the table so let us bite the bullet and look at local government reform as well.

I speak as someone who started their community leadership in local government as a councillor and deputy mayor, so someone who I think comes fairly to this conversation. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Tuesday 24 February 2015 at 11:00.