

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday, 25 March 2015**

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

*Parliamentary Committees***SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE UNITING CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA (MEMBERSHIP OF TRUST)
AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:02): By leave, I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Procedure***SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:02): I move without notice:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable government business to take priority over Private Members Business, Committees & Subordinate Legislation for one hour and Private Members Business, Committees & Subordinate Legislation set down for today to be taken into consideration immediately after for one hour.

The SPEAKER: It needs an absolute majority—not present. Ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

*Condolence***FRASER, HON. J.M.**

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:04): By leave, I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Rt Hon. Malcolm Fraser AC, CH, GCL, former member of the House of Representatives and Prime Minister of Australia, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service to the nation, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Today, as a chamber we pass on our respects to the community through this place at the passing of Malcolm Fraser, a prodigious talent and an indefatigable advocate for the ideal of liberalism in Australia's political discourse. As the nation's 22nd prime minister, Mr Fraser's achievements have been well documented in the past week. His leadership, of course, was born in controversy and ruled through a turbulent time through the tensions of the Cold War, oil shocks and white rule in southern Africa.

As a Labor member, and a child of 11 years of age at the time, my recollections of Mr Fraser of course will be shaped by the Dismissal. Indeed, I can remember vividly the teacher announcing to the class the dismissal of Gough Whitlam by the then governor-general, and a fight broke out immediately in the class—not a physical one but a verbal one. It was—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, between the students—so it was a divisive time in the affairs of the nation. But if Gough Whitlam can reconcile with the former prime minister, then so should Labor people, and so it is in that spirit that I provide my contribution today.

What I can say is that we recognise Mr Fraser and his deep commitment to public service both throughout his period in office and in his life after politics. It is extraordinary the involvement he maintained in the daily affairs of our nation. Elected to parliament for the Victorian seat of Wannon at the age of 25, at a time when not just federal politics but Canberra seem to be full of old grey men,

the young Fraser became a political force. His will to power quickly catapulted him into a central role in the leadership of the affairs of the nation.

I want to single out for special mention some of the initiatives that I think those on our side of politics were most attracted to. His seven years of office included achievements like the formation of the Kakadu National Park and the Great Barrier Reef protection arrangements, so his commitment to the protection of the natural environment was something that people on this side of the house were grateful for and respect.

His commitment to the diversification of Australia, with approximately 200,000 migrants arriving from Asian countries, including 56,000 refugees from the Vietnam War, is something which is an extraordinary achievement. I think that we have a powerful example of this policy initiative with our Governor, His Excellency Hieu Van Le, rising to the highest office in this state, being a man who arrived in a boat across the waters and welcomed because of the policies of Malcolm Fraser.

We also acknowledge and pay respect to his decision to pursue the first Aboriginal Land Rights Act and see its passage through the Australian parliament at a national level. His advocacy on the international stage against the injustices of apartheid was also something which allowed our nation to stand tall in international affairs. His influence, through the institution of CHOGM, played a critical role in applying pressure to the South African regime.

As prime minister, he had the unique distinction of his term of office commencing and concluding with double dissolution elections, and while much can be said about the way in which he rose to office in 1975, one cannot forget that he won the greatest electoral majority in Australia's history with his 30-seat swing, meaning his coalition held 55 seats more than Labor in the 1975 election. Whatever one can say about the events of 1975, certainly the people of Australia strongly endorsed Mr Fraser and his government.

In retirement he was a keen contributor to important debates in this nation and on a world stage, including his calls for a more humanitarian approach to the question of people fleeing persecution and seeking refuge in our country.

I met Mr Fraser at the airport as he was leaving the funeral of Gough Whitlam and he seemed happy and healthy, and it is sad to reflect that merely months apart we have lost these two most important links with our national history.

Mr Fraser leaves behind his wife of almost 60 years, Tamie, and their four children, Mark, Angela, Hugh and Phoebe, and our thoughts are with them at this sad time.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:11): I rise to speak on behalf of the South Australian Liberal Party on the passing of the Hon. Malcolm Fraser AC, CH, GCL, 22nd prime minister of Australia and, in particular, to extend our sympathies to his friends and family.

It is indeed a sad moment in the history of our nation as we bid farewell to one of Australia's most recognisable and charismatic prime ministers and one of the giants of the Liberal movement. Malcolm Fraser was born on 21 May 1930 in Toorak, Victoria. He was raised in the Riverina and his early years were shaped by the education he received at Melbourne Grammar and later at Magdalen College, Oxford. It was while at Oxford that his political philosophies, particularly those of liberalism, were shaped under the great tutelage of renowned lecturers, including Isaiah Berlin and A.J.P. Taylor. It was here that he fully developed the strong set of values which would be his touchstone for his entire political career and beyond.

Upon his return to Australia he was elected to the seat of Wannon in December 1955, aged only 25. He was the youngest future prime minister to enter federal parliament. An excerpt of the preselection speech he wrote while campaigning for Wannon shows his idealism and his commitment to public life. He spoke about:

...the necessity for liberalism to reach out to everybody...I want to play some part in this. I am young and would like nothing better than to devote a lifetime to this end.

I think that we can all agree that he was successful in achieving this ambition.

A year after his election to Wannon in 1956, he married the love of his life, Tamie Beggs, who would remain by his side until his death. They had four children together: Mark, Angela, Hugh

and Phoebe. Barry Jones said in recent days that having a wife and family humanised Malcolm and that as his children grew they enlarged his range of issues and interests.

Mr Fraser served for more than a decade on the backbench, passionately representing his constituency before he was appointed to the cabinet by prime minister Harold Holt in 1966 as minister for the Army, his first of many key positions within the federal Liberal Party. As opposition leader, Mr Fraser was a formidable opponent to Gough Whitlam's government and the rivalry between him and the prime minister was legendary. Malcolm Fraser will, of course, be remembered as one of the key players in this most tumultuous period of history and the dismissal of the Whitlam government.

Following the Whitlam dismissal, Mr Fraser led the Liberal country party coalition to win the largest parliamentary majority as a proportion of seats in Australia's political history. He would go on to serve as prime minister for 7½ years and restore much needed fiscal and budget discipline and political stability after the chaos of the preceding Whitlam administration.

In much later years, Mr Fraser and Gough Whitlam grew to become friends and the chemistry between them, even in casual social situations, remained energising, according to many who knew them both. It is notable that these two bookends of Australia's political history would depart this world less than six months apart.

For the son of a wealthy pastoralist from country Victoria, Mr Fraser had a deep affinity for those from distant shores. He was the first person to introduce the word 'multiculturalism' into the political lexicon and he surprised many of his opponents by adopting a formal policy to resettle refugees from the Vietnam War in Australia on humanitarian grounds. The positive impact that the Vietnamese settlement had upon Australia's culture cannot be understated. As South Australians, all we need to do is look at our Vietnamese-born Governor His Excellency the Honourable Hieu Van Le to truly appreciate this.

Mr Fraser established the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council in 1977, set up the Institute of Multicultural Affairs in 1978 and established the Australian Refugee Advisory Council in 1979. However, it was the establishment of the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS) in 1980 that remains his greatest legacy to Australia's bilingual communities.

Mr Fraser was a prime minister with one eye fixed on the international arena and was a highly respected leading figure in the commonwealth of nations. Under his prime ministership, Mr Fraser strengthened Australia's international standing as a country with the ability to punch well above its weight. He had a keen sense of justice and was vocal in his disapproval of South African apartheid. He refused to allow the Springbok rugby team to land here en route to New Zealand in 1981 and strongly opposed the white minority rule in Rhodesia.

However, Mr Fraser was not just a prime minister who recognised injustice in other lands, he also understood that in order to better our nation we needed to reform at the domestic level. He extended native title rights, passed the Northern Territory Aboriginal Land Rights Act, was the first prime minister to introduce freedom of information laws and established Australia's first commonwealth ombudsman. In 1981, he successfully introduced the Human Rights Commission Act and established the Human Rights Commission.

Following his retirement from parliament in 1983, Mr Fraser remained committed to humanitarian issues. In 1987 he formed CARE Australia as part of the international CARE network of humanitarian aid organisations where he served as chairman from 1987 until 2002. He continued to be involved with CARE Australia well into his senior years. In 2000 he was awarded Australia's Human Rights Medal in recognition of his Aboriginal land rights legislation as well as his personal and professional commitment to anti-racism, reconciliation and minority rights both in Australia and abroad.

Malcolm Fraser was a giant, both physically and figuratively, of the Australian Liberal Party and the nation. He was a man of principle who followed through with his convictions and did not ask for forgiveness. He did not go gently into that goodnight but continued to rage, advocating and lobbying for the causes that he believed in right up until the end of his days. I believe that the history books will be kind to the legacy of the Hon. Malcolm Fraser. He was a prime minister who keenly understood the times in which he served, valued and enhanced Australia's place on the international

stage and was a true friend of our multicultural communities. His imprint upon our nation's history will forever be remembered. Vale Malcolm Fraser.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (11:18): Malcolm Fraser always confused me. He was the first prime minister whom I became politically aware of growing up and I remember heated discussions at home with my mother being a keen supporter of his and my father being a staunch opponent of his. My parents both walked to the ballot box to cancel out each other's vote, both in 1975 and right up until the end in 1983, when my father told my mother a fib about who he was going to vote for just to keep her quiet.

That is the type of emotion that Malcolm Fraser generated amongst a lot of people. His relationship with former prime minister Whitlam, while not as close as Jefferson and Adams, seems very similar. They both died on the same day in the same year, but Whitlam and Fraser died six months apart. I do not know how close they became personally but, publicly, they had become a lot closer, and I think they had both healed the wounds that were caused through that tumultuous period in 1975. I am too young to remember it but I hear many people speak of it, particularly on our side of the house, and they speak of it with a great deal of rage and indignation. However, as the Premier said, the public overwhelmingly endorsed then prime minister Fraser in the 1975 election. To this day that result confuses me; I do not understand it, but I think what it speaks of is the eloquence and political style of the former prime minister.

I was lucky enough to meet him personally—again, at an airport—when he was being asked to remove his shoes before he passed through security. I was quite indignant about that; he was a former prime minister and I would not expect a former prime minister to carry anything offensive onto an aeroplane. I raised it with the security guards; one, surprisingly, did not recognise him but they then allowed him to pass through.

We spoke about it afterwards in the lounge, and he asked who I was. I said I was the Treasurer of South Australia, and he said to me, 'You have an excellent Governor.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Governor. I was trying to be nice about the Liberal Party, but that lasted about 30 seconds. He said, 'You have an excellent Governor,' and we had a long chat about that period. When I say long it was long for me; it was about two minutes for him, but for me it was an eternity. He talked about the obligation he felt, as prime minister, towards the Vietnamese people after the Vietnam War, and I found that quite moving, because he really was a champion of multiculturalism.

The political divide has grown over time, and as we look back at that period our political leaders then were much more accepting of people of diversity than perhaps they are today. I do not mean to make a political point; it just seems to me that at that time then prime minister Whitlam and then prime minister Fraser were much more accepting of people from diverse backgrounds. The example they give us today is one of tolerance.

Again, I do not understand Mr Fraser's resignation from the Liberal Party. Even as a staunch Labor supporter I felt saddened that a former prime minister could not relate to the political party he carried to office, to victory, so many times. I think that speaks ill of our political system, not necessarily of the Liberal Party but of our political system; I suspect that even the great man on our side was disappointed with us as he got closer to his end.

The thing about Malcolm Fraser that always impressed me was that he was always in the fight, even up to the end. He engaged in new forms of media like Twitter, and I think he was the first former prime minister to have been on Twitter. He was on there before Kevin Rudd, I do not think John Howard is on Twitter, and he was there before Julia Gillard became a former prime minister; he was always tweeting. Unlike other public figures of his stature he did not caveat his tweets by saying, 'Tweets by MF are personally by Malcolm Fraser.' They were all his, they were all his thinking. He was constantly letting us know where he thought we were failing and where he thought we were doing well. I think that type of political leadership, right up until his passing, is an example to us all: that whether or not you win or lose it is about being in the fight. That is what I respect about Malcolm Fraser.

I think he also formed a number of people's political views, especially through that period. However, the one relationship he had that I never understood was that with Greens senator Sarah Hanson-Young. I tweeted a while back, 'This is the reason I'm Labor,' and there is a picture of Malcolm Fraser and Sarah Hanson-Young. It was not meant to be a personal attack on either of them, it was just that I didn't understand the two ideologies and I didn't understand how they could meet, but that is how complex and complicated he was.

I suppose great leadership comes from the ability to hold two opposing ideas in your head and make them work, and that is what Malcolm Fraser did. He was a very complex, complicated man and complicated prime minister. He was very, very smart and very, very talented, and he served our nation well. Malcolm Fraser is someone we should be proud of as a former prime minister. I think he carried himself with a great deal of dignity in that role, promoting Australia's interests wherever he went.

I feel very sorry for his family in what seems to be a sudden passing, even for a man of his age, because he was exceptionally fit. God rest Malcolm Fraser, and I wish to express my condolences to him, his family and to the Liberal Party.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:25): I rise to speak on the motion recognising the Hon. Malcolm Fraser. I thank the Premier for moving this motion, and I particularly thank the Leader of the Opposition for his contribution to this motion in outlining, for posterity in the state parliament, for South Australians, the magnificent contribution of Mr Fraser, both as a former prime minister of Australia and member of the House of Representatives and also through his lifelong service to public debate and the advancement of social issues on which he worked so hard.

I also wish to acknowledge Mrs Tamie Fraser and their four children in particular for the sacrifices they made in giving a member of their family to high public office. That is an enormous sacrifice. My observations of Mrs Tamie Fraser was that she undertook this sacrifice without reservation, and I commend the manner in which she conducted herself, in becoming involved in all of the areas of both political and public life, to ensure that Mr Fraser was able to both enjoy a magnificent, wonderful and long family life and also to have the support in all of his adventures.

The 1975 controversy (or constitutional crisis, depending on what side of the political divide one sits on) is a matter which I do not propose to traverse, just as I did not at the passing of the Hon. Gough Whitlam. I will say, however, that I certainly remember the election and the 'Turn on the lights' campaign, because, as a result, so many people were unable to start their cars when they went home from work because they had turned on their lights and left them on, and batteries went flat all around the nation! It was a stunningly successful campaign, and Mr Fraser won three elections for the Liberals. He was a great Liberal, and I, along with Liberals from around the country, will recognise the passing of Mr Fraser at a national level at his state funeral this Friday.

The one matter I do wish to place on the record is that I have often thought what a different Australia it would be if the events of 1975 had not taken place. If, in fact, the Whitlam administration and/or any subsequent Labor administration had continued on, without those events, and we had borrowed what is now the infamous Khemlani loan, then our great-grandchildren would be buried in debt. I am actually grateful for the intervention, controversial as it was. The country was broke, and Treasury was advising against overseas loans, and it was a decision which led to those fatal steps to the governor-general, and the rest is history.

Many generations will go on debating the controversy surrounding whether it was constitutionally appropriate or indeed necessary. It is fair to say, as the Treasurer has said, that it was a time of considerable controversy. I do not doubt for one moment that it galvanised many people into the spirit and support of political activism at that time. There were a number of people who joined in the rage at that stage and became politically active. We have not actually seen such a galvanising constitutional event since, and perhaps we never will, but certainly, at a political level, it was monumental.

I thank Mr Fraser for his contribution post life as a prime minister. Similarly to the person operating the X-ray machine, I can recall an occasion in the 1980s of driving to the airport to pick up Mr Fraser in his post prime ministerial role. I had explained to my then 10 or 11-year-old son that I

would not be picking him up from sports practice after school. The obvious question came: why? I said, 'I am picking up Mr Malcolm Fraser from the airport.' The obvious question came then: 'Who is Malcolm Fraser when he's at home?' I had to explain to him that he was a past prime minister. I think it is important that we recognise and respect those who have made such high sacrifice and contribution to public office so that future generations remember him and others who have served.

Subsequent to that, he came to South Australia once to ask for my vote, which was interesting, as he had nominated to be federal president of the party. The Hon. Robert Hill, a few others and I had a vote in those days. A message was sent through to me from my receptionist in the legal practice, saying, 'A Mr Malcolm Fraser rang, Ms Chapman.' I said, 'Yes.' 'I told him he couldn't speak to you because he didn't have an appointment.' 'Right, I'm going to give you a list of a few people who, if ever they ring, are to be put through immediately. Mr Malcolm Fraser is on the top of the list—and these are the other prime ministers.' So, we went through that exercise, and it did not happen again.

We had a meeting, and what was extraordinary about that was that he did not, in fact, ever actually go through with his election. On the day, at the federal council, we were all there ready for the speeches from the candidates. I was sitting near Mrs Tamie Fraser, who was stoic in her expression. Mr Fraser went up to give his speech to get the support of the room. He announced that he was not going to stand and that he was withdrawing his nomination, and he walked out of the room. Throughout the entire incident, which everybody was gobsmacked at, Mrs Tamie Fraser sat there without an expression on her face. I thought, 'What an incredible woman!'

Unfortunately, I never actually got to vote for him, but I greatly admired him. I think his work subsequent to his well-known political period of contribution as prime minister is now testament to the fact that he is a truly great Liberal. He is a giant on our side of the political fence as such, and he went on to make a contribution in public office which I think many of us should aspire to follow. If we do even half of what he has done, we will be remembered as great Australian citizens and giant Liberals.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:32): Malcolm Fraser's death came as a shock to me although, when I saw him on a recent TV appearance, he did seem a little less than he had been in the past. He played a pivotal role in my political life because Remembrance Day 1975 had a profound effect on me. I was working on the ground floor of the cash payment centre of Medibank in Grenfell Street in the days when a visit to the GP cost around \$5.95, with a refund of about \$4.75—proof that there has always been a co-payment.

My workmates had told me of the Dismissal, but I did not believe it. They teased me about it all day until lunchtime when someone brought in one of the newspaper headline posters saying, 'He's out.' It was devastating for me for a number of reasons, and I joined the Labor Party at a rally in Victoria Square some days later—the first time I had actually held a ticket myself.

Having said that, my opinion of Malcolm Fraser has changed over recent years. In his time in politics, he played a cutthroat game to win. He gained perspective and became a humanitarian in later life, and he gained meaning in pursuit of people's basic human rights. He told it as it was: to squib responsibility for public policies which hurt people on the basis of race is simply wrong.

He stood up for refugees and Aboriginal Australians and spoke out in ways I wonder if anyone on any side of any parliament would be prepared to do in their retirement, let alone in their life in parliament. He was able to stand up against the blatant racisms that we see today against asylum seekers and, of course, the first nations people. He became a true Australian statesman.

Just as Gough Whitlam came to appreciate his many fine qualities, so have I and many other Australians. Some of his tweets from *The Advertiser* are testament to the many issues he saw very clearly. One of them states:

Four reasons to raise women's pay that should make men happy. Let's do it!

Another said:

David Hicks: It feels good to be an innocent man. Abbott should apologise, US evidence shows conviction was trumped up by two Governments.

Another said:

2014 Was Hottest Year on Record, Surpassing 2010. And still the deniers deny!!!

We also had a few quotes in the paper that week:

...If they are genuine refugees, there is no deterrent that we can create which is going to be severe enough, cruel enough, nasty enough to stop them fleeing the terror [they face] in their own lands.

There was another on reconciliation, which states:

Reconciliation requires changes of heart and spirit, as well as social and economic change. It requires symbolic as well as practical action.

Along with all of you here today, I add my condolences on behalf of the people of Florey and extend our sympathies to Mrs Tamie Fraser and the extended Fraser family. He was a truly amazing man and, more tellingly for me, he was a lover of gardens and even named a camellia he bred after his wife Tamie. Vale Mr Fraser.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (11:36): I also rise to speak to the condolence motion for the late Malcolm Fraser. I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of Malcolm Fraser, Australia's 22nd prime minister, and I express my condolences to Mrs Fraser and the whole Fraser family.

Malcolm Fraser was a deeply considered and highly principled man. Though all of us come to politics with varying degrees of political courage, very few of us can say we are fearless. Malcolm was fearless, and his passion and sincerity enriched the nation. Fraser's political courage and hunger for reform saw him embrace a large-scale social agenda that reshaped Australia. In particular, his government:

- introduced a legislative framework for Aboriginal land rights in the Northern Territory;
- instituted self-government for the Northern Territory;
- set up both the national crime commission and the Australian Federal Police;
- stood firm against the evil of apartheid in South Africa;
- prohibited whaling in Australia's territorial waters;
- banned sand mining on the ecologically sensitive Fraser island; and
- accepted Vietnamese refugees fleeing war in Vietnam that Australia was actively engaged in and later allocated funding to what became the SBS.

It should not be readily forgotten that Malcolm Fraser was a warrior for our party, and his efforts to dispense with the Whitlam government were vindicated in the December 1975 general election landslide. The events surrounding the Dismissal and subsequent election required real personal and political toughness. Fraser had that toughness.

Fraser's political strength was moderated by his conscience. I have said that Fraser was fearless and very often he was fearless on great matters of conscience. He said of his decision to accept more than 50,000 refugees from the Vietnam war and Indochina conflict that it was morally the right thing to do at the time even though the polls were 80 per cent against him. Fraser's commitment to multiculturalism was lasting. He remarked at the opening of SBS in 1980 as follows:

We used to have a view that to really be a good Australian, to love Australia, you almost had to cut your links with the country of origin. But I don't think that was right and it never was right.

As the grandson of immigrants, I have a deep personal understanding of what it means to love Australia and to celebrate diverse and sometimes very different cultures. Fraser made that possible. It was Fraser who truly ended the white Australia policy.

In foreign affairs, Fraser was a strong opponent of communism and the Soviet Union and 100 per cent committed to the Australia-US alliance. He participated in the 'Let Poland be Poland' broadcasts of the 1980s and was patron of the Australian National Committee for Relief to Poland.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Great union movement, Solidarity.

Mr DULUK: Very good union movement, probably the only good one. I have mentioned Fraser's commitment to land rights and to reconciliation. Speaking about reconciliation, Fraser said:

Reconciliation requires changes of heart and spirit, as well as social and economic change. It requires symbolic as well as practical action.

And I agree. Though now forgotten, Fraser was devoted to the Federation and to states' rights. He adopted a conservative approach to tax reform and economic policy. He offered the states the power to reduce or increase income tax levied by the commonwealth within a 5 per cent margin. No state took up that offer at the time and handed back to the states control over some offshore resources.

Reflecting on the 1975 constitutional crisis and Fraser's natural instincts on economics, Paul Kelly said that he was a conservative as well as a reformer. We on my side of this house are at our best when we are true to conservative values while driving a passionate reform agenda. I emphasise, in that respect, that all true conservatives have a deep compassion.

Malcolm infamously said that life wasn't meant to be easy and, in later life, speaking to us forcefully and directly about the issues of conscience, he did not make an easy life for himself. He asked all the hard questions and knew that the answers would lead to better policy. It is a measure of his quality as a man and as a leader that he ultimately made friends with his enemies, especially the late Gough Whitlam. We must celebrate political leaders who are prepared to stand up for their principles. I pay tribute to a great prime minister and a man with a principled heart.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (11:40): I rise to speak on this condolence motion for former prime minister of Australia Malcolm Fraser AC. Malcolm Fraser's 30-year political career was over before I was born, yet that does not, and should not, make his career any less relevant to me or other members of this house who may not have been immediately impacted by the outcomes of his government.

As someone with a keen interest in Australian politics and a keener interest still in the values and qualities that create leadership, I have spent time analysing Australia's 22nd prime minister, not only by looking at his time in office but also in exploring the good works he undertook in the three decades since his departure from the prime ministership.

Malcolm Fraser was Australia's 22nd prime minister, serving in office from December 1975 until March 1983. He was elected to the Western Victorian seat of Wannon in 1955 when he was only 25 years old and he was the last Australian prime minister to represent a rural electorate.

Malcolm Fraser was greatly defined by the way in which he came to office, although the Dismissal, while tectonic in historical terms, did little more than bring forward the date of the Coalition's emphatic victory in the general election held just weeks after Gough Whitlam was removed from office. Fraser's huge victory in 1975 resulted in his securing the largest parliamentary majority in Australia's history—a record not yet broken.

The Fraser era formed a plateau of economic and social stability—an effective antidote to the chaotic Whitlam years and a foundation for the necessary economic reforms that followed during the Hawke, Keating and Howard governments. Some headline achievements of the Fraser government include the introduction of the family allowance, family income support, lone father's payment and abolition of estate and gift duties.

His government was a huge champion of multiculturalism and essentially founded what modern multiculturalism is in Australia. Between 1975 and 1982, Australia welcomed some 200,000 refugees including, as has been mentioned by many members today, 56,000 from Vietnam alone. The establishment of the Special Broadcasting Service, better known to us as SBS, is a pivotal moment in Australia's commitment to multiculturalism and a great thing that can be celebrated about the Fraser government.

Another great achievement of the government was initiating a modern-day focus on conservation and expanding the number of national parks in Australia. Some of these environmental achievements included banning whaling in Australia, the declaration of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, prohibition of sand mining on Fraser Island and having five areas placed on the World Heritage List, including the Great Barrier Reef, Kakadu, Willandra Lakes, Lord Howe Island and south-west Tasmania. As someone who is a strong and passionate environmentalist, I think those are very worthy achievements and I am glad they have been mentioned on both sides of the house today.

The Fraser government also established FM radio, the Australian Institute of Sport and the Commonwealth Ombudsman's office, opening up scrutiny to government processes. Prime Minister Fraser strode the world stage and fitted well with his contemporaries, Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, as they formed a generation of Western leaders who were united in their push for Keynesian economic reform, looked at ways to cope with the oil shocks, dealt with Cold War politics and analysed and worked towards improving the challenges of white rule in Southern Africa, with Mr Fraser becoming a vocal opponent of apartheid and doing a great deal to ensure that that ghastly practice was brought to an end.

After Malcolm Fraser left his role as prime minister he helped establish the Australian chapter of the aid organisation CARE, which stands for Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere. This became a great passion of his, as he got the organisation up and running in Australia, sought substantial philanthropic support and drove appeals for victims of natural disasters across the world. He was chairman of CARE Australia from 1987 until 2001, and also president of CARE International from 1991 to 1995, and its vice president until the end of the century.

For me, one of the characteristics of a successful leader is someone who can transition from one sphere of leadership to another. Malcolm Fraser's move from leading our nation to becoming a world-leading figure in humanitarianism marks him out as an excellent leader who has achieved more than simply political success. He was a genuine Liberal, his own man, a humanitarian and a leader. Farewell Malcolm Fraser.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:46): 'You have to be an optimist; why involve yourself in issues of public policy unless you are?'—Malcolm Fraser. In my late teenage years I visited a giant in our area, Nick Bianco, in his office, and there was a coaster on Nick's desk, and it read 'Life was not meant to be easy.' I remember asking Mr Bianco what this was about and him explaining to me that it was a quote from one of the greatest, if not the greatest, prime minister of all time, Malcolm Fraser.

It was explained to me why Malcolm Fraser was such a huge icon in the multicultural community: because he was an empathetic and tolerant leader and did many great things for the migrant and multicultural communities. I rise to say a few words about him on his passing. An empathetic man, but not a socialist. In fact, on socialism he said:

It is not a way of life, it is an unworkable formula which would apply to robots but not to men and women.

It is with great sadness that I approach parliament today to remember the Hon. Malcolm Fraser who died on Friday 20 March, who served as the 22nd prime minister of Australia between November 1975 and March 1983. Today I acknowledge some of the impacts he had on Australia.

Entering politics at the ripe age of just 25, when he was the youngest member of the 22nd parliament, his first 10 years in politics were spent as a backbencher in the Menzies' government. After Harold Holt was elected as prime minister a few years back, Malcolm Fraser served as minister for the Army and held numerous titles in the governments of John Gorton and William McMahon.

After the Whitlam government winning office in 1972, he sat on the opposition benches for the first time, and remained there for some years until 1975, when he became the leader of the opposition, providing the Liberal Party with a new sense of purpose and direction, after being appointed as caretaker prime minister in November 1975 by the governor-general, Sir John Kerr, when the Liberal Party came to government. He shortly won office with the largest landslide of any federal election, and won the largest parliamentary majority, as a proportion of seats, in Australian political history.

Mr Fraser's life and time in office will always be remembered by Australians. In economic policy the Fraser government pursued the goals of reducing expenditure, streamlining the public service and providing responsible economic management. Economic rationalism was introduced by the Fraser government in policy debate. However, traditional principles of financial management and fiscal policy marked the reality of Malcolm Fraser's prime ministerial term.

He supported strong defence spending and reinforced trade and diplomatic relations with countries of East and South-East Asia, from which we are still benefitting today. Fraser saw defence and foreign policy as areas that were key to economic benefits in the future. He was influential on

the changing relations of countries within the British commonwealth. He took a strong stand in supporting reform in South Africa, and he also played a significant part in the commonwealth's efforts to establish an independent Zimbabwe. He was not afraid to speak his mind and he was passionate about human rights, even when his party disagreed.

During his term, Australia saw the National Gallery of Australia completed and the construction of the new Parliament House. In closing, Malcolm Fraser will always be remembered by his colleagues, family and friends and to Australia at large as a giant of our time. May he rest in peace.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:50): It is with both pleasure and sadness that I rise to support the motion as moved by the Premier. Unlike a number of members in this house, I remember very clearly the days of Malcolm Fraser, both before he became prime minister and his prime ministership. I remember very clearly those tumultuous events of 1975. I happened to be a commonwealth public servant at the time, working here in the middle of the city.

I remember attending a rally (no doubt the same rally the member for Florey attended) in Victoria Square immediately following those events, probably for a different reason and I was not moved to join the Labor Party as a result of attending that rally. In fact, I suspect I was one of the few people in the rather expansive office that I worked in who was quite relieved at the events as they unfolded on that fateful day.

Sir, let me just say a few things about Fraser. I want to talk about the context of his time as well because sitting here reflecting on many of the events and the giants of the time—and we must remember that Fraser entered the federal parliament under the prime ministership of Robert Menzies as Menzies' reign came to an end—those names of the Liberal Party: Holt, Gorton, Snedden, McMahon, there was a change, a huge change, both in the Liberal Party but also in Australia and Australia's place in the world.

We then had that incredible election in 1972, I remember it very well, and the Whitlam government and great names in that government, names that remain firmly in my memory of Whitlam, Cairns, Murphy, Connor, people who were living at a time when the world was certainly changing but Australia's place in the world changed forever. Out of all of those names I have just mentioned I think Fraser was (at least as much as any of them, if not more than any of them) able to see the changing world and to adapt to what has become a very different world to what he would have grown up in and, indeed, experienced when he first went into parliament.

To live through and observe firsthand—and most members, being a few years younger than myself, will not fully understand what I am talking about—how every young male in Australia in those days, as they approached their 18th birthday, was wondering whether they were going to end up in the jungles of Vietnam, that is the context in which Australia approached that incredible election in 1972.

We then saw the ending of the Vietnam War; the way we ended our involvement and very shortly thereafter the end of the involvement of the Americans. We saw on our nightly news broadcasts, as it unfolded before our very eyes, the impact that had on those who were left, those South Vietnamese who were left. I am absolutely convinced that had a huge impact on Malcolm Fraser and, I suspect, the attitude he carried forward from that time. It certainly had an impact on me and the way I view the world because, as I just said, I think I missed out on the ballot of conscription by a matter of months.

Mr Pengilly: Me too.

Mr WILLIAMS: The member for Finnis says he was in the same boat. So, we were—and I suspect the member for Finnis would agree with me—very conscious of what was going on in the world in those times, and I was certainly very conscious of what we had left behind, the turmoil and the mess that we had left behind in Vietnam. I am sure that Malcolm Fraser was equally conscious of that, too. I can well understand the attitude that he carried forth when he became prime minister towards the people of Vietnam and those who wanted to seek refuge in Australia. Of course, he saw that there were not dissimilar issues in many other parts of the world.

Just on a lighter note I want to refer to one of my constituents, a stalwart of the Liberal Party in the South-East of the state, the late Ian Rocky Smith who a lot of people on this side of the house would remember. Rocky always used to come back from the bull sales over at Nareen, Malcom Fraser's property, and we reckoned he used brag to his mates about how he had lunch with Malcolm and how he chatted with Malcolm. Rocky used to get a fair bit of stick in the local community about his supposed relationship with Malcolm Fraser. Lo and behold, one night we were watching TV and, from memory, I think it was a *Four Corners* program, it showed the prime minister in Queensland. I am not sure why he was there but he was walking down in front of a crowd of people and all of a sudden he veered across to the crowd and vigorously shook the hand of somebody standing in the crowd. Lo and behold, it was Rocky Smith! We always had to believe Rocky thereafter about his relationship with Malcolm Fraser. That was probably the closest I ever got to meeting Malcolm Fraser, through the late Rocky Smith.

Malcolm Fraser was a giant in every sense of the term, and was certainly a giant of Australian politics. He was a giant of an Australian. Along with a very small handful of people, he placed Australia where it is on the world stage today and I think we should all be very, very proud of the way he positioned this nation. To his wife and family I offer my sincere condolences and those of the people of the seat of Mackillop.

The SPEAKER (11:57): John Malcolm Fraser won the federal division of Wannon in western Victoria from Labor. Indeed, so strong was support for the ALP among the large class of agricultural labourers that Labor won the polling booth at Nareen, the Fraser family seat. Mr Fraser was able to win Wannon at the age of 25 with an 8.5 per cent swing at the 1955 general election after the Labor leader, Dr Evatt, had played the sectarian card to preserve his leadership and split the Labor Party.

Malcolm Fraser was a principled opponent of communism and was vindicated in that by history. Although it may seem odd now, in the internal politics of the Liberal Party, Malcolm Fraser was, throughout his parliamentary career, a candidate of the right wing or conservative tendency.

Malcolm Fraser thought it was legitimate, when in opposition, for the Senate to refuse supply to the government. He also thought it was legitimate to arrange covertly with the then governor-general to obtain informal legal advice from the chief justice of the High Court about deadlocks between the two houses, and to arrange the dismissal of the prime minister without the prime minister having the opportunity to change his advice to the governor-general about calling an election and, with Mr Fraser waiting in another room, unseen, to be commissioned by the governor-general after the dismissal. I strongly disagree with Mr Fraser's position, but it is now part of the constitutional arrangements of our country.

Once Mr Fraser became prime minister he carried out a policy that, in Britain, would be characterised as One Nation conservatism or, in the words of Margaret Thatcher, wet. Mr Fraser's government ran budget deficits, ending in 1982-83 with a massive deficit, and avoided microeconomic reform.

Once Malcolm Fraser had left office after the 1983 general election defeat, a severe reaction against his legacy set in in the Liberal Party. Indeed, for years to come the dominant tendency in the Australian Liberal Party consisted of those who regarded the Fraser years as a lost opportunity.

Malcolm Fraser was a man of the Cold War, and he believed in the Australian military contribution in defence of South Vietnam. He predicted that a communist victory would result in massive retribution, a bloodbath, religious persecution and a Vietnamese *Gulag Archipelago*, and so it did—with the result that tens of thousands of Vietnamese took to small fishing boats on the South China Sea with a high risk of being drowned or killed by pirates.

As this happened, prime minister Gough Whitlam told Clyde Cameron that his government would not be admitting to Australia thousands of 'effing Vietnamese Balts'. To his credit, new prime minister Malcolm Fraser gave asylum to these thousands of Vietnamese on the South China Sea or rotting in camps in Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia, such as Pulau Bidong. This is Malcolm Fraser's greatest achievement, in my opinion, and one that puts his critics on the matter to shame.

Rest eternal, grant unto him, O Lord, and may light perpetual shine upon him.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 12:02 to 12:11.

Motions

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION REGULATIONS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:11): I move:

That this house request the Legislative Review Committee to inquire into an amendment to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Regulations 2011 to enable de facto relationships to be recognised on the register recording the death of a person (death certificate).

Currently the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996 includes in part 6, division 4—Registration of death:

The Registrar registers a death by making an entry about the death in the Register including the particulars required by regulation.

As you would expect, the current regulations are fairly straightforward. They include things like the deceased's name and residential address, place of birth, date of birth, the deceased's age at their last birthday, the deceased's sex, the date and place of death, whether the deceased was of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent or both and, if the deceased was over the age of 16, his or her marital status at the time of death. There are several others, probably another eight or so. The regulations also say:

- (g) in relation to each marriage of the deceased—his or her age at the date of the marriage and the name of the person that he or she married.

That is all very straightforward, and I am sure none of us would have any concerns about that, but the regulations do not include anything whatsoever about de facto relationships. I am certainly not trying to encourage de facto relationships in any way, nor am I opposing them, but the reality is that in today's current world if de facto relationships are not included then the death certificate, in my view, is an incomplete record with regard to that person.

This is something that has been raised by constituents. I have been contacted by a constituent whose long-term de facto partners have died and yet former partners by marriage have been registered on the death certificate but not the de facto partners. Again, this is not about excluding the inclusion of the married partner but including the de facto partner where appropriate.

This has caused great distress to the surviving de facto partners and also complicated administration associated with the death. I will give two examples. In one case a surviving de facto relationship partner where the relationship existed for 33 years was excluded, as is currently lawful, from the death certificate. In another case, the former husband had physically abused the former wife, who had died, during and after the marriage and yet that former husband was recorded on the death certificate but the de facto partner of the woman who died was not, and that caused him great distress.

South Australia is the only Australian jurisdiction that does not record de facto relationships on death certificates. New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, ACT and Northern Territory legislation/regulations provide for the inclusion of details regarding marriages and de facto relationships in the death certificate, while Western Australia and Tasmania make no specific provisions but, if information as to a de facto relationship is received when the death is registered, it can be included on the death certificate.

Given the very high percentage of de facto relationships, in my view the current regulations are outdated and should be amended to reflect the real world. According to the ABS, the number of people in de facto relationships in South Australia has increased from 79,635 in 2001 to 113,166 in 2011, a 42 per cent increase, and in line with the national rate. Interestingly, the number of people aged 55 and over in de facto relationships has increased by 156 per cent, the largest increase of any age category, and I am sure that an enormous number of those people would have been in previous marriages, so it would apply to them very specifically.

I say again that my interest in this is purely that legislation on death certificates reflects the real world, reflects the state and the society that we live in. I think this is an incredibly important issue for families and an incredibly important issue for children and grandchildren, and so on. People

deserve to have the relationships that are recognised in other parts of society, both legally and socially, included upon death certificates. De facto families are very much part of the real world, and if de facto relationships are excluded from death certificates then those death certificates are an incomplete record and so will not reflect the intent of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act.

One of the issues that has been raised with me in regard to this is that of same-sex de facto relationships. I am not trying to confer any additional rights upon people in same-sex de facto relationships, but I am very clearly saying that if they are recognised in administrative processes from the ATO all the way through our society, then it would be remiss for them not to be recognised on death certificates. I say again that I am not trying to confer any additional rights on any people in any de facto relationships that they do not already have, but I believe very, very strongly that to exclude them from the death certificate does great harm to the surviving partners. Again, it is an incomplete record of the person's life on the death certificate, and so does not fulfil the intention of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:18): The member for Stuart spoke to me recently about this motion and asked if I would be prepared to speak to it. I am prepared to speak to it because while, at a personal level, I am an old-fashioned type of guy—indeed, for me it is the traditional form of a man and woman marriage, the commitment for life—I do respect (and the member for Stuart quoted some amazing statistics that illustrate this) the fact that Australia, as a society, is changing and that there is a need for the laws under which it is governed and the regulations under which controls are in place to reflect that. I accept that.

In my own case I have a son who was married a week and a half ago, and I am very proud of that. It is a life partnership relationship for them; they were together for 10 years before the marriage date (they started very young), and for them it is a forever commitment. I am very proud of that, but even if they had chosen not to marry I would have recognised the commitment that had been made. I would have tried to ask him to do what I see is the right thing, in my eyes, and therefore a marriage to occur, but they would have remained very strong. My daughter is engaged as well, to a nice young man.

I do have in my own family network, as probably all of us do, a relative who was married in the past, divorced after probably less than 10 years, but who has been with another partner for probably 25 years. I consider his original and divorced wife to be an aunt and I consider his partner now to be an aunt also. When the member for Stuart spoke to me about this, it made me consider that as an instance of where it would be a tragedy if that level of commitment was not given due consideration.

In standing before the house to support the motion, I do recognise that it is based on the fact that the Legislative Review Committee will determine and consider the implications and report back to the parliament on what the options should be that we, who are here and elected to govern on behalf of the people, have to consider. I think the motion is an appropriate one, and I do hope that members of this house will support it, because it is part of Australian society moving forward. I commend the member for Stuart in bringing the motion to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NOARLUNGA AMBULANCE STATION

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (12:21): I move:

That the 513th report of the committee, entitled Noarlunga Ambulance Station, be noted.

The SA Ambulance Service is proposing a new regional ambulance station at Noarlunga to support the delivery of their new model of care. The current infrastructure at Flaxmill Road Morphett Vale is outdated and unable to be redeveloped to meet the current and future needs of this important service. The new model of care sees vehicles predominantly on the road at more times both day and night, with paramedics and specialist paramedics providing emergency treatment in people's homes prior to transport to an appropriate hospital. In some cases, transport to hospital is not necessary, as

specialist paramedics can treat patients at their home. It is estimated that 70,000 patients a year are treated this way and avoid going to an emergency department.

In order to support this treatment model, a different infrastructure model is required, namely a hub and spoke model. The model establishes a regional hub station, as is the one proposed for Noarlunga Ambulance Station, that supports smaller spoke stations in the region. The approach will achieve efficiencies that allow for services to be provided that otherwise could not be delivered at each individual station. These services include regional training facilities and the ability to employ specific staff to clean and restock vehicles whilst the crew themselves have their break and de-stress time, particularly after responding to major incidents such as cardiac arrest.

The Noarlunga Ambulance Station hub is designed to accommodate the projected growth in demand over the next 10 years. It will include a purpose-built ambulance station with capacity for 10 vans and four emergency response cars, with the ability to be expanded further in the future if required. Ambulance crew amenities include rest facilities, kitchens and meal areas, locker room, showering facilities, sleeping quarters for staff rostered on night duty, and a secure courtyard. There will be a dedicated training room to be used by all staff in the region, and it will have office facilities, including hot-desks and a secure car park for staff and visitors.

The proposed works for this station are due to commence this year in July 2015. As this is a greenfield development, it is anticipated to be a quick build, with construction to be completed by the end of June 2016. The cost of the project is \$4.571 million exclusive of GST.

It is a project that will provide necessary services for the southern suburbs. I thank the committee members in their bipartisan commitment in support of this project. Finally, given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:25): I commend the 513th report of the Public Works Committee and I would like to acknowledge the important work and the hardworking committee that attends to the public works needs and what it undertakes.

SA Health referred the Noarlunga Ambulance Station to the committee under requirements of the Parliamentary Committees Act, and SA Ambulance has been transitioning to a new model of service delivery known as the hub and spoke model.

The cost of the new facility on the greenfields site at Noarlunga is \$4.571million, with construction to be completed by June 2016. It is important to note that the current facility that the SA Ambulance Service works within is in need of redevelopment and the facility no longer meets its requirements.

The new state-of-the art facility will become an ambulance hub for the southern metropolitan region and will include a purpose-built ambulance station including regional office space, ambulance crew, amenity, rest facilities, training rooms, undercover ambulance facilities, vehicle parking and a secure parking area for staff and visitors.

We heard evidence from a number of witnesses, and concerns were raised around the size of the proposed new station with the increased demand on ambulances. I note that there is land available to expand the station, but we are not building the station to meet the full requirements from day one so that was a concern. Increased transport time for patients with the downscaling of the Noarlunga emergency department was another concern raised by witnesses.

The minister has announced that the state government will not shut the emergency department at the Noarlunga Hospital but it remains unknown as to whether this will remain in its current format. After listening to witnesses it was clear this new ambulance station is much needed, therefore, I commend the report to the house.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:27): I commend the motion and the report from the Public Works Committee and thank the member for Elder for bringing it to this house. I would also like to lend my support to the construction of the Noarlunga Ambulance Station which is going to be a very important development in the southern suburbs.

As members may know, at the moment we have an ambulance station in conjunction with St John at Morphett Vale, which I think holds four or six ambulances. Then there is quite a large gap down to McLaren Vale where there are a couple of ambulances, and then down to Aldinga where there are a couple. In between that we have a large number of houses that have been built in recent years and more and more are being built all the time.

One of our election commitments was to construct this larger ambulance station at Noarlunga replacing the old set-up at Morphett Vale, and to also create a smaller station at Seaford to serve that local area as well. Today we are seeing the first step of that in the construction of the Noarlunga Ambulance Station going ahead, and I understand that the Seaford Ambulance Station is not too far away but SA Ambulance staff are busy trying to locate a good site for that. If SA Ambulance staff are listening to the recordings of this transcript, then I encourage them to be very speedy in their search for that site because that is very much needed as well.

As members have discussed, the site at Noarlunga will be much bigger to enable more ambulances to be placed there, but also greater facilities for training in the southern suburbs. The set-up of the new site, which I was privileged enough to see the plans of with the member for Reynell, the Premier and the Treasurer when the community cabinet was in Christies Beach in the southern suburbs, actually enables ambulances to flow properly right the way through the station, as opposed to the current set-up where a large amount of reversing and parallel parking is required by ambulance drivers and paramedics, which is obviously not ideal in an emergency set-up.

This is a much more modern layout for an ambulance station adopting best practice, and also it has the capacity to further expand as is required. It is also located right next to the Noarlunga Beach Road entry and exit to the Southern Expressway which will enable very quick access around the southern suburbs on our newly duplicated Southern Expressway, so it is a fantastic project and has my full support. I know that the government as well as the member for Reynell are looking at options to try and relocate the St John service which is currently at Morphett Vale to another site as well. I am looking forward to seeing this project come to fruition.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:30): Thank you very much to the member for Elder for bringing this report to our attention. As the member for Kaurna spoke about, early in 2014, the then candidate for Kaurna, now member for Kaurna, together with myself and the Minister for Health, Jack Snelling, had the opportunity to go and talk in detail with ambulance officers at the current site at Flaxmill Road in Morphett Vale in the electorate of Reynell about the needs for the future.

We had a very robust conversation with those staff members. We and certainly myself have also had robust conversations over time with the very dedicated and generous volunteers of St John Ambulance who operate out of that Morphett Vale site. It pleases me greatly that, following those conversations, we have listened to those workers and listened to the southern community about the type of ambulance station that we need to service the south into the future.

I am very glad that we are going ahead with those proposals. As the member for Kaurna mentioned, we had the benefit of looking at the plans for the proposed new station when community cabinet was held at the beautiful Christies Beach Surf Life Saving Club in the heart of Reynell just a couple of months ago. Again, I am very pleased to see that we have fulfilled this commitment. I think it is absolutely going ahead in the right way. It is going ahead in the right location, and it really will make a difference to the southern community. So, again, thank you very much to the member for Elder for bringing the report to our attention.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (12:32): I also would like to commend the motion and the report from the committee, and thank the member for Elder for bringing this very important piece of information to the house. As a young child, I clambered through the grapevines and the paddocks that were once land opposite my home—only 500 metres, actually, from my home—where they then built the much celebrated Morphett Vale ambulance centre.

I have fantastic memories of growing up as a teenager and being a member of the Noarlunga cadet brigade. I participated in first aid competitions statewide as a member of that very friendly service and I have got wonderful memories of that, so thank you very much.

Being a St John cadet actually sparked my hunger to serve and advocate for the community. I cannot stress enough how important it is to have the right environment to be able to educate and pass on this sort of knowledge to the next generation whilst also serving your community, so it is very important that this piece of work is going ahead.

It started a lifetime of volunteering for me, and I am not alone in that—that is not special. There are many volunteers in all areas of South Australia who started their volunteering as a youngster in the St John Ambulance brigade. I saw the transition of St John Ambulance to paid workers, now known as SA Ambulance Service, and have seen the professional nature in which those services are now able to be delivered through that format which is now also recognised as part of the university training curriculum.

We see daily the fallout from shiftworker stress, so I also thank the committee for their recommendations and the government for the planning around making this facility much more comfortable and amenable for shiftworkers who are there for very long periods of time overnight and on weekends.

Following my period of time with the St John Ambulance cadets, I then became a registered nurse. Over time, my appetite for that emergency service continued. I participated as a retrieval nurse out of the Flinders Medical Centre intensive care ward and got to know very closely many of the ambulance workers from the Noarlunga brigade based at Morphett Vale. I know how happy they will be to see an additional service down south. When you work in that environment as an emergency services worker, you become very connected and very attached to the stress of taking some time to get to a patient, so I know that it will be appreciated by them as well.

In summary, I just want to say thank you to the committee and to the government for its vision and this opportunity of Transforming Health to roll out such a great improvement in emergency services to the south of Adelaide.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (12:35): I would like to thank the member for Chaffey, my fellow member on the Public Works Committee, for speaking. I also thank the local members from Kurna, Reynell and Fisher for speaking on this very important piece of public works. I think we would all agree that this goes towards a very progressive model in the ambulance service.

I thank all those involved with the Public Works Committee for their committed hard work. In particular, I would like to thank the witnesses from this project and the SA Ambulance Service for their passion, commitment and also innovative progress in their approach in serving the people of South Australia.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION: WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (SACFS FIREFIGHTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (12:36): I move:

That the 19th report of the committee, entitled Report into the Referral of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (SACFS Firefighters) Amendment Bill, be noted.

This report is in response to the referral from the house on 16 October 2014. When the question was put that the bill be read a second time, the member for Newland moved an amendment to the question as follows:

That all words after 'be' be left out and the words 'withdrawn and referred to the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation for its report and recommendation' be inserted in lieu thereof.

Our committee obviously took this referral very seriously, hence my report today on behalf of the committee. The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (SACFS Firefighters) Amendment Bill was introduced by the Hon. Tammy Franks on 7 May 2014 to provide volunteer firefighters with the same presumptive protection for 12 specified cancers as are already available to career firefighters without the need for them to prove which carcinogen, toxin or hazard of the fire scene they had been exposed to during their volunteer firefighting career.

A CFS volunteer firefighter's cancer is taken to have been caused because of their lifelong commitment to firefighting and the relation to the work itself. I should mention that the member for Morphett also had a very similar bill that he was pursuing on this issue, and I commend him for his work in this area as well. Our committee worked diligently to undertake its responsibilities in this matter in order to bring back a thorough and timely report.

Firefighters are usually the first responders in the event of a fire or other emergency situations and, while many of us run away from danger, these brave, highly-respected men and women run towards it. The most recent bushfire at Sampson Flat, which was one of the worst in the state's history, and its devastating effects are still being felt by many in the local community, including volunteer firefighters.

It is a sad reality that while protecting the community from fire, chemical spills and other emergencies, firefighters put their own lives and safety at risk. We hear news and reports about injuries and fatalities arising from the work performed by firefighters, but we do not hear a lot about the long-term health risks such as cancer.

Following a Senate inquiry in 2011, the commonwealth government introduced legislation to provide presumptive protection for career firefighters who contracted any one of the 12 specified cancers. While career firefighters in the commonwealth jurisdiction no longer have to prove that a specified cancer arose from their employment, the same protection was not provided for volunteer firefighters.

The Senate inquiry found that, while there was sufficient evidence to provide presumptive protection for career firefighters, there was insufficient evidence to provide the same protection for volunteer firefighters. This was influential in the decision by the Deputy Premier when he introduced the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (SAMFS Firefighters) Amendment Bill 2013 into parliament in June 2013 to provide presumptive protection for South Australian career firefighters only.

It is now internationally recognised that both volunteer and career firefighters are exposed to the same cancer risks. International research has demonstrated very clear links between the work that firefighters perform and a certain specified cancer. When I say, Deputy Speaker, that the risks are the same, there is also some evidence, certainly from the career firefighters and the volunteer firefighters that I know, that they do also attend different sorts of fires in some instances, but I do not think that takes away from the point that there is a risk there.

Firefighters are at greater risk than the rest of the community in contracting 12 specific cancers, including brain cancer, bladder cancer, kidney cancer and leukaemia, just to name a few. Many countries, including Canada, provide the same presumptive protection for volunteer firefighters as for career firefighters. In 2013, Tasmania became the first Australian state to enact presumptive legislation for the benefit of its 300 career firefighters and 5,000 volunteers. Western Australia, which has had presumptive protection in place for career firefighters since 2013, extended protection to volunteer firefighters in 2014. But some other states continue to debate this issue.

In recognition of the increasing awareness of cancer risks to both career and volunteer firefighters, last year the Deputy Premier, together with the Minister for Emergency Services, announced that SACFS active volunteer firefighters will be provided with automatic compensation if they are diagnosed with one of the 12 specified cancers. Therefore, the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (SACFS) Amendment Bill has been superseded since this announcement, which resulted in changes to section 31 of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 and schedule 3 of the Return to Work Act 2014.

While inquiring into this matter, the committee found that the Australian Fire and Emergency Services Authorities Council, which represents both career and volunteer firefighter agencies in Australia and New Zealand, had commissioned Monash University to undertake a health study on Australian firefighters. The research was led by an occupational hygienist, Associate Professor Deborah Glass, who released the final report in December 2014. The research found that firefighters are a healthier cohort than the general population, but their length of service as firefighters can increase their risk of contracting several types of cancer. However, the risk estimates reported are

uncertain and should be interpreted cautiously. Professor Glass recommended a follow-up in five years.

I do wish to extend my sincere thanks to the members of their committee. Many of us found this inquiry very important, and we, as I said, tried to be timely in our response. I would also like to acknowledge the commitment that everyone on the committee had to this task.

The newish member for Schubert replaced the former member for Schubert on our committee—an excellent representative. The member for Reynell, who did a sterling job, was replaced by the probably even newer member for Fisher, due to the member for Reynell becoming a parliamentary secretary. We were very pleased for the member for Reynell in attaining that position, but we were sad to lose her from the committee. However, we welcome the member for Fisher. The other members are the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. John Dawkins and the Hon. John Darley. I thank them all for their terrific work and I also thank our committee's Executive Officer, Ms Sue Sedivy. I commend the report to the house.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:45): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I have been working on the speed at which I can rise to my feet. It seems to be a skill in this place, from time to time—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Only if you want to be noticed.

Mr KNOLL: —especially in trying to observe the traditions of this house and pay proper respect to the Chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr KNOLL: I rise to speak to this report. This has been quite an interesting process. The private member's bill that the member for Morphett brought to this place was referred to the committee by the member for Newland. We also had a bill introduced by the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place to look at and, obviously, the two pieces of legislation are quite similar. In the meantime, the return-to-work bills were put through parliament and, lo and behold, a provision for presumptive cancer compensation for volunteer firefighters was inserted. That is how the report came about.

If I can take a step back before that, this has obviously been an issue in the public area for a number of years. It was certainly a key issue at the 2014 election and it was a huge issue for my electorate. I have a very strong CFS presence in my electorate. We are part of region 2 and we have brigades in my now hometown of Angaston, Nuriootpa, Freeling, Kalbeeba, Williamstown, Mannum (where there is quite a large brigade; I was talking to the brigade captain there the other day) and Kersbrook. The Kersbrook CFS brigade held a very successful fundraiser a couple of weeks ago. There would have had to have been about 1,500 people there bidding on 400 live auction items and about 200 silent auction items that the community had gathered as a separate incorporated association, which is helping to raise funds for the Kersbrook CFS.

This issue is one of equity and common sense and, certainly, the committee discussed it in that light. It is one of these frustrating things in politics, where we take opposing sides and dig in almost out of spite rather than anything else. It is an issue we fought very strongly in favour of at the 2014 election and one that the government would not canvass. It has built up a lot of angst and it broke down a lot of goodwill that exists within our, I think, about 10,000 or 11,000 CFS volunteers across the state. For them, it was probably more about the fact that they were not being recognised for their volunteer efforts rather than the compensation itself.

I have an MFS brigade in Tanunda with firefighters who are on call, as opposed to having a standing firefighting unit, and when I talk to my CFS volunteers, they are at pains to remind me that they are almost always the first responders. They are the ones who get there quickest. They are the ones who deal with a broader range of issues, and they do it all for the love of it. They do feel they have been let down by the government.

Certainly, the government saw sense in the end and quietly put something in the return-to-work bills which was great, and we must commend the government, but why it took years for them to come to that decision remains a mystery to me, because the scars are still there, especially as we roll on now to the emergency services sector reform where, again, we see changes to the CFS. There is a lot of angst in the community about those changes. My electorate is covered by region 2

with the exception of Mannum and those surrounding brigades, which are part of a separate region, and the brigades in region 2 are extremely anxious about these reforms. There is a lot of entrenched negativity about the reforms, and I wonder how much of that is because there now appears to be a series of points where the government is seen to be attacking the Country Fire Service. They would not stand up for a long time on cancer compensation. Now there are a lot of question marks about these reforms and about to what extent this is an MFS takeover, and people are very keen to keep the independence of the CFS.

Now we see reported in the paper over the weekend that the minister is bringing a defamation action. Certainly, the way I read the newspaper article was that they are looking not only to target the newspapers but the CFS volunteers who dared speak up. I find it very difficult to understand that a government that seeks to reform a sector, and engender goodwill in a sector, has gone about this in, I think, the worst possible way. Agreeing to cancer compensation up-front would have taken away what was a very negative election issue for them, being up-front and honest about what the emergency sector reform really is.

I still do not understand what it really is going to do. I have read everything that I can about it. I have read the report that was handed down last year. I have certainly been through the facts and figures, the fact sheet that the minister put out a couple of months ago that was reported in all the local press. He did definitely get a fair hearing in my electorate on it. Now we have this issue where a defamation action is being brought against a newspaper and implies that CFS volunteers may or may not become part of the action somewhere down the track.

It speaks of a government that really is going about reform the wrong way, especially when we look at the fact that the government cannot afford to replace these CFS volunteers. It cannot afford to replace these CFS volunteers. It speaks volumes and, I think, talks about a greater disconnect between rural South Australia and this Labor government.

Can I say of my committee members that it was a fantastic robust discussion where we got down to the nitty-gritty of what the Monash University research did or did not say and what links that research did or did not make. It was all done in the right spirit, and at least around that table there is a level of bipartisanship on this issue that I think was quite warming.

To close, what I see happens in our committee work is that all of us come from our entrenched positions and discuss common purpose and common ground, and we can come to sensible decisions. I wish beyond wishing that there were more opportunities for us to do that and that indeed, if we are going to tackle change and reform in our communities instead of retreating into entrenched corners and perspectives, we come together to find a better way to improve this beautiful state in which we live.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:52): I rise to speak to the 19th report of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation, entitled Report into the Referral of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (SACFS Firefighters) Amendment Bill. I certainly concur with everything that the member for Schubert has stated. It does beggar belief that volunteers are being used as political pawns in a process by the government as to whether or not they would get compensation. This debate has been going on for the last couple of years. It all started from the Metropolitan Fire Service volunteers being able to get compensation for 12 particular cancers in regard to firefighting efforts.

In many fires across the state, MFS and CFS fight side by side. As the member for Schubert indicated, he has MFS brigades in his district. So have I in my district in Murray Bridge, and in many situations they are side by side. At a recent sawmill fire, I think it was only last week, they were side by side putting out that fire. It just seemed to be a debate we did not need to have, where basically the government was devaluing the close on 13,000 CFS volunteers—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, close on 13,000; it is heading that way—for the work they do across the state. I certainly state my interest as a CFS volunteer for my local brigade at Coomandook.

As I said, it is something that should never have happened because of those man hours our CFS men and women put in, whether they are on the front line or manning the control centres, in

regard to the work they do for this state in saving people's homes—and I have seen many effects of it recently in my electorate. Rockleigh has had four recent fires in the last few years, and they were fortunate that in the last huge blaze that happened only one house was lost. One house is too many, but it was amazing to note, when I toured the area afterwards, that that fire had burnt up to so many homes but that the CFS was in place to save those homes.

The CFS volunteers certainly do deserve the same level of compensation, and I note that they have that now. But they have been put on the merry-go-round by this government again with the emergency services levy debate. I know that in the member for Flinders' area his people are still having discussions, and some have made it very clear that some of their brigades will not fight fires on government land; certainly they will if there are lives at risk.

When the debate gets down to that level, it shows how much the real people of this state are hurting under different government proposals and announcements. I think that ministers need to get out into the real world and talk to these people more. In saying that, we have heard from the Minister for Emergency Services that he has consulted heavily on his emergency services reform, but we note that that is getting peeled back layer by layer as time goes on. He made an announcement the other day that that will be peeled back further.

I wonder why all the volunteer sectors, and the Metropolitan Fire Service sector for that matter, are being put through these reforms. I think that it is more about the minister saving his skin and saying to the Premier, 'Well, this is why I am a minister: I've created this reform.' We have seen through all the recent fires and even going further back, through SAFECOM, and if we look at Sampson Flat, a whole range of fires that have happened—down at Tantanoola, for instance—the latest two big ones, all of the sectors work together well. They get on with the job and they do the job. To see a minister meddling in something that I do not believe should be meddled with I think is just wrong.

In closing, I reiterate what the member for Schubert mentioned about potential legal action against *The Advertiser* by the Minister for Emergency Services and, in particular, potentially CFS volunteers who the minister was hoping *The Advertiser* would name. Well, certainly *The Advertiser* will not name them. I think it is an absolute disgrace that a minister wants to go down that path.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (12:58): I thank members for their contribution to this longstanding issue. The member for Schubert's view that this is a matter of equity is my view as well. I think that most of the members in this house are particularly pleased that volunteer CFS people will be recognised, sadly, in a very difficult area of presumptive cancer. In saying that, I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

Motions

SPEED DETECTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Wingard:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report upon—

- (a) the operation of speed cameras and speed detection devices in South Australia;
- (b) the relationship between the location of speed cameras and the incidence of road accidents;
- (c) the impact of constantly changing speed limits and the effectiveness of speed limit signage;
- (d) the effectiveness and appropriateness of current penalties for speeding offences, including a review of fines imposed;
- (e) the operation of the Community Road Safety Fund; and
- (f) any related matters.

(Continued from 25 February 2015.)

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Bright.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (12:59): Deputy Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to presumably very briefly talk on this motion. The motion which is before the house is:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report upon—

- (a) the operation of speed cameras and speed detection devices in South Australia;
- (b) the relationship between the location of speed cameras and the incidence of road accidents;
- (c) the impact of constantly changing speed limits and the effectiveness of speed limit signage;
- (d) the effectiveness and appropriateness of current penalties for speeding offences, including a review of fines imposed;
- (e) the operation of the Community Road Safety Fund; and
- (f) any related matters.

This is obviously an ongoing and very contentious issue in the community, the need to strike that effective balance between road safety and discouraging people from speeding and breaking the connection with revenue raising.

Revenue raising is something that is often mentioned to me out in the community. When people think of speed cameras, unfortunately, because of the current policy settings in place, they immediately connect that with revenue raising and believe that the government's current approach to speed cameras is not necessarily positioned around the safety on our roads but instead is connected with revenue raising for the government's coffers, and that is exceptionally unfortunate; it is not a place we want to be. I seek leave to continue my remarks at a point further on.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:00.

Petitions

COBDOGLA IRRIGATION AND STEAM MUSEUM

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey): Presented a petition signed by 5,732 residents of Cobdogla and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to ensure SA Water continues to own and support the Cobdogla Irrigation and Steam Museum and allocate funds to facilitate the ongoing operation of the Humphrey pump and museum to enable current and future generations to appreciate the state's water heritage.

Ministerial Statement

PLANNING REFORM

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Today, I released the state government's response to the final report of the Expert Panel on Planning Reform. Our planning system in its current form is not sufficiently responsive, ties development up in red tape and does not reflect the expectations of our community. In February 2013, the government appointed an expert panel, chaired by Mr Brian Hayes QC, to review our planning system and explore ideas for the future of planning in our state. Since that time, the expert panel has produced three reports, informed by the contributions of over 2,500 South Australian individuals and organisations.

The final report of the Expert Panel on Planning Reform, 'The planning system we want', was delivered to the government on 12 December 2014. This final report contains 22 recommendations on how to make the planning system better. The government considered the report by asking: how will this benefit the state, its people and our economy? The government's response to the report includes a summary of our views on each of the recommendations and outlines a framework for implementing them in whole or in part and, in some cases, plans for further investigation. Some key recommendations include:

1. The consolidation and clarification of up to 23,000 pages of planning rules across 500 residential zones and some 2,500 combinations of zones, overlays and spatial layers.
2. Consolidating statutes concerning planning or which impact upon planning issues.
3. The creation of a charter of citizen participation, which will provide a framework (that can be tailored to the needs of each respective community) for proper community consultation with planning policies and directions at the outset to ensure we get agreed planning outcomes in respect of each community.

I also intend to introduce legislation that will replace both the Development Act 1993 and the Urban Renewal Act of 1995 and also incorporate relevant components of our transport and infrastructure laws. Drafting of the new legislation will commence immediately, and I anticipate that a bill for consultation will be introduced around the middle of this year. I have consulted and will continue to consult with the Local Government Association and industry groups as the legislation is developed.

While this work will be done as quickly as possible, some of these recommendations need further consideration before they can be implemented. Ideally, I would like to see if all of these reforms could be implemented over the next three to five years. An improved planning system will play a pivotal role in unlocking economic opportunities for our state. It is estimated that every million dollars invested in construction in South Australia generates \$2.9 million and 37 jobs in the economy as a whole.

I would like to formally recognise the effort undertaken by the expert panel and contributors and thank them all for their work. The expert panel's package of recommendations is comprehensive and wide ranging. We applaud them for their dedication to the task and their willingness to explore new and sometimes radical ideas.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Forests (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

South Australian Forestry Corporation, Direction pursuant to the Public Corporations Act 1993

Ministerial Statement

FORESTRYSA

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:05): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The Mid North forestry plantations were devastated by fires in 2013 and 2014 which have resulted in a reduction in the plantation of more than 80 per cent. The government is aware of the significance the plantations have to the local community and South Australians, as they provide a source of jobs, tourism, sporting grounds, as well as environmental appeal. In winter 2014, ForestrySA, which manages the Mid North forests, undertook a small replant of 60 hectares of the Bundaleer forest.

This week, I have issued a direction to ForestrySA to undertake a further replant of approximately 150 hectares of radiata pine trees in the Bundaleer forest during this autumn and winter. ForestrySA understands the importance of the replant and supports the move. However, as the decision involves matters of public policy, where community interests as well as commercial principles have to be applied, ForestrySA has requested a direction to be issued.

ForestrySA will allocate the resources to the replant from within its existing operational budget. It is expected the replant will occur in the coming months during favourable conditions. The replant is vitally important, given the consultation being undertaken by the government in regard to the future of the Mid North forestry areas which will not be completed until the end of 2015. Until the government has made a decision about the future of the Mid North forests, it is not appropriate to replant on a larger scale.

The Mid North Forests—Future Strategy, which is being led by the government, will determine what the best options for the Mid North forests are from an economic, business, social, recreational, environmental and financial perspective. I am advised that at the current rate of supply, we have about five years of logs remaining. Trees planted this year will not start to produce commercial-size logs for a least 22 years. Planting larger areas will not change that time frame, which is why a range of options for the future management of the forests must be considered.

A report commissioned by ForestrySA a year ago, Strategic Directions for the Mid North Pine Plantation Estate, prepared by Mr Doug Parsonson, found there was no future for pine plantations in the Mid North. The region needs a diversified economy, not one that has a dependency upon forestry, and it is important that all locals have a say on the matter. The future may involve private ownership of the forests, which have been in government hands since the 1870s.

The government is committed to ensuring the region is best placed to enable growth, jobs and prosperity in the local area, given the situation it has faced in recent years. I would like to thank Mr Greg Boston, chair of the Northern Forest Community Initiative Group which has facilitated recent public workshops attended by around 350 people in Jamestown and Wirrabara. I should also put on the record my thanks to the member for Stuart and the member for Frome. As good, hardworking local members, they have been involved in the process along the way, and we still have plenty of work to do in the next six to nine months as well.

There are still a lot of discussions to be had. By not replanting any new trees this year we would have made those discussions worthless. This move does not guarantee there will be a future for the forestry industry for the Mid North. We do not want to give people false hope, but we do want to give them every chance of success if the decision made at the end of the year is for some form of forestry to continue.

FRASER, HON. J.M.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:09): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made by the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:09): I bring up the fifth report of the committee, concerning subordinate legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Minister for Health. How much of the \$6.4 million allocated to the Transforming Health project in the December 2014 Mid-Year Budget Review has been spent so far?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10): I'm happy to get it and report back to the house.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Supplementary: when doing so, will the Minister for Health also identify if there has been a need to increase this amount (whatever it is) to cover the additional costs incurred in this financial year.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10): I'm happy to get a report back to the house but from recollection there has been no additional funding allocated to the project.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is also to the Minister for Health. How much of the \$6.4 million has been spent on paid advertising and promotional materials?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10): Likewise, I'm happy to get a report back to the house but let me just make one thing clear: we will spare no expense when making sure that South Australians are properly informed about Transforming Health and what it is trying to achieve to combat the lies that are being put out by certain sections of the community about what is proposed.

We have had senior Liberal figures, such as Christopher Pyne, saying blatantly falsely that the Modbury Hospital is slated for closure; something that is completely untrue. So we will spare no expense making sure that South Australians are properly informed about these things. Quite frankly, to spread that sort of misinformation is not only an act of bastardry but it is also dangerous—frankly dangerous—to tell communities that a hospital that is not slated for closure is slated for closure, because people will not know that it is there when they need it.

I make no apologies for making sure that South Australians are properly informed about what these proposals are and what the government is attempting to achieve by them so that they know what the services are that are going to be in their local community. To be quite frank, we have to do this because there are certain people without any principles, without any pretence when it comes to telling the truth, who will make up anything to score a few cheap political points.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Adelaide, Unley and Hammond.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): I have a supplementary question, if I may, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: I'm on such good behaviour today.

The SPEAKER: Yes—so far.

Ms CHAPMAN: My supplementary is: while you're inquiring into and reporting on how much was spent on advertising and promotion, will you also bring back to the house how much was budgeted for advertising and promotion at the time of the Mid-Year Budget Review?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:13): I'm happy to have a look at that. I'm not sure at MYBR time we had actually worked that out but, if we had, I'm happy to have a look and inform the house.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): I have another supplementary. Does this budget include any money spent on opinion polling?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:13): No, not that I'm aware of but I will double-check and come back to the house if that is incorrect.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): Finally, on a supplementary: how much is budgeted for advertising and promotional material in order to sell the reforms beyond the final decision being made by cabinet?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:13): I dispute the premise of the question, which is that somehow this is selling something. What we are attempting to do is to make sure that South Australians have proper information. As I say, we make no apology for making sure and taking every effort we possibly can to make sure that South Australians have the proper information in front of them so that they know with regard to their local hospitals what services are offered, what new services are proposed, if services are shifting how they are going to be shifted, and how they are going to access the health services they need.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I'm happy to. I will have a look and be happy to.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:14): My question is to the Minister for Defence Industries. How is the state government responding to recent developments concerning the federal government's shipbuilding strategies?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:14): I thank the member for Taylor for her question because there have been some very important developments recently on this subject. First of all, *Four Corners* ran a very informative program some weeks ago during which it was revealed that in October the federal government—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —was within a whisker of announcing that—

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

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —our submarines would be built in Japan and that—

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned a first time.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —a media release had been prepared and that the decision was virtually a done deal until wiser heads caused a delay resulting in what is now a competitive evaluation process, thankfully.

But the second development is that the Royal United Services Institute has this morning in Adelaide begun a submarine conference. It was well attended with about 200 people there this morning and all of the key opinion leaders, including the federal Minister for Defence, Kevin Andrews; the opposition leader, Bill Shorten; the opposition defence spokesperson, Stephen Conroy; David Feeney, his deputy; and a host of other dignitaries and senior defence leaders.

There were some remarkable developments. First of all, the defence minister has formed a new consultative group to bring together DMO, industry, and the federal and state governments. The state government welcomes that and we commend the defence minister for doing that. He has also outlined further details of his competitive evaluation process which, regretfully, as emphasised in his

address this morning, reiterates that the federal government is determined to ensure that an overseas build and a hybrid build—that is, some of the submarines built overseas and some built in Australia—along with an Australian build, are all considered as part of the response.

He repeated that the response would be limited to France, Germany and Japan. The state government believes, and I think the majority of the audience this morning believed also, that the federal government is on the wrong track. It is on the wrong track, and what absolutely changed things this morning was that the federal opposition leader set out the alternative government's view, and the alternative government's view—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: They don't like it, Mr Speaker. They don't like it because the alternative government's view is to propose a 12 to 18-month process involving a request for a proposal, followed by a request for tender. They want to include Sweden in the four choices available. They want to have a two-phase process funded by the commonwealth based on three fundamental principles: a guarantee of submarine performance, Australian ownership of intellectual property and, most importantly, that the next generation of submarines will be built, maintained and sustained in Australia—and they are on the right track.

The federal opposition have offered the government a bipartisan way out of this mess and they have said that if the federal government will agree with the alternative government's view, it will grace through the parliament and they will see it done. There is an opportunity now to get this right on the basis that we are going to build this in Australia so that we can have the discussion about how we do it, not whether we will do it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I notice Senator Sean Edwards has got the courage to stand up and so has Senator Dave Fawcett. I even see in the paper this morning that a senior former ex-Liberal minister, McLachlan, also stood up, which just shows that you can stand up and show some moral fibre on this and stand up for what you know is right instead of taking orders from others. What the government will do is everything it can to ensure that a bipartisan outcome is achieved. It was great to see an opposition putting out an alternative policy instead of just—

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. I call to order the members for Stuart, Chaffey, Mount Gambier, Davenport, Flinders, Heysen, deputy leader and Treasurer. I warn a first time the members for Adelaide, Chaffey, Hammond and Mount Gambier. I warn a second and final time the members for Schubert, Hammond, Mount Gambier and Chaffey.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: That's right, I loaded up the charge sheet. Deputy leader.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Health. How much has been paid to McKinsey & Company to date in respect of the Transforming Health consultation, and what is the projected spend?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:19): Likewise, I am happy to get back to the house with a report, but let's keep one thing in mind: health is a \$5 billion a year business in South Australia. McKinsey are the leading experts from around the world in health reform. They have successfully carried out health reform projects to the United States and the United Kingdom, just to name a couple of examples.

They are the source of the best advice in the world about getting your patient flows, about integrating your health systems—all of these things which Transforming Health is attempting to do. So, the cost of McKinsey, given their stature around the world as the leading advisers when it comes to health systems, will be worth absolutely every dollar. Put against the fact that it is a \$5 billion a year business, and it is important that South Australians have confidence that they are getting value for money for every dollar of that \$5 billion, it will well and truly be money well spent.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): A supplementary, if I may: now that the report has been received and, I think, summarised in the material that has been presented to the parliament, does the minister agree to table a copy of this report prepared as the business case for this reform?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:21): All the information we are able to make public we have now made public. There is a summary of the business case which we have released to anyone who has asked for it and, as well, the significant document which I tabled in the house last week, coming to some 400 or 500 pages, I think, of information which provides people with the data upon which we have based the decisions we have made.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): A further supplementary: I appreciate that the summary is in the material that you have presented to the parliament, minister, but in respect of the report, if you say that you are not able to release any of the balance of the report, why is that? Is there a confidentiality clause or some reason?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:21): Look, there is an enormous amount of work. There would be thousands and thousands of working documents that have gone into producing this report—both SA Health documents and data. We have released everything that we are able to release and we intend to release. It's now there, but it's simply not practice to release the working documents that are produced both within the department and by our advisers as part of these reforms.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is called to order for commenting on the alleged comment.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Were you sneezing? Well, in that case, it sounded like comment to me but, obviously, I am in error. I will take your word for it that it was a sneeze. Deputy leader.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question again is to the Minister for Health. Why did SA Health organise only three community meetings and events during the consultation on the Transforming Health proposals paper but is now organising 11 community events to promote the government's decision?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:23): During the consultation phase, there was a combination of community events. I know that I went to a number of community events. In addition to that, the member for Fisher, the member for Reynell and the member for Kaurna asked me to speak to community forums which they hosted. There were of course the community forums held by SA Health, and there was of course the process whereby people put in submissions. I think we received about 2,500 submissions in the second part of the consultation process, but having said that, of course, as I have been quite clear, the consultation continues.

This is not simply a situation where decisions are now made and, therefore, we are going to cease the engagement, because the fact is that, now we have made these in-principle decisions, there is an enormous amount of detail that has to be gone through. I did take on board the fact that, I think, overwhelmingly, in the submissions that came in, the recurrent theme was, 'Look, we just don't know enough. We need more detail.'

The problem is that, until we have made the in-principle decisions to go ahead with certain reforms, it's very hard to work out the detail of those changes, so we need to get the horse before

the cart to enable us to work through that detail. We will be engaging with people as we go through that process so, again, of course we'd be having further community forums because we need to consult with people and continue the engagement process as we roll out these reforms.

HONG KONG KOALAS

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:24): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house on how koala diplomacy is helping to strengthen the relationship between South Australia and Hong Kong?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for her question. I know she has been a visitor to Ocean Park in her previous role as minister for multicultural and ethnic affairs. It may sound flippant to talk about koala diplomacy, but the Chinese love their koalas and it is a lovely way of reaching out to peoples on the other side of the world and, in doing so, draw attention to South Australia and make some wonderful connections.

I had the great pleasure of launching the new Adventures in Australia exhibit at Ocean Park, Hong Kong, featuring three koalas, a couple of wallabies and some laughing kookaburras, as they are called in China.

Mr Pengilly: I can provide a few more koalas if you want them.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes; I said there were more where they came from. In fact, I did get a question from the Hong Kong press about the fact that they were being brutally slaughtered in other states and I said, 'Not here. We treat them with kid gloves and are not engaged in culling,' even though there are some who would urge us on that course.

On this visit, I was joined on the delegation by South Australians including, most importantly, His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le, whose brainchild this event was. Four years ago he dreamt up this idea. It has taken quite a long time to bring it to fruition, but I must say that not a day has been lost. There has been an enormous amount of work done over that four-year period in dealing with quarantine, in creating the habitat, in growing a plantation of gum trees somewhere in mainland China and then acclimatising these koalas to the experience.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, that's true. We did wonder whether we should have invited the member for Bragg but instead we invited the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Tung Ngo from the other place, as well as representatives from the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. Ocean Park is one of the world's premier theme parks. To give you some idea of its visitation, seven million people come through the parks—

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, Mr Speaker: this is all detailed in the Premier's press release from the 23 March, entitled 'Cleland koalas discover a new home in Hong Kong'.

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Schubert please email it through to me?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will be giving some insights that can only be given to you now. Being fresh off the plane from Hong Kong this morning, there are things that have not yet hit the press and I am happy to—

An honourable member: Even though they're waiting outside for the latest detail.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. One of them is that it's a miracle I'm standing here at this moment. The other that I should let you in on is that Mr John Tsang, Financial Secretary of Hong Kong—effectively, the Treasurer of Hong Kong—has struck up a wonderful relationship with our Governor, which is obviously an incredibly mutually beneficial relationship for our state.

It is going to allow us to share opportunities for exchanging tourists, because they can just look but not touch the koalas in this sanctuary, but they will be able to cuddle the koalas if they come up to Cleland. That is a rare thing—to be able to go up to the top of the freeway, 20 minutes away from the city, and actually interact with animals in a way that can only be imagined in places like Hong Kong, a highly urbanised environment. This is a fantastic way in which we can reach out and make these relationships.

The other element of it that is very powerful is the fact that a young South Australian chef, Nigel Rich, a great young man—

Mr Knoll: '...Executive Chef from The Elbow Room...?'

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is one of his jobs, but what he has now done, more importantly, is to make sure that a number of fantastic South Australian wines are on the menu. I know that there are not too many theme parks that carry Grange Hermitage on their menu list.

An honourable member: By the glass?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I don't know whether it's by the glass: we were drinking it by the bottle. What it has done, though, is it has allowed people in Hong Kong to see what we have on offer. Essentially, what is being represented to people from mainland China—about 60 per cent of the people who come through Ocean Park are from mainland China—is the very best of Australia seen through the eyes of South Australia.

So when people think about Australia, they will be thinking about South Australia and they will have a fantastic brand of South Australia very much in their faces as they walk through this extraordinary exhibit. All credit to His Excellency and also the agencies who make this work.

The SPEAKER: I have considered the member for Schubert's point of order. The news release was issued by the Minister for Tourism, and I think the Premier's answer was sufficiently different not to offend the rule against readily available information.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister explain why Ambassador Exploration was originally granted petroleum exploration licence 570, when an internal departmental assessment, done just two weeks prior to the granting of the licence and received by the opposition under FOI, states:

Ambassador Exploration has provided no financial statements or evidence of any current financial resources with which it could meet its obligations if granted an exploration licence...On the basis of the applicant's stated financial position, there is no evidence that they have the proven capacity to undertake the obligations arising under the grant of a PEL.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before the minister answers, I welcome to parliament the former member for Price, Murray De Laine, who is in the gallery today. I also welcome students from the Adelaide Secondary School of English, who are guests of mine.

Question Time

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:31): I will ask the department, which had my delegated authority to issue those petroleum exploration licences, but I will inform the house that the PEL was offered in the Cooper Basin in 2010 by the government on the basis of a working program. I understand that the CO2010 acreage release opened in April of 2010 and the close of bidding was 10 March 2011. Eleven bids were received from six national and international explorers. Block C, which became PEL 570, attracted six bids.

All applicants were provided with details of the scoring system to ensure an open and fair process. The receipt and assessment of the bids is governed by strict policies and procedures. Ambassador's work program scored the highest of the six programs bid. Ambassador's five-year work program included eight exploration wells, 200 square kilometres of 3-D and 300 kilometres of 2-D seismic. Petroleum exploration licence 570 has the potential for accumulations of oil and gas in conventional reservoirs, I am advised, as well as gas in deep unconventional reservoirs.

In terms of technical capacity, Ambassador Exploration was represented by Mr Tino Guglielmo, who subsequently became a director of Ambassador Exploration. As I have previously told the house, he was appointed managing director of the company subsequently floated on the ASX.

An honourable member: He's a good man, Tino.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, he is a good man. Mr Guglielmo had many years' prior experience within the oil and gas sector, including 20 years at very senior levels with Santos and as managing director and CEO of Stuart Petroleum. Also, Mr John Davidson was the exploration adviser and had over 25 years' experience at very senior levels of industry, including Exxon.

In terms of the financial capability, the key personnel had to demonstrate their experience in raising capital in respect of the oil and gas sector at the time, when the share markets were relatively receptive to Armstrong petroleum capital raisings. On the specific freedom of information documents that the member is quoting from, I will speak to the bid team about their thinking at the time but, as I said, the authority to issue these exploration leases is delegated, as it should be under the act. I will get an answer for the house.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:34): Supplementary, sir: I accept the fact that the minister said he will check with his departmental staff but if, once he checks, he finds out that what I have just suggested is true, does he agree that 'one of the most important criteria for assessment of work programs, the adequacy of financial resources and technical expertise available to the applicant may not have been met'?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:35): No, I do not accept that. I accept the advice of the department, which is constantly ranked as one of the best regulators in the world. Mr Barry Goldstein, who heads up the petroleum division within the Department of State Development, is a world-renowned regulator who is held in the highest regard not only by the industry but I think also the government and, I thought, the parliament. I think, by and large, his reputation across the country is one that many people seek to replicate. Indeed, the most recent Hawke inquiry from the Northern Territory government referenced at length the South Australian regulatory approach to conventional and unconventional gas and marked us out as leaders. The architect of that act is Mr Barry Goldstein.

Ms Chapman: No-one's criticising him.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm not saying you are. They are the people who evaluate these bids, not the minister and not the government. They are the ones who have the delegated authority from the executive to do this work. I have the fullest confidence in Mr Goldstein and his team to conduct this work. I have full confidence in the way they that conduct themselves, in the bid process and in the integrity of the bid process. I ask, if anyone has any evidence that the bid process has been compromised, to provide it.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:36): My question is again to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. When, on three occasions approving variations to the work plan for petroleum exploration licence 570 for Ambassador Exploration, did the minister consider the work programs offered by the other original applicants for the licence before granting the variations?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:37): Going back to the original question—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: What's wrong with this one?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm going to answer this one, too. I have additional information.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If you're not interested in it, fine, I'll give it to you on notice. I'll take that question on notice and get a detailed answer for the member. Other than to say—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Which question?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The question you just asked now. I will get you some detailed responses to that. I will also say I think it is important that the shadow minister quote in its entirety the FOI that he used to ask his first question and perhaps that would better explain and make the house fully aware of what it is he is attempting to seek.

Mr Wingard: How do you know that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If the member for Mitchell claims to have some further information, perhaps he can get up and ask me a question as well.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just talking to himself, is he? Okay. It seems that selectively quoting from FOIs is okay. But I, again, stand by the integrity of the department, stand by the integrity of the bid team and stand by the integrity of the way this government has regulated the oil and gas sector and, if the members opposite have any evidence, I ask them to provide it.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:38): Supplementary sir, to the second question which the minister said that he would get an answer to and come back to the house with. My supplementary question is: when Ambassador repeatedly failed to meet its work programs, did the minister continue to believe that they were the best company to hold the exploration licence?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:38): Regarding the work program that resulted in year 1 of the program being pushed out to 2015, I suppose what the member is asking is: what is the benefit to the state of allowing delayed work programs?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm going to answer that. In 2013, in August, Ambassador succeeded in obtaining extensive US shale development experience by attracting Outback Energy Hunter to take up a 70 per cent interest in petroleum exploration licence 570. Outback Energy Hunter agreed to pay all costs, including funding Ambassador's remaining 30 per cent share associated with the exploration work.

We encourage foreign direct investment in this state. I note that the member for Mitchell was complaining about foreign direct investment, but I do not know why he would. He claims that nothing has happened, the member for Mitchell claims that nothing has happened. Outback Energy Hunter successfully secured the remaining 30 per cent share associated with the exploration work program to satisfy the first five-year term of PEL570 up to a maximum of \$50 million. This strategic farm in led to Outback Energy Hunter taking a 52 per cent interest in petroleum exploration licence 570 in February 2014.

Outback Energy Hunter's parent company, New Standard Energy, purchased producing and prospective acreage in both the Eagle Ford shale in onshore Texas from Magnum Hunter Resources and 52.5 per cent of petroleum exploration licence 570 in the state's Far North, funding the first \$42.5 million of the primary work program.

In terms of the current state of play for PEL570, based on market announcements New Standard Energy acquired Outback Energy Hunter's stake in PEL570, as announced on 10 December 2013, and on 29 October 2014 Ambassador was delisted following a compulsory acquisition by Drillsearch. On 29 October New Standard announced that it had completed its farm out of 35 per cent of petroleum exploration licence 570 to Santos. In return, Santos will meet 75 per cent of New Standard's expenditure commitment associated with New Standard's \$42.5 million farm in obligations to Drillsearch (formerly Ambassador Energy), of which \$300,000 has

been spent. Santos (35 per cent) will operate PEL570 with joint venture parties New Standard Energy (17.5 per cent) and Drillsearch (47.5 per cent).

A significant work program by very experienced companies in a joint venture operated by Santos is the result. That is a good result for the people of this state and that is a good result for the Cooper Basin, but I suppose good news in the oil and gas industry is not what the opposition is interested in.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:42): A second supplementary, sir: given all the information that the minister has just provided to the house with regard to the deals that have been done, has any actual exploration work been done on petroleum exploration licence 570 since the minister announced it was awarded to Ambassador on 11 April 2011?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:42): I think I just answered that.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Sir, I do not accept the minister's answer to the question. He has told us about the agreement to do work. I am asking about—

The SPEAKER: There is no obligation on ministers to answer questions as questioners would like them to.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:42): A third supplementary, sir, to the same minister: has the minister actually been approached by any of the other original unsuccessful tenderers throughout this whole process, saying that if they had been awarded this licence they would actually have undertaken exploration work?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:43): Anyone who is awarded a petroleum exploration licence is required to undertake work.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, the opposition fails to understand the tactics of the division of petroleum within State Development to attract international players to the Cooper Basin. The reality is that for us to grow our unconventional gas reservoirs, to convert our natural advantages into investment, we need to create an opportunity for international mergers and acquisitions, we need to create joint ventures, we need to have foreign direct investment here in South Australia—and the foreign direct investment we want is people who have experience in unlocking unconventional gas.

I know the opposition's view on exploration of unconventional gas is about stopping it, but we are about trying to encourage it. We want to see more exploration, we want to see more investment, we want to see more international companies, especially US shale companies, invested in South Australia. Why? They bring with them expertise. Why? They bring capital. Why? They bring prestige. Of course, what they also bring is knowledge, they bring markets. Of course, we know that this industry is one where deals are very, very important. Places like APPEA are a very good opportunity for deals to be done, but what we need is an international focus in this state.

The oil price is at record lows. We have seen South Australian companies' share prices halve. We have seen a lot of investment at risk. What we need to do is to create a regulatory environment that is bipartisan, to encourage as much as we can, to have as many international companies think that South Australia is a good destination to come and invest in. Unfortunately, I have to say that that bipartisan spirit which was once available is fast eroding, and I urge the opposition to regain that bipartisan spirit which they were offered when we were in opposition during the drafting—

Mr Bell: Bipartisan when you need it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is living on the edge.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir, he is. I urge members opposite to think about the consequences of their words and their language. These are words that can never be taken back. When the opposition talk about inquiries into unconventional gas, when they talk about—

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr KNOLL: The minister is not responsible to the house for the opposition.

The SPEAKER: The minister is comparing and contrasting policies. Unless he goads the opposition unmercifully and makes the opposition the principal target of his remarks, he may continue.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. A wise judgement, sir—very wise judgement. My view on the oil and gas industry is that it needs to be nurtured. It is a vulnerable industry—high risk, high reward. A lot of the wells that they drill come up dry. They spend a lot of money and a lot of time trying to unlock very valuable resources, and sometimes that is unsuccessful. I think what the industry looks for from government is an acknowledgement of the risk this industry takes.

I have to say that the questions that are being asked of the government bring into doubt the bipartisan spirit we once had about this industry, because members opposite know I play absolutely no role in the awarding of PELs. That is done independently of me, as it should be, because the opposition at the time—the then Labor opposition—and the then Olsen government agreed on a petroleum and geothermal act that had that very clause in there: the ability to delegate the option to have bids assessed by experts, not by the executive.

The SPEAKER: I warn the minister for ironical toadying. The member for Stuart.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:47): Final supplementary: can the minister advise the house whether any actual exploration work has been done on the other two petroleum exploration licences which were granted at the same time as PEL570?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:47): I will tell you what I will do: I will get a copy of all exploration licences that we have for the member. I think the opposition need to understand that a lot of companies bid for PELs and financial conditions change. Given that commodity prices are fluctuating now where we have the oil price dropping—and it probably has not hit its bottom mark—what do these questions say to potential investors in this state who are looking at taking out petroleum exploration leases? That the opposition will have very, very dim views about it. I have to say, I would have thought the Liberal Party would want to encourage risk and reward risk rather than be punitive in the way that they conduct themselves. So I would caution them of their tone and let them know that the investment community pays close attention to these types of questions.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:49): My question is again to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister explain why a strictly confidential internal departmental assessment was made and a draft letter approving a variation to Ambassador Exploration's work plan for PEL570 was sent to Ambassador's managing director before Ambassador had made an application for the variation? An email which was sent to Mr Barry Goldstein, who the minister referred to before, on 1 February 2013, one week before Ambassador lodged their application for variation to their work plan, says, and I quote:

When you came to me on Friday last week, in strict confidence I was asked to score the proposed work programme using the bid assessment score sheet with published criteria...

Staff member—and I will leave that person's name out—

was not available and you needed an answer that evening. The work programme was scored as per the standard methodology.

Can the minister explain why that work was done, assessing the application before the application is lodged?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:50): I will have to get a detailed answer from the department, but I can only assume it is in a bid to reduce red tape.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So, I don't know why that occurred, but I suspect that's probably what it is. I think the mocking from members opposite of our hardworking and diligent public officials, who administer our petroleum exploration licenses—

Mr Marshall: Do you support that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Do I support reducing red tape? Yes, I do.

Mr Marshall: No, you don't.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I note in the Leader of the Opposition's interjections that no, we don't. We do support reducing red tape, and we can do things to try to speed up the processes. If the Leader of the Opposition just says we've circumvented processes, I would ask him to provide evidence. Without having the details in front of me, I can only speculate. Let me give a hypothetical situation about another matter. Perhaps, for example, there is someone who's got a work program and is in constant contact with the regulator and, I don't know, financing is coming to a close and they need to drill a hole, and the application is all in order but the paperwork hasn't been filled out. Is the opposition really asking us to tell people to delay? Let's wait and have a look first at what the answer is before we assume that the Leader of the Opposition's privileged remarks here in the parliament turn out to be fact or fiction.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell and the leader are called to order. The deputy leader and the member for Heysen are warned a first time and the member for Adelaide and the deputy leader are warned a second and final time. The member for Schubert.

HOUSING SA TENANCIES

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. Can the minister outline, as per her answer yesterday, whether the policy review that she's initiated into tenants renting out rooms is in relation to how the department investigates potential breaches or is the review into potential deficiencies in Housing Trust tenancy agreements?

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) (14:53): I thank the member for Schubert for his question and welcome his interest in social housing. When I said there would be an investigation, that is taking place. What I indicated yesterday is that, when issues like this arise, I think it is important for us to contemporise any of our policies to make sure that they cover any incidents that may not have been covered previously.

HOUSING SA TENANCIES

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:53): Supplementary: I ask her really the same question. You're saying that it is about contemporising the way the department investigates these breaches or contemporising the tenancy agreement itself?

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) (14:53): It is contemporising the policy around tenants and their contracts.

HOUSING SA TENANCIES

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:54): My question is again to the Minister for Social Housing. In the minister's answers to questions yesterday, she stated, in relation to the safe disposal of rubbish

program, that providing individual bins would cost \$6,000 for Rosslyn Court. What is the specific cost of providing the bin enclosure that she referred to, any moneys paid to KESAB and the education component of the program?

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) (14:54): Once again, I welcome the member for Schubert's interest in bins and for Housing SA tenants. This issue was raised with us—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: —that there was an issue with illegal dumping in one of the Housing SA properties. Housing SA worked together with the Unley council, who raised this issue, and with KESAB to come up with a solution. One of the key issues we had was that there were not individual bins and outside people had access to those shared bins—as they were. We found a solution to this issue and we had a bin contain—we have bin contains and we have individual bins now and KESAB work with people about things to do with recycling.

HOUSING SA TENANCIES

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:55): I have a supplementary question. Whilst I appreciate the minister's answer and understand everything she said, I'm merely asking about the costs of providing that solution.

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) (14:55): I answered that question yesterday.

HOUSING SA TENANCIES

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:55): I have a supplementary question. Has the minister actually received advice on what the total program will cost?

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) (14:55): As I indicated yesterday, we looked, in conjunction with the council and KESAB, at the problem of illegal dumping, and a problem that was exacerbated because there were shared bins that outside people had access to. As I indicated yesterday, if this is a problem in other Housing SA tenancies, particularly in our unit areas, then we would seek a solution.

HOUSING SA TENANCIES

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:56): I have another supplementary question. Can the minister outline if there were any other costs incurred besides the \$6,000 that she is referencing in relation to this program?

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) (14:56): Not that I have been made aware of.

HOUSING SA TENANCIES

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:56): I have a final supplementary question. Can the minister provide information to the house about how much her department spends on professional cleaners in relation to Housing SA tenancies?

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) (14:56): Obviously we have a theme here. I will come back to the house with the detail about cleaning.

WORLD WATERSKI CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Further to his remarks in this place last week, will the minister detail the supposed \$1 million in costs associated with the World Waterski Championships?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:57): I thank the member for the question. Yes, I can bring back some information about the World Waterski Championships.

WORLD WATERSKI CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:57): I have a supplementary question. Given the event will attract participants from an estimated 45 countries, what support is the government going to provide to this potentially lucrative major event?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:57): We have been having discussions with the group for a couple of years now. We are well aware of the potential for the event but we are also aware of the potential risk for the government and the taxpayers of South Australia in hosting the event. We have asked the organisers for some further information and we are still waiting on that. The last I heard, when I spoke to the South Australian Tourism Commission, they were still waiting on that information to come back from the organisers.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CIVIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Mr GEE (Napier) (14:58): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General update the house on the launch of SACAT?

The SPEAKER: That is the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his question, and I apologise for the interjection over there. On 30 March 2015, the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal will be open for business. This represents a significant milestone for South Australia with the establishment of a one-stop shop for civil and administrative disputes.

Mr Marshall: The last in Australia.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Until now—the best, actually.

Mr Marshall: The last state in Australia. You are stating the bleeding obvious.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There is the WACAT, VCAT—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can I take the Leader of the Opposition back to that old song about cat food: 'The cats of Australia have made their choice'—and here it is, SACAT. It will only have one lodgement form, simplifying the process for lodging a dispute. Lodgement of this form can occur online. SACAT objectives emphasise accessibility, efficiency and fairness. The objectives are, firstly, to keep costs to a minimum, secondly, to be accessible and responsive to the South Australian public's needs—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think you are in sync with another space. Bear with me.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is right on the edge. If he moves his lips again out of order he will be leaving us early.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think the member for Schubert appears to be channelling another press release, so if I can just go on. We will be keeping it accessible and responsive to the South Australian public's needs; process and resolve disputes—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is also living right on the edge.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —as quickly as possible; use language we can all understand; be as flexible as possible; promote the best principles of public administration, including independence, natural justice and fairness; make quality and consistent decisions; and have transparency and accountability. Now, with criteria like that, who couldn't be for this? SACAT will initially take on the work currently performed by the Residential Tenancies Tribunal.

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, Mr Speaker: everything that the minister has outlined so far is on sacat.sa.gov.au, including the objectives and the costs. He has actually just quoted word for word the objectives as part of the SACAT website.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to what the minister has to say and, if he is providing the house with information that is already readily available on the net, his leave to answer will be withdrawn.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Mr Speaker, sometimes—

The SPEAKER: I would suggest some elegant variation.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Indeed. Sometimes some truths are so self-evident that people completely independently come to the same conclusion. We will have state-of-the-art management technology. In fact, I was talking to a chap only the other day who was going through the training regime for operating the SACAT equipment, and he informed me that this is absolutely state-of-the-art. The capability—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader has been called to order and there have been two warnings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The information management systems that SACAT have are outstanding and I'm sure even for the cynics elsewhere will be absolutely shown to be first-class.

I would particularly like to take the opportunity to thank the hardworking staff from the SACAT implementation team. These people work within the Attorney-General's Department and they have done an absolutely extraordinary job. I mention in particular the manager of the team, Rob Templeton, who has done an outstanding job. I also want to mention registrar of the SACAT, Clare Byrt and, of course, Justice Greg Parker and Judge Susanne Cole.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: What a shame.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Given the recommendations of the independent review of the Adelaide electrification in June 2012 after the state Labor government cancelled the Gawler rail electrification project, was a new master plan for the upgrade of the rail network established?

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) (15:03): I thank the member for Mitchell for his interest in this matter. Perhaps I will

provide a bit of background to the house. In 2012 a report was procured by the department into the electrification project, principally of the Noarlunga line which, of course, has been extended out to Seaford. That is not an uncommon thing to do. It is not uncommon that external advice would be sought for major projects of this nature. In 2012, if I recall rightly, due to the declining revenues which the state was suffering, a decision was made to postpone the Gawler rail electrification project.

Casting our minds back a little earlier than that, in 2008 the government first announced the electrification of our rail network, and it was made very clear at that point in time that the Noarlunga line would be the first line to be electrified, followed by the Gawler line and then subsequent lines, such as the Outer Harbor line, after that. This was for good reason: there had been a massive increase in residents living south of Noarlunga in the past few years, which of course meant that more services would be required to the southern suburbs.

Ms Redmond: Not a high priority.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is a sentiment which—

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Heysen might be interested to know that they are not necessarily my words. They are the words of the member for Bragg which were uttered in 2012, outlining the necessity of these sorts of transport projects to service—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —to service the southern suburbs. Not only did we commit to electrifying the Noarlunga line, extending it by 5.7 kilometres out to Seaford, including building a 1.1 kilometre rail bridge, we also committed to duplicating the Southern Expressway to make sure that these burgeoning areas of our metropolitan city were best serviced.

We have made it clear since then, most particularly in the budget that was released, if I recall, in June of last year, that we would be recommencing works on the Gawler line with funding. Off the top of my head, I think it's \$60 million to be provided in the 2017-18 year.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: If the leader likes to take exception to this fact, then I would urge him to pick up the phone, call his good mate Christopher Pyne and try to convince him to reinvest in public transport infrastructure because it is current federal and state Liberal Party policy not to invest in public transport infrastructure—not to invest at all.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr KNOLL: The minister is not responsible for the policy of the opposition.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to the minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: We consistently see an absolute refusal from both state Liberals as well now as federal Liberals to improve public transport infrastructure and, under those circumstances, we need to make sure that we cut our cloth appropriately. We have made it very clear that we want to deliver a public transport upgrade, for example, for the O-Bahn project, for—

Mr Marshall: Like the Outer Harbor line. How's that going? That was a promise.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, we are very passionate about the Outer Harbor line because some of us live down that part of Adelaide. It's not just an inconvenient extra five or seven minutes to tow our yachts through. We will continue upgrading the electrification of our rail lines over time when funds provide but, when we've got a South Australian Liberal Party with members both in this parliament and also federally who don't believe in public transport investment, it means we need to go it alone.

BOAT REGISTRATION

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on the uptake of the new six-month boat registration scheme?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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) (15:07): Yes, a very good policy, as the Treasurer, the former minister for transport, stated in the lead-up to the last election. Can I thank the member for Colton for his question. He is keenly interested in this area—I am not so sure about the registration of boats; it's more the recreation on the boats, and fishing, I think, more particularly.

With summer drawing to a close, it is timely to update the house on the initiative to reduce registration fees for boaties who wanted to take up the option of only registering their boats for a six-month period, mostly over the summer period when most people use their boats. A new six-month boat registration option was introduced in October of last year, allowing boat owners and owners of personal watercraft to register their boats for only the half of the year when they were more likely to use them. Boat owners had the flexibility to do that when they thought they would use their boats the most, and I am encouraged to say that we have had a pretty good take-up of this initiative.

There are currently 59,000 registered boats in South Australia, including nearly 3,600 personal watercraft. We know that boating provides an enjoyable recreation activity for many South Australians and also contributes to local economic activity for communities along both coastal waters and inland waters, such as along the River Murray.

During the summer months, of those boaties whose registrations became due, or of those people who had purchased boats for the first time and were looking to register them for the first time, nearly 10,000—9,679 people—took up the option to register their boats for a six-month period. That's approximately one-quarter of those new or renewed boat registrations that fell due over the summer period. Of those 9,679 vessels, 1,795 were personal watercraft and, of course, the activity supports communities in places such as the River Murray.

Grievance Debate

COBDOGLA IRRIGATION AND STEAM MUSEUM

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:10): Today, I rise to speak about how the Riverland community has rallied behind one of its most beloved historic icons—the Cobdogla Irrigation and Steam Museum and the world-renowned Humphrey pump. Today, I presented a petition with almost 6,000 signatures urging the state government to take immediate action to have SA Water continue to own and support the Cobdogla Irrigation and Steam Museum whilst allocating the necessary funds to facilitate the ongoing operation of the Humphrey pump and museum to enable current and future generations to appreciate the state's water heritage.

I would like to commend the Cobdogla Steam Friends Society for their efforts in distributing this petition and note that people across the world signed it. Many recognised engineers, history and tourism organisations have thrown their weight behind the petition and what it stands for, and these include the National Trust of South Australia, the History Trust of South Australia, Destination Riverland and Engineers Australia.

As a bit of background for the house, the Cobdogla Irrigation and Steam Museum was established by the then engineering and water supply department (now the SA Water Corporation) as a major project commemorating South Australia's sesquicentenary in 1986. The key drawcard to the museum was the Humphrey pump, which is one of only two in the Southern Hemisphere and holds the title of the only working Humphrey pump in the world. In June 2010, it was declared a national engineering landmark by Engineers Australia—the ultimate accolade from this organisation—and another honour along these lines was recently announced.

In May 2012, a gas leak occurred during the operation of the Humphrey pump at Cobdogla, and following this event operation of the pump ceased. Volunteers at the museum provided a

submission to SA Water outlining the need for the pump to become operational again, and after two years they had heard nothing from the department. It was not until I organised for questions to be asked in the parliament that the state government acknowledged the situation. I wrote to the Minister for Water in October last year, and he responded by stating that SA Water was unable to commit to the capital upgrade required for the pump and associated infrastructure or to subsidise the ongoing operation of the museum.

Further pressure from the community caused a backflip by SA Water (despite SA Water's continual denial of this, I have correspondence to prove that this was a backflip), providing financial support to the museum but not to the Humphrey pump. Senior managers from SA Water visited the museum while in the Riverland on another matter and were given an insight into how the museum has developed and the role the steam friends and the National Trust have played over 27 years since they took over the running of the museum.

Following that visit, SA Water's general manager, operations and maintenance, Mr Mark Gobbie, stated that there were no plans to withdraw money or reduce support to the museum and that SA Water had always undertaken to maintain its commitment and pay other costs associated with the site to ensure that the Cobdogla Irrigation and Steam Museum could continue to operate. I do note that nearly 300 people attended an open day recently at the museum to provide support to that petition.

As an irrigator, I am proud to stand here and be a part of the fight for the continued operation of the Humphrey pump. It is world renowned, it is an icon of the South Australian irrigation fraternity but, more importantly, it is an icon of Australia's history with irrigation. It is an icon recognised by world-renowned engineers, and it is visited by world-renowned engineers, and this is the reason that it has so much commitment from the community and from afar.

The community had a win with the continued commitment to operate the museum, but it is outrageous that the minister will not provide the same commitment to make the Humphrey pump operational again. This pump is a historic icon for South Australia and will continue to have many tourism benefits for the state. The passionate volunteers who operate the museum and the pump deserve much better from this state government.

JAMES MORRISON ACADEMY OF MUSIC

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:14): In February this year, the Premier travelled to Mount Gambier to be present at a special event, the opening of the James Morrison Academy of Music, which is affiliated with the University of South Australia. In its first year, the academy has already attracted 50 students from all over Australia who have auditioned and won the right to be the class of 2015 and will be the beneficiaries of the result of something that started many years ago: in James's case, a lifetime of work as a musician and educator, and for Mount Gambier it is their work in creating the atmosphere for the event that has become Generations in Jazz, which is after all the reason James has chosen to make Mount Gambier his base and family home.

I have been lucky enough to attend Generations in Jazz for around 16 years through my introduction by Modbury High School, a Florey public high school that has a fine tradition in travelling to the Mount to expose the students to the best there is in jazz, because of the special inspiring performances that have always been a highlight of the weekend, as well as the competition that allows student musicians to practise with an aim rather than just for practice sake and to meet peers from all over the state, and more so in later years from all over the nation.

Mr Reg Chapman is the man who I owe the debt of gratitude to for encouraging me to accompany the school on that first visit. His work, along with that of his assistant, Ms Shirley Robinson, inspired a tradition in the school that continues to this day. After Reg, Mr John Duncan took the school into the next phase with the help of Ms Joan Baker. Now, Ms Rosie Carr holds the baton that leads the stage band into the future, with Ms Baker still acting in her role.

These fine educators inspire their students with the total support of the governing council and school principals, Mr Robert Hill in the first two years, followed by Ms Jay Strudwick. Jay and I used to travel down together, as she had taught my children at The Heights School, and our friendship continued until her death. It is now my pleasure to support the students with current principal, Mr Martin Rumsby.

Modbury High has an extensive involvement with musical activities, with a concert band, stage band and ensemble groups in brass, string and classical guitar. Performances are given at parent meetings and school assemblies, none better than the one we had recently for the 50th anniversary of the school's opening. They also perform for other schools and senior citizen venues. They also appear in the Yamaha school bands festival. But it is Generations in Jazz that is the focus of the year's activity, and that is because of the atmosphere that has always been there, something that I sincerely hope is not lost as the event moves into a new phase.

From the earliest days of my recollection, the day-night events took place in what was then the 'Barn Palais', I think it was called, a straw ceilinged venue that seemed to hold hundreds of people. It is a far cry from the now much bigger event. This year, between 1 and 3 May, up to 3,700 young Australian musicians from nearly 100 schools will gather for competition and performances by international artists in a 5,000-seat big-top style pavilion, which transforms a paddock into an exciting venue for the weekend.

Important as this transition is in taking Generations in Jazz into the future, it is still the community support that makes the event. I can remember being welcomed by Karyn Roberts, the principal organiser and an organiser par excellence, every year. I know she and the Generations in Jazz board addressed almost every conceivable detail before each event and then the many that arose as it was underway. They fed and accommodated all the adjudicators, guest performers, participants and participant supporters, and made sure the competition venues—and there were several—were all well appointed and operational, with the myriad of technical equipment needed to make the performances sound great.

This hardworking group looked after the army of volunteers who made the weekend such a success and credit to the can-do attitude of the South-East. It is those volunteers who still will make the event what it is. I look forward to many more visits to Generations in Jazz at Mount Gambier and wish the event and the James Morrison Academy of Music every success into the future. The James Morrison Academy is located in the Old Town Hall complex on Commercial Street and it offers a full-time one-year diploma course and a two-year associate degree accredited by the University of South Australia, with plans to offer a full year three-year Bachelor of Music degree next year.

Enrolments are projected to grow to 140 by 2017, and inquiries have been received from musicians in the US, UK, South Africa, Switzerland and Germany. It is a great way for our South Australian musicians to be able to have world-class tuition and to be exposed to the sorts of performers who will be able to help them make their careers overseas flourish. I commend everyone involved with Generations in Jazz and the James Morrison Academy of Music and hope that some members will actually go down to Mount Gambier this year. I am sure some of their local schools are involved. They will not regret it; even if they are not jazz aficionados, by the time they come back they certainly will be.

OAKLANDS PARK RAIL CROSSING

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:19): I wish to speak today about an issue which is regularly raised in this house, most often by my colleague and electorate neighbour, the member for Mitchell, that is, the congestion disaster which unfolds each day at the Oaklands crossing at Oaklands Park. Given the regularity with which the member for Mitchell raises this issue, I am sure that members of this house will be more than familiar with the situation in Oaklands Park but, in summary, the equation is at follows: two roads divided by one railway line plus tens of thousands of vehicles per day equals a traffic nightmare.

We have Morphett Road and Diagonal Road awkwardly intersecting at this point, which would be bad enough, but this problem is greatly compounded by the Seaford line cutting through the middle of this mess. It is an archaic hangover from a land before town planning when train movements were relatively infrequent, traffic volume was far less significant and the Marion precinct was still surrounded by vineyards.

This is not an issue which has emerged in recent years. From speaking to people in my electorate who have been around for much longer than me, I understand that grade separation in the form of an overpass or underpass was first touted in the 1970s and has been raised continually for the last 40 years; and, at each juncture of it being raised by members of the community or explored

by the government, the cost of a potential solution seems to rise each time. I think the initial discussion in the 1970s was that grade separation would cost just a couple of million dollars and now the figure being touted is in the mid 100s.

While no solution has yet been implemented, the problem has gotten worse and worse. I have recently been undertaking a concerted doorknocking campaign throughout my electorate and have had the issue of the Oaklands crossing raised repeatedly on the doorsteps, particularly in the northern portion of my electorate, in the suburbs of North Brighton and Somerton Park and, in particular within those suburbs, those parts which lie on the eastern side of Brighton Road. Residents living in these communities really have no other option than to travel through the crossing to reach the shopping and recreational precinct which is found at Westfield Marion.

I have spoken to some residents who simply drive from their homes towards the crossing and stop short, parking in the streets to the west of Diagonal Road, where they leave their cars and walk the last kilometre or so through to Marion. Obviously, this is not an ideal situation and not an option available to everyone, and it also creates parking problems in those side streets, streets such as Bowker Street and Dunrobin Road.

The Oaklands problem is one which lasts all day, every day. Obviously, it is worse during peak traffic times in the mornings and late afternoons, but there are actually very few times of the day (except, perhaps, in the middle of the night) when you will not be caught up in significant congestion at this crossing. Recently, I thought I would be safe to travel from Glenelg through to Marion at 2pm in the afternoon and, really, I should have called the member for Mitchell beforehand and he would have told me that this would not be a good idea because at 2pm it was not safe to travel through that area at all. I spent some 15 minutes backed up at the Oaklands crossing unable to get through to Westfield.

As the member for Mitchell has regularly mentioned, a \$2 million feasibility study into the crossing was undertaken in 2011 and some colourful images made it onto the front page of the *Guardian Messenger* and were splashed through Adelaidenow one afternoon, but that was about it. The study highlighted that grade separation through an overpass was possibly the most suitable option for this site, though there has been some speculation that other options are also on the table.

The lack of certainty around how this project should be delivered underlines the government's lack of commitment and disinterest, or perhaps just complete lack of understanding of the necessity of this project within our community. Members of the house can expect to hear much more from the member for Mitchell and me over the coming months and years as we continue to ramp up our campaign to have an infrastructure solution developed for the Oaklands crossing.

NAPIER ELECTORATE

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:24): I rise today to speak about the recent visit to my electorate by the Premier and ministers Bettison, Close and Gago. Premier Weatherill joined me for coffee and a stroll through the Munno Para shopping centre, and it was fantastic to have him join me to meet the locals. It was a very positive and enjoyable visit, with the Premier meeting and talking with local business owners and shoppers, who were all delighted to meet him. The demand for photos was just terrific.

It gave the locals an opportunity to discuss the issues of the day, mostly how poor the federal government was in comparison to our state government, and there were some creative suggestions regarding the future of Prime Minister Tony Abbott. One shopper indicated that she was a fan of Steven Marshall; however, she believed he was the leader of the Greens. We met Mark and Christine. Mark is a former Bridgestone worker who is now running a very successful café with famous fish and chips, which, we will know, is a favourite with those living in the North. We also met Stewart, a talented musician, who is volunteering with United Way, and Steve, who is acting cleaning supervisor and who enjoys his job and who is very active in fighting for workers' rights and workplace safety.

Later in the day I joined minister Close at the Elizabeth Downs Primary School. The Elizabeth Downs Primary School, like so many my electorate, is a school that battles the odds to do the very best for its students. We were joined by principal Meredith Starkey, the governing council chairperson Danielle Sharples, and four student leaders on a tour of the school. Minister Close also held meetings with staff and student leaders learning about the achievements and challenges of the

local school. I am very pleased to see that minister Close is visiting schools on a regular basis and seeing what life is like for the students and teachers. I appreciate her taking the time not only to visit my electorate but also to visit the more complex schools in my electorate.

From primary education to adult education, Para Worklinks is a training organisation in Smithfield that delivers accredited training in conservation and land management, landscape construction and horticulture. Students can also learn other skills, including the use of a forklift, responsible service of alcohol and white card accreditation.

I was pleased to join minister Gago, CEO John Sobieray and other stakeholders on site at Para Worklinks to meet with Work for the Dole participants taking part in metalwork and woodwork as part of their skills development and acquisition requirements. The Work for the Dole and work experience participants who complete their woodwork and metalwork requirements are then able to manufacture furniture for the Playford Community Fund, an emergency relief agency based in Elizabeth which assists families in crisis by providing furniture for disadvantaged families who are in desperate need of furniture, food and other assistance.

Para Worklinks has also trained Indigenous young people from remote northern South Australia so that they can take skills back to their local communities. Para Worklinks and the Playford Community Fund have also provided furniture and other supplies to the lands.

The afternoon concluded with a visit to the Davoren Park Youth and Community Club, where minister Bettison met with the Creative Kids program participants and parents. Minister Bettison spoke with volunteers and the neighbourhood policing team about the great work of the centre, which is all run by these volunteers. The centre runs Creative Kids, bingo, Meet and Greet and other programs, and has had a positive impact in the local community since it opened. Community resilience and connectivity has increased and there have been many other benefits. The centre, which has lost the support of the City of Playford, continues to build its attendance numbers every month. I sincerely thank all the volunteers involved with the Davoren Park Youth and Community Club.

I will speak more about them in a future griever, but I want to thank the Elizabeth neighbourhood policing team for all the work it does in the local community. Sergeant Glenn Pink and Senior Constables Jamie Costigan, Adam Osborne and Luke Horjus, and First Class Constable Kimberly Fuller do a fantastic job on a tough beat. They are building community resilience and faith in the police, conducting crime prevention and dealing with some tough people. They are a credit to SAPOL and to the community.

It was a pleasure having the Premier and ministers in the north seeing the great work that local organisations and schools are doing in my electorate. I look forward to seeing them and more ministers in my electorate again, as more exciting developments occur.

PORT AUGUSTA GREYHOUND CLUB

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:29): I take this opportunity to say a few words about the Port Augusta Greyhound Club. There would not be a member among us who was not shocked and deeply concerned by the revelations of live baiting going on in the greyhound industry in other states, and I know that every single one of us here would want to work very hard to make sure that that does not happen here in South Australia.

I think that Greyhound Racing SA's reaction to those revelations was quite important. To paraphrase, essentially what they said was: 'It was found to have been going on in other states and we are glad it wasn't found to be going on in South Australia, but that doesn't mean that we don't need to be ever vigilant to make sure that it doesn't.' I think that is a very responsible approach to this issue.

I am the very proud patron and member of the Port Augusta Greyhound Club. My purpose in speaking today is really to put on record a very strong view I have that, while this industry is battling across Australia at the moment with some very difficult issues, the sport of greyhound racing should not be dismissed out of hand because of those issues. Of course, my particular interest, the Port Augusta Greyhound Club, is a very fine establishment. They work exceptionally well and exceptionally hard. They are a volunteer organisation. I know that they will do everything they

possibly can to ensure that their club continues to uphold the highest standards in every way possible.

This is a volunteer club, as I mentioned. It is actually free; anybody who wants to can walk in off the street to come and look at races, enjoy the races, have a beer, not have a beer, just chat with their mates—whatever they would like to do. I am surprised that more people from Port Augusta do not come to enjoy, in winter, a really relaxing and enjoyable afternoon or, in summer, a really relaxing and enjoyable evening of greyhound racing.

I am concerned that sections of the population would be keen to take the opportunity, as they see it, to grasp the revelations of what has been going on in other states to try to run the whole industry down. I am sure that every single one of us has at different times come across revelations of disgraceful conduct in the plumbing industry, the legal fraternity, the car sales industry, mechanical workshops, union officials, politicians, doctors, etc. The list would be endless, but it does not mean at all that every single person or every single organisation operating in those industries or areas of endeavour is bad.

I urge this house to support greyhound racing across the state. I urge this house to support GRSA in their efforts to ensure that racing in South Australia is absolutely 100 per cent as squeaky clean as it can possibly be. I invite any member of this house, or staff member who would like to, to come to the Port Augusta greyhound racing club and see an absolutely wonderful example of a local community group, volunteer run, at Chinnery oval. It is a picturesque little oval where, from the main viewing area, you can literally walk right up to a three or four-foot-high chain link fence. It is lower than my waist. The racing happens right there on a grass track. Beyond that is a beautiful oval, beyond that is the beautiful Upper Spencer Gulf and beyond that is the beautiful Flinders Ranges. It is a very hands-on opportunity to come, relax, look and enjoy.

Port Augusta Greyhound Club would welcome anybody who wants to come and have a look through their facility. They have absolutely nothing to hide, whether it be a GRSA inspector, a vet, me as the patron wanting to be absolutely sure that I am involved with a top-notch organisation or any member of the public who wants to come and enjoy themselves and find out how wonderful greyhound racing can be. They would all be welcome.

NATIONAL DAY OF ACTION AGAINST BULLYING AND VIOLENCE

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:34): I rise today to speak about the National Day of Action Against Bullying and Violence that was held last Friday. This important national day was inaugurated in 2011. In fact, I remember the day because I was at the launch in Queensland with Peter Garrett at the time. It takes place on the third Friday of March every year. This year the national day was observed on 20 March, and all organisers and participants are to be congratulated for adding their voices and saying, 'Bullying. No way!'

An initiative of the Safe and Supportive School Communities Working Group, which comprises representatives of all Australian education authorities, the national day reaches out to government, Catholic and independent schools and it provides an opportunity for school communities right across our cities and our regions to take a stand together against bullying and violence.

I speak today on this issue not only as a member of parliament but as a parent, as a member of an extended family, a former teacher, an education media person, and as the chair in 2011 of the federal parliament's Joint Select Committee on Cyber-Safety. I tabled the committee's interim report, High-Wire Act: Cyber-Safety and the Young, in the Senate on 20 June 2011. The evidence offered to the committee in all jurisdictions across Australia, both in person and by way of submissions and surveys, remains clear in my mind today. I will return to that issue shortly.

This year's National Day of Action Against Bullying and Violence involved 1,950 schools and nearly 900,000 students in local events, presentations by guest speakers and participation in classroom-based activities using resources, including 'stand together' lesson plans. These lesson plans were tailored to year levels, with separate kits for years 3 to 4, 5 to 6, 7 to 9, and 10 to 12. Each plan had age-appropriate common themes around bullying and violence for students to explore. Themes included examining the qualities that are important in friendships, arriving at definitions of bullying, discussing students' understanding about being online, online friendships, communicating

in a reasonable way online, cyber bullying, identifying examples of reasonable online behaviours, and critically evaluating those behaviours students believe to be most important in that environment.

I commend students, their families and schools for allocating time in busy schedules for this important initiative. It fosters safe and supportive school communities and, from my studies overseas and here in Australia, the reality is it could be a life saver. Australian research indicates that up to 25 per cent of students experience bullying to varying degrees and that bullying behaviours peak in the middle years and early senior years at school. Research tells us that younger children are more likely to bully overtly, verbally and/or physically, and that, as children develop, social or more covert bullying behaviours such as manipulation and exclusion increase.

As students gain access to mobile and other online communication devices, cyber bullying increases, and we are more aware than ever before of the physical, emotional and psychological consequences of bullying both in the short term and in the long term. That comes about not only just with bullying when it is face to face but certainly the 24/7 nature of online bullying. There are a number of ways that this can be avoided. The Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) has a fantastic website that students, parents and teachers can access that provides them with information regarding bullying and protective behaviour that can be put in place to ensure that children, young people and even adults do not become victims of this.

Our adolescents may exhibit the consequences of bullying by way of, for example, deteriorating academic performance, low esteem, increased anxiety. I know I have run out of time on this, so I would like to continue at another time.

Bills

NATURAL GAS AUTHORITY (NOTICE OF WORKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:40): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Natural Gas Act 1967. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Bill I am introducing today will increase the safety of natural gas pipelines and the security of the natural gas supply in South Australia, by establishing a process for the approval of excavation and similar work near natural gas pipelines.

The purpose of the Bill is to amend the *Natural Gas Authority Act 1967* to require landowners and other parties such as road builders, to give the pipeline owner notice of, and gain consent for, excavation or similar work near natural gas pipelines, to set down grounds that must be satisfied if consent is to be refused and to establish a process for the resolution of disputes if consent is not granted.

The *Natural Gas Authority Act 1967* applies to the Moomba to Adelaide Pipeline and the Katnook Pipeline in the State's South East, which were purchased by Epic Energy from the Pipelines Authority of South Australia in 1995. Before then, the land on which the pipelines were situated had been subject to registered easements which included a requirement for landowners to give notice of, and gain the pipeline owner's consent for work near the pipeline. This was to avoid damaging the pipeline, which could lead to catastrophic explosions, interruptions to the supply of natural gas and other adverse consequences.

The *Natural Gas Authority Act 1967* was amended in 1995 when the pipelines were sold. The amendments extinguished the previous registered easements and replaced them with statutory easements which, however, did not include a requirement for landowners to give notice to, or gain the consent of, the pipeline owner for work near the pipeline.

The Bill amends the statutory easement provisions in the Act by requiring landowners and other parties such as road builders to give the pipeline owner at least 21 days' notice of proposed work in the vicinity of the pipelines. The pipeline owner must, within 14 days of receiving the notice, by notice in writing, consent or object to the proposed works. This period may be extended by mutual agreement if, for example, the parties negotiate on conditions for consent.

The pipeline owner may not object to the proposed work unless the owner is of the opinion that the work would interfere with the safety or operation of the pipeline or associated equipment, and must set out the reasons for the objection in the notice to the landowner or other party.

The Bill establishes a process for the resolution of disputes if the pipeline owner objects to the proposed work. In that case the pipeline owner must notify the Minister, who may attempt to mediate between the parties in order to arrive at mutually satisfactory terms under which the proposed work may be carried out. The Minister must give the parties notice of his or her decision to mediate within 21 days of receipt of the notice of objection. If such notice is not given, it will be taken that the Minister has decided not to mediate. The Minister may delegate the power to mediate.

If mediation does not occur or does not resolve the dispute, either party may apply to the Warden's Court for a resolution of the dispute. The court may confirm the notice of objection, or revoke the notice of objection and determine terms under which work may be carried out, or remit the matter to the parties for further consideration or make consequential or ancillary orders or impose conditions that the court considers necessary.

The previous registered easements included a provision that the pipeline (which included associated equipment) on the easement remains the property of the pipeline owner. Under the Bill associated equipment (the definition of which has been updated to include telecommunications equipment), not only on the easement, but also on 'outlying land' (adjoining land), remains the property of the pipeline owner.

The previous registered easements provided that work related to the construction, maintenance, repair or replacement of a pipeline may be carried out on land immediately adjacent to the easement, as may reasonably be required by the pipeline owner. The Bill clarifies that such work may be carried out on the outlying land.

The Bill also defines the terms necessary for the effective operation of the amendments.

The Department for State Development has consulted with Epic Energy, the owner of the pipelines, and relevant Government Departments and agencies, all of which indicated their support for the proposal.

I commend the Bill to Members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Natural Gas Authority Act 1967*

4—Amendment of section 11—Rights conferred by statutory easement

Subclauses (1) and (2) make amendments consequential on the provisions in proposed section 15A. Subclause (3) amends section 11 to clarify that any associated equipment installed on or under the servient land or outlying land for the purposes of the section remains the property of the owner of the pipeline. Subclause (4) amends the definition of associated equipment to include telecommunications equipment.

5—Insertion of section 15A

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

15A—Notice of prescribed works on land subject to statutory easement

The proposed section provides that an owner or occupier of servient land must not carry out or permit the carrying out of prescribed works on or under the servient land without the prior written consent of the owner of the pipeline, with a maximum penalty of \$60,000. Owner, occupier and prescribed works are all defined for the purposes of the proposed section.

The proposed section sets out the process by which the owner of the pipeline may consent or object to prescribed works on or under servient land, including:

- that the owner or occupier of servient land must notify the owner of the pipeline of the intention to carry out prescribed works and the nature of the works to be carried out;

- the manner in which the owner of the pipeline may consent or object to the proposed prescribed works by notice. The owner must not object unless of the opinion that the prescribed works would interfere with the safety or operation of the pipeline or associated equipment;
- a requirement that the owner of the pipeline give notice of an objection to the Minister.

The proposed section also sets out a dispute resolution process including:

- the circumstances in which the Minister may attempt to mediate between the parties;
- the circumstances in which the owner of the pipeline and the owner or occupier of servient land may apply to the Warden's Court for a resolution of a dispute, and the orders that the Court may make on application for resolution of a dispute.

The Minister may delegate to a person a function or power of the Minister under the proposed section.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 March 2015.)

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:41): I rise today to make a contribution to this important bill and to note some concerns with the overall process. The announcement of the streamlining process, which included a widespread review of all state government boards and committees, created much angst amongst community committees and boards in my electorate. However, I believe it is important to decrease the layers of bureaucracy and red tape that currently exist in this state government.

In July 2014, the Premier announced a review of boards and committees of the South Australian government and the Premier stated that the boards and committees would need to justify their existence and that those boards and committees that could not would be abolished. In September, it was announced that of the 429 boards and committees, 90 would be retained, 107 would be abolished, 17 would be merged and 62 were subject to further review. This bill abolishes or merges 56 boards and committees, including abolishing 28, merging eight and simplifying 20.

I do not have a problem with getting rid of bureaucracy, streamlining boards and committees, getting rid of red tape and putting to one side boards that are defunct or dysfunctional. However, there are a number of boards that are going to be abolished that play important roles, and I want to make a contribution in support of those, including the South Australian Horse Industry Advisory Group, which is to be abolished. Dr Holly Lewis, an equine veterinarian, submitted a letter stating that South Australia has a large and active equine industry and a proud history of equestrian achievements in an industry that is far too important not to have a direct advisory role to government.

Sandra Hale, a member of SA Thoroughbred Breeders, submitted a letter stating that the advisory group gives a range of diverse horse groups a single voice to communicate with PIRSA and the government regarding numerous horse industry related issues and to assist with the control of exotic diseases that can be brought into Australia. This is the only group that brings all horse industry groups together, and she says that it would be detrimental for the industry group if it were disbanded. I think that really does explain the importance of particularly that board.

The Genetically Modified Crop Advisory Committee has been re-formed with a simplified important process which is to transfer the power from the Governor to the minister. The Genetically Modified Crop Advisory Committee provides advice to the minister on the issues and risks of genetically modified crops to markets and trade.

In 2004, South Australia enacted legislation, the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004, to regulate the cultivation of GM food crops in South Australia. We note that the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designation of Areas) Regulations 2004 established that currently the whole of South Australia is designated as an area in which no GM food crops may be cultivated.

The act established the GM Crop Advisory Committee to undertake functions assigned to it by the act or the minister to whom administration of the act is committed. The advisory committee consists of between nine and 11 members appointed by the Governor, and at least two members must be women and at least two members must be men. Why does the minister need advice when he is clearly anti GM? Would it not be better to maintain some independence with the Governor appointing that committee? Again, it is a government that is hell-bent on centralisation and hell-bent on not having anyone who opposes their view or their say. I think it really is a sad day when we lose that independence.

The regional communities consultative council has been abolished. They argued that they were a conduit between grassroots people and government. I question whether we are further losing our regional voice by scrapping these types of committees and, again, it has a taint of centralisation. It clearly is that dysfunctional between government and real grassroots regional communities.

The wine industry council was abolished last month and a committee on phylloxera was also abolished. I understand the phylloxera committee was an advisory committee to the phylloxera board, so I do not think we needed that duplication. The wine industry is a huge economic driver in South Australia, and for the minister and the Premier to abolish such an important industry committee I think is quite foolish. Let's not beat around the bush: we do have an ailing wine industry at the moment. The wine industry is very important, but we know that, particularly in my electorate in the Riverland, wine grape growers are returning much less than the cost of production.

At the moment, the focus of government is on producing a commodity and underpinning a bottom line for their economic boasting rights, but what we are not doing and what we are not seeing is a link between advisory boards, the grower and the marketing arm. I think the marketing arm is probably one of the most important parts of the wine industry that is sadly lacking at the moment. I think the support is not there, and I think we will read a lot more in coming weeks and months about how the wine industry is needing support. Particularly, we need to sell our product, rather than be so focused on growing a product that we cannot sell.

The rock lobster fishery advisory committee and the fisheries council have both been abolished. It is a pity that the minister has only just left the chamber because I think all these boards and committees that are being abolished are very important conduits between the grassroots, what is happening in a sector, and government, and how we can better market our product, how we can better use R&D to further the establishment of bigger markets, better product and putting the right product on the table.

The chair of the committee, Richard Stevens, said that it was critical to continue its role to provide sound, independent advice. We hear those words again, 'independent advice'. I am sure that the minister likes to hear the tone of his own voice when giving himself recommendations and advice. It is a relevant issue of importance to South Australia's rock lobster fishery. The annual funding of \$40,000 for the operation of the committee is cost recovered from the industry. It is an annual licence fee, so no government funding is required.

Mr Stevens said that, without the mechanism of consultation provided through the committee, many of these issues would take an enormous amount of time in negotiations not only with the commercial fishing sector but across all fishing sectors, with consequent adverse resourcing implications for both industry and government. Since the announcement that this was to be abolished, the industry has said that it will now have to try to re-establish a fisheries management advisory committee under its own steam. Mr Stevens said that members of this committee are extremely disappointed with the outcome and the attitude of the government.

I certainly support, as I have said, the streamlining of the bureaucracy, but many of these boards and committees do play an important role, particularly with communities, and contribute to government decision-making with those communities and the impact that those sectors have when government makes decisions or policy adjustments. The boards and committees play an important role in providing leadership, direction and accountability across every area, particularly within the government's activity. Some of the boards provide policy advice to government while others oversee trading enterprise. There are a number of professional registration boards where, I think, the government is almost looking a gift horse in the mouth.

In August, Premier Weatherill listed tourism as one of South Australia's top economic priorities. The industry lobby group Tourism and Transport Forum said that abolishing the SATC Board would make South Australia the only state without such a body. The South Australian Regional Tourism Chairs' Forum, which includes regional tourism organisations in the Hills, the Fleurieu, Kangaroo Island, the Barossa, the Yorke Peninsula, the Flinders, the outback, the South-East, the Riverland and Murraylands—very important—put forward submissions calling on the state government to retain the South Australian Tourism Commission Board and stated that it is essential that the board is independent and contains regional representation.

In listening to the minister's contribution last week, I note that he pointed out several times the industry panel he is about to set up, which he will be part of. So, again, the minister will be accountable to himself, giving advice to himself and putting recommendations of his own to himself. The issue that I think was very clear in his contribution to this was that the lines of communication were lacking. The minister and the board are both acting in isolation.

It was very clear, particularly when tourism were developing a brand. Why would the minister have one idea of having his own brand and tourism have an idea of having their own brand? Again, I think it is blatantly obvious that there was a lack of communication. Whether there were egos involved or whether there was a lack of preparedness to sit down and listen to one another is something that is by the by but, again, I think it just shows you where the breakdown was in accounting for how important Tourism SA is.

I think what we have seen, particularly with tourism, is clear. The minister wrote to the industry stakeholders stating that the board is to be replaced with this panel. I will just touch on the panel. The panel was all about the tourism industry with a strong voice on decisions. I think that is what the Tourism Commission is offering at the moment. I just think that there has been that communication breakdown.

The minister said that the estimated saving of around \$200,000 a year from this move will be spent on marketing in South Australia. Well, minister, you were talking about growing an industry from \$5.8 billion to \$8 billion by 2020. I think you really need to acknowledge the importance of a tourism board. You need to be connected with regional tourism bodies and you need to be connected with all of the inputs to making the right decisions on things such as branding. We all know that tourism in South Australia is becoming more and more important to the bottom line of the state's economy.

A panel of industry tourism stakeholders will include the Airport, Education Adelaide, two regional representatives—two! Why only two representatives from regional tourism? I think the state needs to be represented by a majority of regional tourism panels so that we can get a good overall picture of just exactly where the state is heading and where we need a contribution.

We do not just need populist marketing campaigns in a couple of regional centres: we need populist campaigns in all regional centres because all of regional South Australia is an important mechanism. It is an important, if you like, cog within tourism here. It is not just about promoting Adelaide as a tourism hotspot. It is about complementing all of the regions to Adelaide, because let's face it, Adelaide is the hub that people come to and then go off on their holidays and their destinations. It is all about internal tourism as well. It is not just about bringing tourists from overseas: it is about states visiting their neighbouring states. I think South Australia has a huge void to fill in attracting interstate tourists, because it is one of the great destinations in this country.

The Pastoral Board was established in the late 1800s to help implement the land management act and it served as a mediator between pastoralists, bureaucrats and government. It is an independent body dealing with the concerns of pastoralists and is earmarked to be scrapped. Livestock SA said the Pastoral Board had been around for too long to abolish and has served the community really well. Board members raised concerns as to who would undertake pastoral lease assessments. I know the member for Stuart has a long history with the Pastoral Board and he has stated in this house how important the Pastoral Board is, as it is to my electorate of Chaffey. We have a number of pastoral areas that need representation. They need an independent voice to government, and I think the Pastoral Board is another one.

The state government suggested merging HACs in my electorate of Chaffey, and the overwhelming feedback was, 'No; merging HACs is a no-go zone.' Country hospitals are the fabric of those communities. Those communities rely on the HAC to give them that feedback. The community give the HACs the feedback that Country Health needs for those decisions then to be passed on to the minister. In a submission to the review, the Loxton-Waikerie district council described the Waikerie HAC as an essential purpose that cannot be met through other means. In other words, 'Keep your hands off, minister.' HACs within Loxton and Waikerie are very important, as they are in Barmera, Berri, Renmark, Paringa, the Mallee. It is very important for those communities to have ownership.

The Mallee HAC made a submission, and they have made it very clear that they do not want any of their HACs amalgamated. I am glad to see common sense prevail and the HAC boards were retained as they are. I think those HACs are on notice that they have to remain relevant. They have to remain an important part of giving information to Country Health SA who then in turn will make decisions upon the minister's agreement. It is very important that country health still has its own identity.

Going through the list, I came across a number of other submissions, including abolishing the River Murray Sustainability Program Steering Committee. Rob Kerin is the chair. He gives great advice to the state government—a former premier who I think is highly regarded with advice to any level of government. He is a real people person and he really does have his ear to the ground at any stage of the day or night and always gives good feedback. Looking at the Riverland NRM group and the Mallee and Coorong NRM groups, they play an important role that cannot be ignored. I think that, again, communities are part of those boards as is industry and I think they should be retained.

In conclusion, I believe it is important to reduce the high levels of bureaucracy currently within government in South Australia, so therefore I support the streamlining of boards and committees. Feedback from the community and industry in regard to all the boards that I have mentioned is critically important. Those boards, particularly tourism, the Pastoral Board, the fishing industry, a lot of economic drivers that need that grassroots advice independent to government, I think need to be acknowledged and retained. I think it is important that the state government listens to these industry groups and professionals in these particular fields and makes the decisions that are in the best interests of these people's groups and in the best interests of South Australia.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (16:00): I rise today as well to contribute to the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Bill and I concur with members before me and the things they have said, including the member for Chaffey. As he pointed out, the Premier said there was a need to 'justify your existence or be abolished' when he looked at over 400 boards and committees that were laid on the table in front of him, and he asked those boards and committees to justify their existence.

I wrote to a number of those people. I will talk a little bit later about the lack of response that I got and some blocking that came from the government to prevent me getting a bit of an understanding of some of the boards and committees in my shadow portfolio areas. As far as government boards and committees are concerned, they do play an important role in providing leadership, direction and accountability across many areas of government activity. Boards and committees represent a vital link between community needs and government delivery of services. While I am a firm believer in cutting red tape to make dealing with government easier, I do not believe taking all boards and committees away is ideal either.

So there are concerns. While I am all for removal of red tape and excessive bureaucracy, as well as any responsible measure to get the state's debt back under control, I am concerned about the potential loss of independent government scrutiny. This will give more power to ministers if all these boards and committees are taken away, and also to department chief executives. It has the potential for great concern.

I also note that some of the boards saved from the axe by the Premier—because he has outlined his list—include boards and committees that have recently had former Labor MPs appointed to them. Coincidentally, I know that Kevin Foley, Grace Portolesi, Karlene Maywald and Jane Lomax-Smith have all received positions. Many might suggest this is jobs for the boys or girls, as the case may be. I do not want to believe that but with the evidence before me it is hard not to feel that way.

Some of the boards that we do not want to see removed are the South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) Board, the Pastoral Board, animal welfare committee and the Health Performance Council. I know colleagues before me have spoken about those boards, and we do not believe they should be removed.

As well as the list the Premier has axed, he has a hit list of 'subject to further investigation' and a list of 'reclassified', and that is where a little of my concern kicks in. I would like to make a couple of points about the Motor Accident Commission. It is interesting to read the submission put forward by Roger Cook, the chairman of the Motor Accident Commission. They talked about some of the highlights they have had over their time since coming into operation. There is a concern that, with the Treasurer putting the Motor Accident Commission on the table, some advantages may be lost to the state, which is a little bit worrying as far as removing boards and committees is concerned.

Since taking over the government's road safety communications program, MAC has helped contribute to SA's annual road toll reducing from 124 in 2007. They have developed and implemented an award-winning road safety communications program to raise awareness and change attitudes and behaviour of road users, and they have developed close relationships with key road safety stakeholders, including SAPOL, the RAA, the SAMFS and the CFS to facilitate a more coordinated approach to safety initiatives in SA.

They have established a number of sponsorships and community partnerships to raise road safety awareness and influence road user behaviour. These are some of the important points that have come out. They have also provided sound financial and investment management of the CTP fund, resulting in a new asset position of \$1.24 billion and a funding ratio of 154 per cent, and they achieved a record operating result of \$271 million in 2012-13, which will be superseded in 2013-14, which was estimated at the time as being \$481.3 million.

They are fantastic figures, and you can see why the Treasurer wants to get his hands on the Motor Accident Commission to take that money out of there. We know he has already spent half a billion dollars, and he is looking to access more funds from the Motor Accident Commission to prop up his flailing budget.

The Motor Accident Commission has done a good job initiating and providing strategic advice and support to the state government in the introduction of the CTP scheme reforms, including the implementation of legislative changes. On strategic business outcomes, the Motor Accident Commission has improved social and health outcomes for South Australian road users through the effective management of the CTP scheme, and mitigated risk to the state government through financially responsible management of the CTP scheme, ensuring the government was not exposed to unfunded liabilities and is in a position to access a significant surplus likely to be in excess of \$1 billion.

I know the government finds this too good to be true because they cannot run a budget that has in excess of \$1 billion. They would be dying for that sort of figure and, again, I stress that is why the Treasurer wants to get his hands on this, to try to prop up his own flailing budget for the state. This government does not understand effective financial management. In fact, last year, in 2013-14, they ran a \$1.3 billion deficit and \$300 million of that was unbudgeted expenditure. It just goes on, and it is quite shameful.

If we look at the new RAH, there are \$620 million in costs blowout, and in relation to the Gawler electrification line we know that nearly \$50 million there has been written off by the Auditor-General—just another sign of how this government struggles to manage its finances. I mentioned before the sponsorships. The MAC also has supported the accident and emergency response teams through the provision of funding and sponsorship of the state rescue helicopter, hospitals and SA Ambulance services, and we know that is greatly appreciated and does help contribute to the welfare of South Australia in those areas.

I mentioned before some of the other sponsorship roles. They are a significant player in Schoolies Week, in keeping our kids safe when they go down to Victor Harbor, as a lot of teenagers do when they finish school. They put on a wonderful festival down there and the Motor Accident Commission funds are greatly appreciated by the people who put on Schoolies Week and, also, the students who are finishing up at high school.

Personally, I know the Motor Accident Commission has a very good strategy for country football. For that matter, they fund a lot of country sport and they use that arm in the regions to help push their message and sell their message of road safety, which is absolutely outstanding.

It was interesting to read that a couple of groups have made comments about maintaining MAC, and the RAA is concerned that the government's tactic of closing down MAC will have negative outcomes for South Australia. I note the Australian Lawyers Alliance says that the South Australian government should not be raiding MAC funds to prop up its budget. There are others who agree with me about the mismanagement of this budget. It is very concerning.

I mentioned that one and, while it is not directly being removed, it is potentially on the hit list, and the Treasurer is doing all he can to rip all the funds out of there. We are well aware of that. He wants to close that down and, as I said, put the money back into state government coffers. But, in doing so, they want to reclassify the Motor Accident Commission board and also reclassify the Claims Management Committee, the Investment Committee, the Road Safety and Sponsorship Committee and the Board Risk Finance and Audit Committee. As part of that, that also incorporates the Third Party Premiums Committee.

As I said at the start of my speech, I wrote to a number of the key players in areas attributed to my shadow portfolios of transport and road safety, and I was very pleased to get a response from the presiding officer of the Third Party Premiums Committee who, again, had some concerns. She forwarded me the correspondence that she had sent through to the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis (Treasurer) outlining her concerns with some of the issues and the good things that are done by the Third Party Premiums Committee.

This committee, which they are looking to close down, cost the state \$464 in the last financial year to get community members together, including chief financial officers of the RAA, Steve Shearer (Executive Director of the SA Road Transport Association) and other prominent members of the community, and this Third Party Premiums Committee, which does a very good job, is likely to be closed down. They have some concerns and, again, I thank the presiding officer for forwarding me this information.

The reason I say that is I wrote to a substantial number of the other boards and committees—and there must have been 15 to 20: I would have to check the official number. In writing to these committees, given that they had been asked (as I said at the start of this speech) by the Premier to justify their existence, I did say, 'I would like to know what your justifications are and I too would like to have that information as to why you think you should stay or go so that I can speak to this bill and the amendments.' I wrote to a number of them.

Interestingly, I got a letter back from the Assistant Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, the Hon. Tony Piccolo. Mr Piccolo sent me a letter telling me in no uncertain terms, really, that I should not be writing to these people, that I should not be contacting them, that I should be going through ministerial officers. So here we are with the government saying that it wants to cut back on red tape and stop these sorts of things, and all I am asking for is documentation that is very straightforward. I am not asking for trade secrets, I am not asking for secret documents that I can obtain through some other means. I am just asking for a copy of the justifications for these boards and committees staying in place—or not, whatever the case may be—as is being sent to the government, so that we can form our opinions on these boards and committees and on whether or not they should be maintained or disbanded.

I thought it was really quite farcical to get this letter. Along with it came the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment's Guideline Requests by Members of Parliament for Briefings—and a nice, glossy little paper it was too—from the Acting Minister for Transport, the Hon. Tony Piccolo MP. It just makes me question why we cannot be a little more transparent in our dealings. As I said, if I were asking for the secret passageway to get into the Premier's office and unlock his cabinets and find his files I could understand that sort of response, but I was just looking for the information that was being forwarded to the Premier about this bill. I hardly think it was super-secretive or super-surprising. However, the minister felt that way and took the time to send me the glossy brochure, which was, I think, a little bit of overkill.

In summary, I do support the bill with the amendments we have put forward. I will be watching with great interest the other boards and committees that the Premier has on his hit list. As I said, I know he is looking at some and is keeping a watching brief on others, and I will also be keeping a watching brief on those just to make sure that we have the best interests of South Australia at heart and are not shuffling all the power, as we said, across to the government and the chief executives so that they can rule the roost and call every shot. We know that boards and committees play a very important role in allowing the community to contribute to the goings-on and the running of government, and it is very important to keep that balance.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:12): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees-Abolition and Reform) Bill and would like to use the opportunity to speak about 'where to from here' with the review of boards. I particularly want to talk about the Teachers Registration Board of South Australia, and some of the comparisons with teachers registration boards across the country.

I hope that the Teachers Registration Board will be reviewed, because I think it is time that it was updated. If we look at what happens in other states, our board looks similar in some respects but it looks a lot different in other respects. For example, here in South Australia we have a board of 16 members, seven of whom must be union members. Of those, five must be members of the Australian Education Union and two must be members of the Australian Independent Education Union. It is the only teachers registration board—other than the ACT, which only has one union representative on a board of 14—where non-union members are actually excluded from participating.

That may have been okay the 1970s and 1980s, when everyone on the left side of politics was going around calling each other comrade, but we are a modern society now, and we know that union membership in the area of teachers, in particular, is nowhere near as strong as it was in those days. Not allowing non-union members to put their hand up to be members of the Teachers Registration Board is, I think, disappointing. All the talent that the Teachers Registration Board has access to is not available to it simply because of an outdated act of parliament.

If we look at comparisons, the Victorian system has a similar size board, where three people have to be elected from registered teachers who are currently teaching in a government school. There is no requirement to be a union member. Then we have the same for registered teachers who are at a non-government school: again, there is no requirement to be a union member. Of course, in the South Australian situation it is the union that also decides, through their own election process, who those delegates are. Even teachers in schools who are not union members are not able to have a say about who could be members of the Teachers Registration Board because, being non-union members, they are not included in the process at all.

If we look at the New South Wales system, again there are requirements: five members are to be elected from persons employed to teach, other than the principal, in a government school. These are described as 'representatives of government teachers'. Again, there is no requirement for them to be members of the union and no requirement for the Australian Education Union to be involved in that appointment. It is an appointment that is conducted by teachers themselves without the exclusive rights of the union. Even in the ACT, where there is a member of the Education Union, it is only one member on a board of 14; it is not five members on a board of 16. You can see that the board in South Australia is out of whack with all the other boards.

I think the model board for the South Australian minister to consider would be the Western Australian board, which is less prescriptive than any of the other boards. It comprises seven members, and we know small boards can be very effective and very efficient. All seven members are appointed by the Minister for Education, and I have confidence that if we had a similar system in South Australia our Minister for Education would be more than qualified to put the right people on that board.

One member of the Western Australian board must be an Australian lawyer and at least three must be currently registered teachers. The minister also nominates the chairperson and the deputy chairperson. The only requirement the minister needs to consider is that 'board members are selected on the basis of their experience, skills, qualifications and relevance to the board's functions', not on their affiliation to a union, a political party or any other organisation but on their experience,

skills and qualifications to do the job. That is a model I would like the education minister in South Australia to seriously consider when the Teachers Registration Board does in fact go through the review process.

Looking at what happens around Australia was an interesting exercise. As I have explained in my remarks, at a glance you could argue that what South Australia is doing is not a lot different from what is happening in other states, but when you get down to the detail you can see that a good number of hardworking and dedicated professionals in our education system, our teachers, are excluded from participating in the process simply because they choose to exercise the right that any member of our society has—that is, whether or not to join a union.

There should not be a requirement that people be union members in order to be considered for government boards that are appointed on merit. They are appointed to do a very important job—to make sure our children are safe and our teachers are qualified and have the skills and ability to teach our children and deliver quality education in South Australia.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:19): I agree with the comments made by the member for Unley. I would like to think that members of these boards and committees were awarded their positions based on merit and nothing else. That could just be my utopia, but I would like to think that in an ideal world that would happen. It should happen. For what reason should people be appointed to these positions, positions that are funded by the taxpayer, other than merit?

Overall, I would support the bill with amendment, as has previously been mentioned today. In particular, I would like to talk about four boards and committees and why they should stay under the government's proposals: firstly, the South Australian Tourism Commission; secondly, the Pastoral Board; thirdly, the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee; and, fourthly, the Health Performance Council.

Speaking broadly, the government has certainly stated their intent to abolish a whole plethora of boards and committees, and they will have many opportunities before they make their ultimate decision. However, there is no doubt in my mind that there may be merit in abolishing some boards and committees. On this side of the fence, we believe that efficiency is certainly a good thing. If you are able to utilise the state's resources, the taxpayer resources, that is a good thing and, if you can do that for the benefit of South Australians, why not? However, we do have a concern about a blanket reform measure that says that you should abolish only to cut costs, say. You should not just cut for cost because there are valuable services, opinions and reports and many functions these boards and committees provide.

They are formed mainly of experts in a chosen field. It is important that they advise the relevant committees, relevant boards and relevant ministers because they are mainly experts in their field. Often, they come up with very valuable findings so, if there is no cause or real argument to abolish them, that should not be done. I note that the Premier has announced that of the 429 boards and committees, 90 would be retained, 107 would be abolished, 17 would be merged, and 62 will be subject to further review, I understand.

I believe that this bill initially abolishes some 56, or thereabouts, either completely or by merging them with another entity. I have spoken about four in particular that I think should be kept, and these have been key and pivotal in identifying for the lawmakers and the government of the day areas of development and opportunity to delve into benefits the state can explore, so I encourage the government to look at keeping these.

Firstly, I look at the South Australian Tourism Commission Board, a board established under the South Australian Tourism Commission Act 1993 and the governing body of the SATC. Every financial year, the board enters into a performance agreement with the tourism minister, covering areas such as tourism policy, planning, market share, industry sustainability, advocacy, visibility, financial management and performance measurement. I think that it serves a very important role and that we should certainly look at keeping it at least for the time being.

If there are financial constraints, and that may be the case, perhaps this needs to be made clear to the board. If they need amended key performance indicators, and that needs to be seen in light of the financial situation, that should be made clear to the board. I think it is wrong just to come

out swinging and say that you are going to sack some boards and not others. What the market is after is certainty, and what these boards and committees are after is certainty.

I think we should definitely engage and consult with them and give them some time lines and ask them to perform and meet certain targets, and if those targets are not met after a certain point in time, sure, perhaps then they need to be looked at, but I do not think that has been done. In fairness to that particular board, I think it should be maintained.

Secondly, I would like to speak about the Pastoral Board. The member for Stuart had a lot to say, I believe, about the Pastoral Board. It serves an absolutely fundamental role in not only his electorate but also across the state. They have certainly been focusing on many strategic priorities in recent times. I just wish to draw upon them to highlight how important they are and why I believe that they should stay.

For example, I note that they provided advice to DEWNR on progress against the SASP targets by 2020, to achieve a 25 per cent improvement in the condition of pastoral land. In the SA NRM plan guiding target 7, the board discussed how its business can contribute to achieving that target and also how the board would report on the target. They have also recognised that various new interests and issues have emerged since the enactment of the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989. I note that this act is still subject to discussion for variation, and the board has also discussed ways to ensure that it can continue to meet its responsibilities through the mechanisms of the pastoral act.

They communicate widely with many stakeholders, often in parts of rural South Australia. Many of these stakeholders often find that, because they are in remote areas, they certainly see this board as a mouthpiece for their interests. I believe that they also entered into a memorandum of understanding with the SA Arid Lands NRM Board in response to improving relationships and synergies with other statutory boards. That MOU has formalised a strong working relationship between the two bodies. They have also done a lot of work with regard to public access routes. Pastoral lessees have also been reminded of their responsibilities regarding boundary fencing and the impacts on neighbours of straying sheep, in light of the increase in farming of alternative breeds of sheep in the rangelands.

They have also had a lot to do with Indigenous land use agreements. Say no more. That is an area where it is fair to say that the government needs improvement in that regard. I could go on and on, but it goes without saying that the Pastoral Board is a fundamental part of the backbone of the remote parts of South Australia and the economies that that supports, economies such as agriculture. It is certainly a very important board and we should look to maintain it.

Thirdly, we have the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee. I know animal welfare is close to your heart, Deputy Speaker, and it is also close to mine. We have seen in recent times issues regarding, say, baiting in the greyhound industry. We know that, from time to time, these issues are raised and they are very serious and important issues. It is committees like this that aim to really provide much needed support to those who own animals and those who trade in animals, and we should certainly look to keep this committee.

They have also, in the last year, provided a whole range of positive changes in South Australia relating to animal welfare not only by responding to ministerial requests for advice in a timely manner but also providing advice to the minister and to DEWNR on draft policies and proposed legislation. I note that they have been involved in the code of practice for the humane destruction of wombats, for example.

They have also provided responses to national standards and guidelines for animal welfare. I note that at its March 2013 meeting the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee considered and commented on the draft Australian Animal Welfare Standards and Guidelines—Livestock at Saleyards, and they were involved in an associated discussion paper as well. In fact, their comments were conveyed to the national writing group for consideration.

They have also provided many comments on codes of practice and developing codes of practice, as well as developing position statements. They provided a series of these position statements regarding specific animal welfare issues. These statements, I am led to believe, have

been reviewed on a regular basis to determine things like relevancy, and they are amended as appropriate. New statements are added as they are considered and, in 2012-13, the committee reviewed its position statements to align with the six categories of animals used within the Australian Animal Welfare Strategy. There is also the sharing of information between nominating organisations and agencies. Subject specialists provided the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee with presentations on many admirable causes, so they should certainly be maintained.

Last, but not least, I think we should also look at keeping the Health Performance Council. The Health Performance Council provides a fundamental role to South Australia. They are an independent body and they review South Australia's health system, as I understand it, across not only private but also public and community sectors, and they speak about and look at prevention strategies in both primary care and hospital care. They are separate from health departments and they are separate from health services. Their independence is a good thing because it means that they are not owned by anyone. It means that they can provide frank advice on whether strategies are being implemented as planned on merit and without bias. This is why they are so important.

They have no specific affiliation to any union or any interest group. They are independent, and in a world today where our health outcomes are not where they need to be and as high as they should be, we need good independent bodies like the Health Performance Council to provide the checks and balances, as well as the other array of expertise they provide. They do report to the Minister for Health every four years and they have recently provided an annual report to the parliament. They should certainly be kept.

I believe that the four boards and committees I have mentioned today should be preserved, so I plead with the government of the day to have mercy. Please do not cut what are very important imperative boards and committees. I understand that there are financial implications of keeping some of these; however, we should not just take an axe to things that provide expertise and benefit to South Australians. We need to be selective. We need to be very measured with this, and I would ask and plead that the government keep these four boards and committees. With those comments and the amendments that I propose, I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (16:32): I will speak only very briefly prior to our moving into committee. I would like to thank all the boards and committees who were engaged in the consultation process and thank those who we will be discontinuing for their service. I thank the ministers and their officers. It is an immensely complex piece of legislation that has required a lot of coordination through public servants, as well as ministerial officers, and I thank them for their efforts. I thank the members of the opposition who have made a contribution to the second reading speech, and I look forward to engaging in some productive work at the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 13 passed.

Clause 14.

The CHAIR: The first amendment belongs to the minister, is that correct?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I do not wish to proceed with that.

Ms CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Chapman-1]—

Page 13, line 8 [clause 14(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

This supports our proposal in respect of keeping the Animal Ethics Committee. It is in support of our position on the Animal Welfare Act amendments, which I have referred to in the second reading speech. I do not think I need to progress it further. I understand the government have reconsidered this matter and are agreeing to retain that committee. We thank them for their thoughtful

consideration of that. I indicate that amendments Nos 2 and 3 also relate to the retention of that committee.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 15.

Mr GARDNER: I would like to signal an objection to this clause. To be clear, the opposition proposes that, as a result of the opposition's amendments, we not proceed with this clause.

Clause negatived.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I will not proceed with amendments Nos 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Clauses 16 to 19 passed.

Clause 20.

Ms CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Chapman-1]—

Page 14, lines 14 and 15 [clause 20(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

This amendment will have the effect of deleting subclause (2), consistent with our position on the Animal Welfare Act amendments.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 21 to 29 passed.

Clause 30.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 1 [PubSec-1]—

Page 16, line 8—Delete 'subsection' and substitute 'subsections (4) and'

This is a technical amendment that reflects consultation occurring under two clauses, not just one, as was originally drafted.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 31 to 61 passed.

Clause 62.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 6 [PubSec-2]—

Page 20, line 31—Delete 'Primary Producers SA Incorporated' and substitute 'Livestock SA Incorporated'

This amendment is needed in order to replace the South Australian Farmers Federation as a board member appointed to the replacement entity. It is appropriate that Livestock SA, rather than the peak body, Primary Producers SA, be appointed.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 63 to 89 passed.

Clauses 90 to 96 negatived.

Clauses 97 to 150 passed.

Clause 151.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am advised that in respect of the original draft amendments to hold the four boards we need this clause to be opposed. This was kindly pointed out by the drafting parliamentary counsel.

Clause negatived.

Clause 152 negatived.

Clauses 153 to 183 passed.

Clause 184.

Ms CHAPMAN: I indicate that we are opposing part 29 of the Opal Mining Act which, if removed, will help preserve the Pastoral Board.

Clause negatived.

Clauses 185 to 216.

Ms CHAPMAN: Part 30 is the area proposed in the bill to abolish the Pastoral Board. We will be opposing the abolition of part 30, which is clauses 185 to 216.

Clauses negatived.

Clauses 217 to 264 passed.

Clause 265.

Ms CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Chapman–1]—

Page 63, lines 12 to 17 [clause 265(1) to (3) (inclusive)]—Delete subclauses (1) to (3) (inclusive)

This amendment seeks to delete the subclauses as indicated to preserve the tourism board and similarly, amendments Nos 7, 8 and 9 all too have the effect of preserving the tourism board and I understand that is agreed to by the government. The numbering has changed a bit, so if I have not referred to the correct numbering in the edicts of this 9(1) schedule, I am happy for you to indicate otherwise.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 266 passed.

Clause 267 negatived.

Clause 268 passed.

Clause 269 negatived.

Clauses 270 to 271 passed.

Clause 272 negatived.

Remaining clauses (273 to 318) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (16:50): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:50): I rise to, firstly, thank the government for their I think thoughtful consideration of the importance of preserving the South Australian Tourism Commission Board, the Pastoral Board and the animal ethics structure we have to provide advice to the government; and, finally, and for me most importantly, the Health Performance Council. I hope that on the last day of parliament tomorrow, in anticipation that this bill is going to pass the parliament here and go to the other place, we will have the four-yearly Health Performance Council's report (which has now been sitting on the minister's desk for a number of months) tabled in parliament tomorrow, if not today.

I think it is very important that the government, in recognising the work of the Health Performance Council and agreeing to keep it alive and let it continue its work, tables that report as soon as possible. Certainly, at present, the government is asking the South Australian

community to make some very important decisions about health reform. I will not traverse the merits of it. Suffice to say that it is clear that the government have a view that they are proposing a better service that is going to be, ultimately, more financially efficient.

It may be, but at this stage there is a lot of controversy about it and the community is obviously speaking a lot about it. Especially after today, and the government's decision not to produce the full business case for this reform, it is absolutely important that we have that four-yearly performance review of the health department which is on the minister's desk. I would urge the government to do so.

I would also urge them, having agreed to keep the Health Performance Council, to reissue them with a request, or direction, from the health minister to resume responsibility for their research and work in the Indigenous program of Closing the Gap, which is a program which has bipartisan support and which is designed to bring together all efforts, energy and resources to ensure that we remove the inconsistency of the life expectancy of our Indigenous Australians compared with others. At the moment, it is a woeful disparity, and I think everyone in the parliament is keen to ensure that there is a reduction and, ultimately, elimination of that kind of disparity.

I thank the government for agreeing to keep these other important boards. I think other members have made contributions which outline the importance of the other three boards. My lack of detailing of their merits in this third reading speech does not in any way suggest that they are less important than the Health Performance Council, but thank you to the government.

I wish them well in the further exercise they have, because they have reviewed over 400 boards. There is a big long list that they have published in their final report that they have provided (and which is available online) that they still have under consideration that they have not decided to remove or restructure. It is a lengthy exercise.

We will continue to work with the government to relieve the responsibility of boards or committees that no longer have a useful purpose; we agree that they should go. I think that rather than doing these reviews over each number of years it would be helpful if, at the conclusion of a board's effective operation, it is actually dissolved at that point; otherwise the thing sits around for a long time, wasting money and resources. Those people could be effective somewhere else.

We look forward to the next tranche of reform, and hope that when the opposition does present a meritorious argument for reform in a different way to what the government has in mind that it will listen again. I thank those on this side of the house for their extensive consultation with their stakeholders and for making sure, on this occasion, that four have survived the knife.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL 2015

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March 2015.)

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:56): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill 2015, and I am sure I will capture your imagination with every moving word I present to you, Deputy Speaker. I do await the surprises this Labor government has in store for the people of South Australia when the state budget is handed down in the coming months. The Supply Bill 2015 is for the appropriation of money from the consolidated account for 2015-16, and that amount is in the order of \$3.291 billion.

Under this state government South Australia has, over the past 13 years, worked up a significant credit card debt. Facing this deficit, the Labor government has further taxed businesses and households until the cost of living is so high that the price for everyday life is unachievable for many. I guess that is what I face as a local member and what everyone in this place faces as local members, we face the pressures felt by our constituents on everyday living. In my case I have many, and that list is increasing with people who are not coping with the cost of day-to-day living, particularly with the tax burden, with the rising cost of utilities, with the costs of all types of government charges continuing to rise.

It is having an impact on people's psyche here in South Australia, and that is probably what concerns me most. It is not only about the cost of living, but about people being able to cope with the day-to-day pressures of just living. Having that financial burden does play on people's minds and knocks their confidence around, because knowing that they cannot deal with those day-to-day pressures distracts them from what they should be thinking about, what they should be doing—working, looking for work, just having an everyday life and living life as it is.

As an example, I was recently at my son's university graduation, where the vice chancellor claimed that 91 per cent of graduates would have a job within four months. I was very proud on Monday watching my son graduate construction management with honours. He has secured himself a permanent position at McMahon Services. It is a great South Australian family business. He is one of the lucky ones. He has a good work ethic, he is smart and he works hard, but there are many like him who just cannot get a job. Many graduates and people with qualifications, some skilled and some unskilled, just cannot get work in South Australia, so the young ones in particular are leaving this state in droves. We know that interstate migration and unemployment is playing a significant role in the future of South Australia.

Where will these people get skilled jobs? Where will international migrants coming over here with skills get jobs? Where will the new graduates coming out of university get jobs? We know that a lot of the skilled graduates who come out of university are international students. It is always nice to think that the majority of them will stay but, as we know, many of them do not. They come here to get a good education, to get the qualifications and then return home.

The number of young people leaving South Australia is of immediate concern. My son has mentioned that many of his friends who have qualifications have decided that it is too hard and they are seeking employment interstate, and overseas in a lot of cases, because of the lack of confidence in our business sector to employ more and more people due to such an uncertain investment future in South Australia.

We have talked about net interstate migration from South Australia. It was 2,968 in 2013-14 alone but, on average, 2,925 residents have left South Australia for another state each year during the term of this Labor government. I do not have the Treasurer's calculator in front of me, but over nearly 14 years we are losing nearly 3,000 residents each year. That is significant. The majority of those residents who are leaving South Australia are skilled and they are taking skills with them. Again, our workforce is poorer for that interstate migration.

This month's ABS data revealed that South Australia recorded its worst trend unemployment rate in 13 years, with the title of the highest unemployment rate in the nation in terms of both trend and seasonally adjusted data. That is a damning statistic. I know the Premier and many of our ministers talk about seasonally adjusted, but this is trended. These statistics are seasonally adjusted and they are trended, and it is a damning number.

There are 6,400 fewer jobs now than when Labor made the 2010 election promise to create 100,000 jobs in South Australia within six years. That promise has been absolutely blown out of the water. It was a promise at both the 2010 state election and the 2014 state election. The Premier did state many times that it was an ambitious promise, but we all know that his ambitious promise and reality are far away from each other. I think reality is what South Australia is facing at the moment.

The creation of 100,000 jobs in six years was political spin, let us face it. There was no justification and no reality behind making that commitment, and we see that today. If we look at unemployment figures, they are seasonally adjusted and annualised, and it is not something that we can walk away from. It is a real figure that has credence. To create jobs in South Australia, as the Leader of the Opposition continually uses as one of his talking points, we need to lower taxes, reduce red tape and encourage business to invest and be part of our economic growth.

I can assure you, as a business owner myself, that when the economic climate is dim there is little incentive to have confidence. I would be very hesitant to further invest in my business, and I would be hesitant to employ more people. For many years, as my business got bigger, I employed more and more people, and if it did get into the hundreds of people, it did, but that was through heady times. As those commodity prices came back, as we had weather implications on the workforce, I adjusted. We have a government that is not prepared to adjust their expectations. They are prepared

to sit on their laurels and continue to give us that unsubstantiated winding of political spin that 100,000 jobs will be achievable—ambitious but achievable. We all know that it is a long way from being achievable.

In terms of taxes on homes and businesses, there was the introduction of a rise in the ESL. Any business that was studious enough to build up their brand and business to make it bigger and better and employ more people was hit even harder by the ESL rise. Anyone that has a building business or is contributing to the state's economy, employing people, was hit the hardest by the ESL increase, particularly landowners and farmers because they are asset rich and finance poor, particularly with the commodities that we are facing at this time.

I think it was the member for Goyder who said that he had constituents whose ESL increases were up over 1,000 per cent. It is just outrageous and it is another disincentive for small to medium enterprises to build their business and to employ more people. There are about 4,000 small businesses in Chaffey, and the cost of doing business I think is outrageous. Land tax has been another burden, and red tape is crippling businesses of all sizes. Whether you are a large or a small business, you are all hit with that land tax relatively.

As of 30 June 2014 there were 143,585 businesses which operated mainly from South Australia, 14 fewer than at the same time 12 months earlier, despite the national number rising. That is a trend that South Australia must be aware of. We cannot keep denying that people are closing their doors. In some cases, businesses are consolidating. The neighbour is buying out the neighbour, the small business within a certain sector is buying out his competitor. Yes, that is happening, but that has happened forever. That has been a natural progression forever. If you are a business owner and you aspire to be bigger and better and employ more people you buy out your competitors, because by getting rid of your competitors it gives you that market advantage and a competitive advantage going into markets.

South Australia has the lowest rate of business entries of any mainland state. Only 11.4 per cent of new businesses commenced last year compared with the national average of 13.7 per cent. Again, we are behind the eight ball when it comes to setting up new business, and that is all around confidence, it is all around the government of the day putting it out there and giving support and confidence to the business sectors as to why they should embark upon improving their business or setting up a new business. It does not have to be about the government giving handouts; it is just about the government installing confidence in the business sector.

The Australian Energy Regulator's most recent annual report on retail market performance revealed that there was a 32 per cent increase from the previous year of South Australians in electricity retailer hardship programs—32 per cent more people are on hardship programs. They cannot afford to pay their bills on a monthly or a quarterly basis. I think that is a sad indictment—and that number is rising. I am sure that the minister must have concerns, and if he does not have concerns he is not looking at his data, that is clear.

The average low-income household in South Australia experienced a 10 per cent increase in its gas bill. There is an above-average number of South Australian customers on payment plans with a high level of debt. So it is not just about being on those programs, it is about the debt burden sitting behind those programs.

There is a reason that people cannot pay their bills and it is not just that they do not earn enough money for the cost of living, it is because the bank has said to them, 'We won't lend you any more money.' Their debt has increased to a point where the bank has concerns about their viability or it is people who have just got a job and cannot make ends meet.

Many people, particularly the elderly, are taking drastic measures to get by. I know a number of elderly people who have come to me with medical conditions but they cannot put heaters on and they cannot put air conditioners on. That is just the way they combat rising costs of living. They do not have creature comforts; they use a candle instead of a light—that really is a sad indictment of this state. I guess that is painting a pretty gloomy picture about what is happening in South Australia. It is alarming that 56,000 South Australians have those large gas and electricity debts.

I turn to the retailers. A staggering 1,339 tourism businesses, the majority of which are small businesses, have disappeared from South Australia since 2010. There are 58 alone in Chaffey that have gone, in the Riverland, Murraylands and Mallee. That is an alarming statistic: 58 tourism businesses alone. We are not talking about SMEs looking at supplying services or small businesses that support the main street—these are tourism businesses that are part of our tourism economy. I know the minister said that he would like to build up South Australia's tourism economy to \$8 billion by 2020. Again, that is almost a projection that is a little bit like the 100,000 increased jobs in six years.

Since the government came to power in 2002, state taxes have increased by 106 per cent; property charges have increased by 120 per cent; electricity bills, as I stated, have increased by 140 per cent; gas bills have increased by 157 per cent. Of course, water bills have increased by a massive 236 per cent. Again, why have water bills increased? Because they are using SA Water as a cash cow. It is just an offset for this state government. It is propping up one sector to prop up another sector.

The Treasurer regularly points out that we privatised ETSA, we privatised electricity, and yet I notice here a 140 per cent increase since 2002. We have not privatised the water utility, SA Water. We have not privatised it and yet it is up by 236 per cent. Maybe the Treasurer needs to go back to his computer and work out why because I know he regularly uses that to get his numbers right.

A recent survey I conducted particularly in the Mallee showed that 40 per cent of all respondents to that survey ranked the cost of living as their number one concern. So out of all people surveyed, everyone registered a concern with the cost of living but 40 per cent registered as the number one priority the cost of living as a real concern.

On the issue of investment and trade, Labor finally has a strategy for South-East Asia. It is funny because I was exporting into South-East Asia 25 years ago and I had a strategy back then and it worked. I exported a lot of my produce, my citrus, into South-East Asia. Back then the economy was a poorer economy but, luckily for them, their economy is growing and they are much more buoyant now and importing a lot more fruit. While \$300,000 was allocated towards putting that strategy together, the Premier has failed to reveal any allocation of funding to put actions forward on a strategy to enter that South-East Asian marketplace.

Interestingly, no member of the opposition was invited to the launch of the strategy. I met with the Minister for Trade a number of times and I looked through some of his press releases last year and he always criticised the government for the lack of bipartisanship and yet we did not see any bipartisanship at the recent launch, not a bit. We even had mention that there were no Liberal members at the launch. How good is that? That is a minister who has really got his bipartisanship working beautifully.

The strategy also highlights the recent record to invest. The 2015 Asian Cup soccer was held in Australia, but the government failed to take part in it. We talk about 1.5 billion viewers for the India-Pakistan game, but we do not talk about the 2.5 billion viewers for the Asian Cup final. Where is the logic? Australia were part of it but not Adelaide, yes, but we had 2.5 billion international viewers. They were all looking at that green and gold jersey take the win, so that was great to see.

South Australia's trade into South-East Asia bordered on \$2 billion in 2013-14, the second largest after China, but it is well under the \$2.2 billion or \$2.3 billion from 2010-11 and 2011-12. Opportunities for high value-added products into South-East Asia is really where it is at. Changes to the Gateway Business Program have now been realised and were long overdue. We look at less than \$1 million in helping an export program. If we go to Victoria and New South Wales they are talking about \$100 million, and you wonder why their economies are growing at the rate they are.

With sport and rec, Labor is persisting in cutting the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program by \$3.5 million that kicks into effect in 2015-16. It is all about grassroots facilities; they will miss out. The ESL impacts on grassroots sports clubs. The impact it had on Adelaide Oval is a perfect example. We also had the fun tax on transport around sport and the \$50 voucher program.

Time expired.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (17:17): I rise to indicate my support for the Supply Bill. It is interesting that we are debating the Supply Bill in the same week as we had a eulogy, so to speak, for the former prime minister, the Rt Hon. Malcolm Fraser, who changed Australia federally over supply.

I thought about what I was going to say and I thought seriously about this state government, and I decided on this quote: one week they do nothing and the next week they do twice as much of nothing. I think it is an applicable quote. The list goes on and there are a host of things. My colleague, the member for Chaffey, has gone comprehensively through a list of financial figures and other things in his contribution. I do not intend to do that because I am sure we will hear it again, but I would like to put on the record a number of issues that are causing grief. Some of the issues will not be a surprise to you, such as the Repat Hospital.

I can tell you that the forecast closure of the Repatriation Hospital by the Weatherill government is causing enormous amounts of angst in my community, as it is across South Australia. I cannot comprehend how stupid this government is, nor how stupid the bureaucrats apparently are, in doing what they are doing, particularly to the veterans' community. It is abhorrent, it is a disgrace and it is a sad announcement for South Australia. I have some 700 vets in my electorate, many of them Vietnam vets, and they are letting me know in no uncertain terms what they think of the closure of the Repat Hospital.

We have seen what the government is proposing for emergency services reform and, to say the least, the Minister for Emergency Services has worn it loud and clear and continues to wear it, and does not seem to want to hear what is going on in the area of emergency services. The shame of it is that last night I went out to Centre Hall to meet some guests. There was a group of people out there who had come from near and far to meet with the Minister for Emergency Services only to find that he was not here. I said, 'He hasn't been here all day.'

The minister's office or the minister himself—I am not sure who is responsible—are so incompetent that they never even told these people, when they would have known first thing in the morning that the minister was not here. They never bothered to ring him up to tell him. It is outrageous and it is a disgrace. Fortunately, I spoke with one member on the other side, and I understand that he was able to run around and try to do something about it, but it was a disgrace.

The CFS, SES and MFS are all up in arms, and I am sure my colleague the member for Morphett will have more to say about that. People are confused. They are fed up with volunteering and being taken as fools. They do not want substantial change. It is quite often quoted that South Australia does not like change. Probably Australians generally do not like a lot of change but, on something like that, to change what in my mind is a successful formula for purely political purposes is ridiculous.

I would like to mention and put my aim fairly and squarely on the firearms section of SAPOL. It is a disgrace, and I say that because I am getting increasing numbers of concerns, emails and comments on the issue of licence renewals. Just let me bring up licence renewals. You get your renewal, you go and get your photo taken, you send it in and you get a piece of paper that is supposed to cover you for 28 days until your plastic licence arrives. Guess what is not happening? They are not arriving. Sometimes, after two months, they still have no plastic licence.

This firearms section is an incompetent section of SAPOL—incompetent, to say the least. People who wish to go interstate with their firearms for a competition or whatever reason are finding that they do not have their plastic renewal, so technically the 28 days have run out and they are not licensed. Is that fair? I say no. On top of that, if you wish to buy a new gun, the delay in getting your gun after you purchase it and put in the application, etc., which used to take a couple weeks, is now weeks.

Members on the other side of the house may wish to pick up these things because I think that there is a deliberate strategy and that the people of South Australia are being targeted by someone or more than one person in the firearms section to deliberately make life difficult for good, honest South Australians who wish to use firearms for sport or, in my case, on the land. We carry a firearm around in the vehicle for various reasons.

Training approvals: if you wish to do a training course for a pistol, that is taking absolutely ages. To top it all off, when you are sent your firearms renewal, like any other sort of bill some people tend to put it to one side and forget about it. If you do that with your power bill or your water bill or your gas bill, you get a reminder, but, no, not with firearms. You are not getting any reminders for your firearms licence.

What has happened to more than one of my constituents is they have had a knock on the door in the evening from a police officer who has had the firearms section advise them. They have to do it, and I have sympathy for the police officers who have to do it. They are going and knocking on doors, and they are required to take DNA samples of people who have not renewed their firearms licence, quite often because they have just forgotten and overlooked it. They are having a DNA sample taken, they are having their firearms confiscated and they are having to go to court and be prosecuted by the police over a simple thing like just overlooking the bill.

Why on earth the firearms section cannot send out a reminder on the day after it is due I do not know. A lady in my electorate was basically left in tears after being visited by the local police. She ended up in court, and the magistrate actually threw it out. He threw the case out, quite correctly in my view. It is simply not good enough. The firearms section in South Australia under SAPOL needs a giant stir and a giant turnover and it needs to be brought back to reality. I do not know exactly, but probably 99 per cent of people who have firearms, or at least the vast majority, do the right thing and use them properly. Unfortunately, the criminal element that does the wrong thing means that the vast majority of the population is persecuted. I am not happy about it.

Distractions like the time zone debate are going through yet again. I will not make any comment on my view, but let me say that the people of my electorate are letting me know in no uncertain terms that they do not want a change to the time zone in South Australia. That will run its course and we will see what happens. It is a mere distraction to the main event—the main event being, of course, the state of the economy, jobs and everything else that goes with being in government in South Australia.

In my electorate, the matter of health reform and Transforming Health have created a lot of angst. The member for Hammond and I held a couple of forums, one in Goolwa and one in Victor Harbor, a couple of weeks ago. The people of Goolwa, whom the member for Hammond can talk about in his contribution, are not happy. The people in Victor Harbor are confused, to say the least. The councils are not happy. They were never consulted. The fact that they are basically doing the private sector doctors out of a job down on the South Coast is not going down well.

That, in tandem with what has happened at Yankalilla with the Southern Fleurieu Medical Practice, where they have taken the funding away so that now people have to go to South Coast or Noarlunga hospitals to get treatment after hours, is indicative of the contempt that rural South Australia is held in by this Labor government, who have been there 13 years and made a mess of it.

Issues on the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island and in the electorate of Finniss do not go away. They will continue to be debated and discussed, I am sure, long after I have left this place. The issue of roads is ongoing. On the Fleurieu, which, according to the figures I have been given, is visited by three million people a year, the condition of some of the roads is not good.

In the western Fleurieu, the road from Myponga through to Yankalilla is a goat track. It is a disgrace and, unfortunately, I see no plans—and from my discussions with departmental people, there are no plans—to do anything about that road, such as taking out the bends. It is the lifeline for all the vehicular traffic, such as trucks and cars, etc., that go through to Yankalilla and also down to Cape Jervis and on to Kangaroo Island.

That leads me on to another subject: water. I would have thought that, with the long-range view that the population is increasing down that way, water reticulation past Yankalilla and through to Second Valley, Rapid Bay and Cape Jervis would be a priority. If you spend the money, you will get something back as it will increase the population, but there seems to be no sign of that either.

The Victor Harbor to Adelaide road is a perennial thorn. There is nothing the media likes talking about more than the dreadful Victor Harbor to Adelaide road. Let me tell you that if the government and the department would just come up with the idea of starting by duplicating the

Cut Hill section of the road, I would be mighty happy, but there is no sign of that. Why? Because it is not in the metropolitan area.

The emergency services levy has hit the people in my electorate and across wider South Australia like a ton of bricks. It is nothing more than a tax on the family home; it is land tax brought back in on the family home. That is what I am telling people and that is the simple fact of the matter. This is an incompetent, bumbling, financial disaster of a government and it is going from bad to worse.

If you put that in tandem with the absolutely ridiculous campaign by the state government when \$1 million is being spent to criticise the feds for removing pensioner concessions, you can put it all together. Unfortunately, the Local Government Association was conned by this government into believing that that was correct. I have simply told my constituents that, of the \$190 pensioner concession, a mere 10 per cent was federally funded.

On top of that, the fact that every other state in Australia has maintained those pensioner concessions, yet South Australia continues to just go on and try and blame the federal government for its incompetence, defies comprehension. I am not going to back down on that and I know this side of the house, as you well know, intends to do something about that in another place. We will see what comes of that later in the year. I am hopeful that the Premier, the Treasurer and cabinet may come to their collective senses and make sure that those pensioner concessions are combined in the state budget when it is handed down in a few weeks' time.

A big issue across both sides of the water again is drugs, and the drug ice. We are seeing the impact of ice in the sad case of Ben Cousins in Western Australia and others, and the impact is horrendous. I am seriously, seriously worried. I have raised the impact of ice with the mayors and councils in my electorate. I am putting it in my newsletters. It is not good enough for the community to be worried about ramifications; they must inform the police if they see activities or if they view their own families and see something that is not the norm. It is killing our younger generation particularly; it is a tragedy. Both sides of the house, I am sure, would be fully united on this, but we have to do more. We have to convince people to let the police know and do something about it when they do have evidence. I am encouraging my constituents on a regular occasion to do that.

There are just a few other things I want to talk about, including, on the other side of the water, Kangaroo Island. Four weeks ago yesterday, they held the interviews for the three days a week commissioner for Kangaroo Island, which you may recall we debated in here for 7½ hours. Three days a week, interviews four weeks ago, so I am told, and still no commissioner. It will be interesting to see what is happening over there. I have been highly critical and I will continue to be highly critical of the commissioner's position—not the person, but the position. I think it is a waste of time. I believe it will be the beginning of the end of the Kangaroo Island Council. Unfortunately, some do not see it that way, but we will wait and see what transpires there.

I would also raise the issue of Brand KI, an organisation that came into existence just before the end of last year and is being very pushy, overly aggressive and, in my view, right out of their depth in doing what they are trying to do. Government members may want to chase up on this, but I am told that Brand KI has been given \$750,000 of taxpayers' money from the Kangaroo Island Futures Authority. If this is correct, I shake my head in disbelief.

While we cannot find enough money to deal with roads, health and drug problems, we can spend \$750,000 on spurious ideas such as Brand KI. The selling point for Kangaroo Island is the very name. It is the very name and always has been. I witnessed and attended a function a couple of years ago where this was thrown around, and at the end of the day most people decided that it was not worth the paper it was written on. However, there has been a persistence by some to try to get this up. They now have a logo. That logo is Kangaroo Island with a heap of spots around it, which I thought were oil wells, but then I was told by one that they are actually fishing spots. I said, 'Well, they are in the sanctuary zones.'

What really worries me is they have conned the Kangaroo Island Council on this by being aggressive. I view it seriously, because I do not believe there is adequate community consultation. I have written, both in my current capacity and also as a ratepayer and former mayor of Kangaroo Island, a separate letter. I think it is outrageous that they have been bulldozed into this. From what I

understand, new councillors do not know what has happened. If they are willing to spend \$750,000 on such a foolish idea, I shake my head in disbelief. We will see: there are many more things that the money could have been spent on.

I quote King Island because King Island was the peak, I suppose, in identification of branding. It had a magnificent local brand and they were producing cheese, beef and all sorts of things with the King Island name on it. Do you know what? None of it is produced there anymore—there is none manufactured there, I should say. It is still produced but it is not manufactured. The abattoir is gone and the cheese factory is gone, and so on.

Not all Kangaroo Island people have been conned by this, I might add. There are a number who have spoken to me who will not have a bar of it. They are trying to force government entities to adopt their logo—the schools, the hospital and suchlike, which I think is most foolish. The one that annoys me more than anything is that the identity of the Kangaroo Island Council has been lost. It was the first settlement in South Australia, which is something to hang your hat on. That has gone and we have seen this silly situation with this organisation pumped up by government funds, and I suspect that when the funds run out the organisation will run out, too.

I welcome the opportunity to make a few comments about my view of the world in relation to some of these subjects. I do not expect everyone to agree. I reiterate that my attention on the firearms section of SAPOL leads me to shake my head, again. I think it is outrageous. With those few words, I indicate again: this government, one week they do nothing and the next week they do twice as much of nothing.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:36): I appreciate this opportunity to make a few comments on behalf of the people of Stuart on the Supply Bill. Deputy Speaker, as you would know, the government is asking permission to spend \$3.291 billion in the next three months of the next financial year. Of course, we on this side of the house support that. Of course, it is necessary to do that. The financial year runs out but the budget bill is not passed for an unknown amount of time (approximately three months) so, of course, the government needs the right to spend that money as it sees fit to keep everything turning over.

The 'as it sees fit' is the part that gives us on this side of the house a great deal of concern. I will be as fair about this as I possibly can. It is an incredibly tough job running a state budget. It is an incredibly tough job to be the Treasurer. I know that Treasurer Koutsantonis has his heart in the job. Nobody doubts that he is trying to be the best Treasurer that he can possibly be. I think it is also only fair to point out that there are things that come along which are out of your control as a Treasurer or a state government.

The key, though, is that you have to be right on top of the things that are in your control and the fact that things come along which are out of your control cannot be used as an excuse—because, do you know what, Deputy Speaker, we all deal with that every day of the year in our own lives. It does not matter what level of financial acumen or what level of funding a person, household or business is dealing with, you have to deal with the unexpected things that come along and you have to be right on top of the things that you can control.

This year's budget is going to be very difficult for the government—incredibly difficult for the government. We are used to, and I think members in the government are used to, the fact that we have an ongoing, perpetuated pattern of the Labor government saying, 'We are going to be in deficit this year and maybe deficit next year but there will be a surplus the year or two after that.'

I have stood here and rolled off the specific numbers so many times, it is just terribly disheartening. But I am positive that, when we get around to budget time this year, the Treasurer will be saying, 'You know that promised surplus, I just don't think it's going to come, but don't worry there will be another one shortly down the track.' I say again that it is a difficult job being the Treasurer but it just cannot go on forever, and that is the pattern we have become used to.

Predicted GST income to this state will be significantly less than was previously forecast, and that is going to be a blow to this state. A very simple example of that is the fact that the price of fuel has dropped significantly over the past 12 months across the nation. Now, GST income to every state from purchases of fuel is one of the most significant contributors to each state's overall GST income, so when the price of fuel drops by approximately one-third for an extended period of time

the GST income from fuel that goes back to the state drops by approximately one-third. That will be very difficult to deal with, but it cannot be used as an excuse.

The federal government did cut money out of our state budget; not nearly as much as the government would have the public believe, but, yes, there were cuts. However, they cannot be used as an excuse either, and the government's advertising and public spend on those issues is pretty disgraceful. It completely overcooks that issue as if it were the issue that the government can hang its hat on for the fact that its own budget is not going to go as well as it should.

Royalty income will come down. Again, that is no fault of the government. When prices which are almost all set overseas come down, royalty income to the state comes down in a few different ways, not only from the reduction in price but also from the reduction in activity, and it has a very long-term impact. A reduction in the profitability of mining businesses—minerals, oil, gas—not only hurts now, it also hurts exploration, and exploration reduction now hurts mining operations—oil, gas, minerals, etc.—several years down the track.

That is going to be a blow, there is no doubt about that, and a lot of that is out of the government's control. Again, however, it cannot be used as an excuse because when you are running a state budget, when you are running a state's finances, you need to know that some of these things will come along. You need to know that you will get some good surprises—and let me say that former treasurer Foley got an enormous number of very good surprises which made him look better than he deserved, let me put it that way, with regard to his performance as a treasurer—but whether they are good surprises or bad surprises, you have to accept that that is what they are and get on with the things you can control, not use those other things as excuses.

I will give a couple of examples of things that are well within the government's control which it has not dealt with. I will start with the potential missed income to the state from the Gillman land deal. We have had at least two companies go to court saying that they think that deal was done inappropriately, and the very logical flow-on consequence of that is that it is pretty fair to assume that they would have paid more for that land. It is unrealistic to think that they would have tried to take the government to court over that issue if they were never going to pay any more for the land themselves. So there was a missed opportunity there.

There was \$160 million spent on Public Service redundancies, yet Public Service numbers have increased. The number of public servants we have operating in our state has gone up while the government has spent \$160 million trying to get them down. These figures are very readily available from the Hon. Rob Lucas in the other place, who pursues this issue very capably and in great detail. There is a huge gaping hole in the budget which was completely within the government's capacity to have addressed.

I will give another example. An amount of \$176 million will have to be spent—which was not budgeted and not forecast and not predicted, but will have to be spent—to deal with transition issues from the current Royal Adelaide Hospital to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Now, anyone building a new hospital to replace an old hospital would have known that there would transition issues with regard to transport, the moving of patients and equipment, and a whole range of issues that need to be dealt with. There is absolutely no way that former health minister John Hill would not have known that, that health minister Snelling would not have known that, that the Premier would not have known that. There is no possible way that those ministers would not have known that this was an issue that was going to have to be dealt with. That issue was well within the government's capacity, so the bad surprise of \$176 million cannot be blamed on anybody else.

I will give another example that we dealt with in question time today, which is the issue of petroleum exploration licence 570. We know that that is a petroleum exploration licence that was granted by the current Treasurer in April 2011, but we also know that not one bit of actual exploration work has taken place on that piece of dirt in the Cooper Basin. They were promised that work would be done and they handed out the licence or the permission based on that, and many other promises. They have actually allowed the successive companies which have owned that right to change their work programs over and over again, yet still nothing has been done.

We now have a situation where we are in a very difficult time for the oil and gas industry—prices are low, the business is depressed and it is very hard to get anything done, even on the very

best and most prospective tenements. There was opportunity for this one to have had some work done back in 2011 or 2012, but it did not happen. Now it is very unlikely to happen anytime soon because it is such a difficult time for the industry, whereas it was very buoyant back in those years. If the government had managed that process properly it is very likely that exploration would have been done. I cannot say whether the exploration would have been fruitful or not, because nobody can say that. Geologists and company directors can be very optimistic about it, but nobody knows. The reality is that now we have no chance, but if that process had been managed well, we would have had a chance.

There are a lot of things that the government will have to deal with that are out of their control, which they will blame, and they should not. There are a lot of things that are within their control, which they will not blame, and they should. That is the heart of the reason that we have successive deficit budgets. I do not have the exact figures, but I think it is about eight years since this government ran a surplus budget, so it will be very interesting to see how we go this year.

In the time that is left to me I will touch very quickly on the portfolios for which I am the spokesperson for the opposition. I will start with mineral resources and energy. This is an incredibly important portfolio and one I know is very dear to the heart of the minister and Treasurer. He takes this portfolio very seriously, but the reality is that we have the highest electricity prices in the nation. Electricity prices have risen so quickly over the last several years that it has been an extraordinary burden on households and businesses. I have already touched on mineral resources. This is an area which is incredibly important to our state, but even the one example I mentioned a minute ago has quite possibly led to us missing out on royalties to our state.

The portfolio of defence industries is again incredibly important. Let me say again, as I have many times both publicly and privately, that defence industries is probably the most bipartisan of all the portfolios that exist. You could not slide a piece of paper between the government and the opposition with regard to our beliefs on this portfolio and what we want to do. I say very clearly that anyone who says differently is guilty of playing politics with this issue. Anyone who says differently is actually the person trying to make it a portfolio area that is not bipartisan, because we want the very best for our state and for all the industries, companies and employees that work in this incredibly important portfolio for our state.

Small business, Deputy Speaker—goodness gracious! The government could certainly help our small business sector if they were to award more of their own contracts to South Australian businesses. It would also help medium-size and large-scale companies. I think approximately 60 per cent of government contracts are given to interstate companies. I am very aware of the probity that needs to be gone through to hand out contracts. It is not possible to just say that we give contracts only to local companies. I accept that full well, but for 60 per cent of them to go interstate? I cannot accept that. I cannot accept that the government would really believe that our local industries were incapable of providing the service it needed more than 40 per cent of the time; I just do not accept that at all.

I would also put very clearly to the Treasurer, who is also the Minister for Small Business, that he should always remind himself that the overwhelming majority of companies that work in agriculture are small businesses. I know he admits regularly that agriculture and the businesses that work in it—and I am talking primarily about family farms—are small businesses. The family farm deserves just as much support from the Minister for Small Business, who is also the Treasurer, as every single corner shop or other small business that might be in metropolitan Adelaide. They deserve exactly the same support, because they are also small businesses trying to get by.

Manufacturing and innovation is a very tough place to be at the moment. I agree with most of what former minister Close said about this issue. I have not yet had much opportunity to work with current minister, the Hon. Kyam Maher, from the other place. This is going to be difficult. This is an area that also deserves bipartisan support. We need to transition most of our companies away from our traditional, large, bulky-type, heavy industry manufacturing towards smarter manufacturing. I have a view that most of that is going to be linked to the transportability of the product.

The government focus on advanced manufacturing, smart manufacturing or high-tech manufacturing of course will be a big part of it, but it could be quite simple manufacturing. If you have a patent or a contract which allows you to make a relatively simple, small and very easy to transport

product, which might be just a component of somebody else's bigger and broader product, that will be one of the things that is most important to us. Because we are an island nation so far away from the rest of the world with a relatively small domestic market, compared to the rest of the world, transportability of the products that we manufacture, so that they are relatively cheap to get to big markets overseas, I think is going to be one of the most important things to try to achieve in manufacturing and innovation.

Automotive transformation is a very tough area. I am sad to say that I am not overly optimistic about where our state is going to go in this, and this is a burden which government and opposition have to share. I emphatically reject all of the rhetoric that comes from the state Labor government about it being the federal Liberal government's fault. On numerous occasions GMH has said very publicly and clearly that, 'It would not have mattered at all how much money the federal government gave us, we were going to leave Australia anyway. We were going to shut down our production at Elizabeth and we were going to go anyway. It was not an issue about the federal government funding.' I reject the government's excuses in that area completely and I accept wholeheartedly the opposition's responsibility to work with the government on that very important issue. It is an important issue not only for the northern suburbs but also for the entire state.

The last portfolio for which I have some responsibility for the opposition is state development. 'State development' as a term, 'state development' as a phrase or as a department sounds fantastic and very important—and no doubt those two words are very important, but I am not sure that it is necessarily warranted to have a Minister for State Development when within the Department of State Development there are five or six other ministers all responsible for different components of that department. Yes, of course, state development is important, and perhaps it is the most important piece of work going on because of course it encompasses everything else, but I am not sure that it really warrants a Minister for State Development when all those other ministers are working in the subsets.

Lastly, in the small amount of time I have left let me just touch on regions. As you know, I am a very proud regional member of parliament. We need money in the upcoming budget. We deserve money in the upcoming budget for the many regional development issues I have regularly spoken about in this place. 'Regional development' covers everything; it is not just the limited work of the Minister for Regional Development or PIRSA, and I do not say that in any deprecatory way. Regional development includes schools, includes education, includes health, includes transport—it includes all of those things.

Now that the government has some clear air, after the two by-elections have passed and the government governs in its own right with the numbers on the floor of this chamber, this is the government's opportunity, when it announces its next budget, to prove that it meant what it said—that it wanted to be a government for all South Australia, including the regions. This is a chance for the regional development minister Brock and Premier Weatherill to prove that they mean what they say.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

At 17:56 the house adjourned until Thursday 26 March 2015 at 10:30.