

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 2 December 2015

Parliamentary Procedure

SPEAKER, ABSENCE

The CLERK: I have to advise the house of the absence of the Speaker. The Deputy Speaker will take the chair.

The Deputy Speaker took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we start, I would like to acknowledge in the gallery the presence of a group of hardworking people from SAMESH and acknowledge that yesterday was World Aids Day. I thank them for their attendance here in parliament today and acknowledge the work they do on behalf of the community.

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON JUMPS RACING

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) (11:01): By leave, I move:

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

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE OPERATION OF THE TRANSPLANTATION AND ANATOMY ACT 1983

Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:03): I move:

That the report of the committee be noted.

As a member of parliament who represents the northern metropolitan area of Adelaide in the Northern Adelaide Plains, I would like to take the opportunity to speak to a diverse and multicultural electorate. Over the years that I have been a member of parliament I have heard several constituents voice their concerns, particularly those who come from Vietnam and Cambodia (and having travelled to these countries). Their concerns are about organ harvesting and a transplant tourism industry that seems to be growing.

It was not that long ago that I attended a fundraiser for the Sunrise Children's Villages, an NGO that cares for children in Cambodia who are most vulnerable. The founder of this organisation, Geraldine Cox AM, described an horrific story of tissue being harvested from a child she was looking to bring into the orphanage.

I have also heard accounts from my constituents of Cambodian and Vietnamese background that reinforce that this shameful industry exists. There are also increasing issues around the globe about the amount of human rights abuse generally perpetrated against low-income communities and countries from people who are keen to sell their organs.

According to 2014 data, South Australia has the highest per capita organ donation rate amongst all the states in Australia. Our state has a proud tradition of ensuring that we facilitate best practice transplant processes in Australia and around the world, and this year South Australia celebrated 50 years of success in kidney transplantation. It was a timely opportunity to establish a Joint Committee on the Operation of the Transplantation and Anatomy Act, which has been in place since 1983.

The committee was formed jointly across both houses to conduct a review on the operation of the act and to ensure that it services the community well in terms of operation and performance and in the space of contemporary ethics as we move forward as a South Australian community. Our society's views have changed greatly since the act first came into effect. As the Chair of the committee, and as a former health administrator, it has been informative to hear the testimony of experts and advocates in the field of organ transplantation and tissue.

The committee received reports from related authorities regarding the operation of state and federal legislation and just how our state can be an international leader in this field. We also heard disturbing reports about practices of non-consensual organ harvesting overseas that confirmed the feedback from my electorate. In an ever-increasing global society, South Australia must be taking the initiative to be proactive in the steps we legislate for to ensure that the ethical global rights of citizens are maintained.

Some of the recommendations put forward by the committee aim to address these issues by strengthening our safeguards against organs sourced by unethical and illegal means. The committee also suggested the creation of a criminal offence for noncompliance to these measures. We should not stand idly by waiting for a situation to occur, as we have recently heard about in the surrogacy industry, or for a problem to arrive on our doorstep. We should take active steps now to futureproof our legislation and protect our citizens and those of our global neighbours nearby.

I would like to thank the committee members who participated and the supporting staff for their time and efforts. I would also like to thank the witnesses, both local and international, for submitting their considered evidence. We have spoken to many community advocates, medical specialists and legal experts who have specialisation in this legislation regarding organ transplantation.

The committee's recommendations contain suggested improvements to add to the state's enviable organ donation system, improve equity and ensure that donors are being given full consent and understand what is about to occur in their lives. I look forward to continuing the discussion about how we can continuously improve organ donation in South Australia and Australia more generally. I commend the report to the house.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (11:07): It is my pleasure to speak today and it was my pleasure to sit on this committee. This was my first joint committee, being on the operation of the Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1983. As the member for Taylor said, the aim of this committee was to inquire into and report on the operation of the act, which is now some 32 years old, and whether or not it should be amended in respect to trafficking in human organs and related matters.

In particular, the committee considered whether or not the act adequately addressed medical advances and social changes in terms of family composition, media and, significantly, the demand for organ transplants that have occurred over the past 30 years. I, too, would like to thank all the committee members, especially the Hon. John Dawkins from the other place, who provided very good guidance to me.

South Australia has some of the highest per capita organ donation rates in Australia, and that is something we should be very proud of. Our transplant technology and medical expertise are world leading. Of course, this year marks 50 years since South Australia celebrated the first successful kidney transplant.

There is a summary of 19 recommendations proposed out of the committee; some of them were procedural and reflected a requirement to update the act in terms of words and meanings, but there were also six ethical considerations that the committee proposed. To me, it is really these ethical considerations that do need to be reviewed, and I hope that the minister does review the medical considerations.

To my mind, we need to look at an enhanced and more coordinated approach to organ harvesting and trafficking at a national level, which is certainly outside the jurisdiction of this parliament, and it is important to ensure that Australians, both as individuals and as a medical fraternity, are not caught up in this abhorrent international trade. There are six ethical considerations that are most important, and then there are seven other recommendations as well in terms of what

we should be doing as jurisdictions in order to look at the area of harvesting and trafficking and the need for further research into alternative therapies and the like.

I want to put on the record my thanks to the member for Taylor for establishing and driving this very important initiative, and I urge all members to look at the recommendations and to see where we can go from here.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:10): I too rise to speak on this really important joint committee that gathered a number of times. We heard from a number of witnesses in the professional area and also from those with heartrending stories to tell us concerning their own communities and how their communities had been preyed upon, for want of a better word.

My interest in this, besides being a parliamentarian, is twofold. I have a nursing background, and I happened to work at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, where kidney transplants were really a big focus back in the day when I was there. It was a very exciting advancement in medical field, and I saw the benefits it brought. Organ donation and organ transplant is a very important medical ability for all of us to support. However, we need to support this in an ethical and moral way, and I think that was clear from this committee and its investigations. My other interest was through my Cambodian connections and the stories I have heard surrounding people there and in other countries.

I applaud all those who gathered and heard from the witnesses. We looked at a number of recommendations, and I suggest that these recommendations are taken seriously. Those who presented to the committee were keen to make sure that South Australia adopts an ethical and moral framework to send a strong message and to tighten the net so that the black market cannot ensue elsewhere. The ethical considerations were very high on our compass, if you like.

The implications of this review, this committee, are paramount. I think that what is interesting in this is to free up some of the language around organ donations and how organ donation occurs, particularly when looking at terminology like 'designated officer' and what that means. It also looked at the ethical considerations and it did a bit of future gazing as well, looking into the future with technologies and advancements. Transplants will look quite different in the future, but these also need to be done within ethical and moral boundaries. With those few words, I support this report, and I look forward to the recommendations being considered.

Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:13): I thank all my colleagues for their contributions today. I reiterate my thanks to the committee staff and to the assembly people who assisted us during the time, our researcher, members in the other house and all the witnesses.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT 2014-15

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:13): I move:

That the 107th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2014-15, be noted.

The year 2014-15 was another busy one for the Natural Resources Committee. The membership of the Natural Resources Committee has remained unchanged from the previous year, with all members of the First Session of the Fifty-Third Parliament continuing on to the second session. The committee staff, however, has changed since the previous reporting period. Former research officer, Mr David Trebilcock, retired at the end of 2014 and was subsequently replaced by Ms Barbara Coddington. The executive officer, Patrick Dupont, remained unchanged during the reporting period, providing continuity of support to the committee.

Over the reporting period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015 the committee undertook 23 formal meetings, totalling 62 hours, and took evidence from 77 witnesses. Seven reports were drafted and tabled: the annual report for 2013-14, the Kangaroo Island natural resources management region fact finding visit report, and five reports on natural resources management levy proposals for 2015-16.

The committee has regular responsibilities to consider NRM levies and to visit all the natural resources management regions to observe the work done under the auspices of the regional NRM boards and staff of the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. The committee

takes this responsibility very seriously and endeavours to visit all eight NRM regions over the course of the four-year parliamentary term in order to meet on the ground with natural resources managers and community members.

The committee prides itself on arranging and attending regional meetings and fact-finding visits. Hearings are transcribed by Hansard officers who travel with the committee to record proceedings. However, for on-site visits, Hansard is unavailable so the committee does its best to navigate around and compile a record of evidence for inclusion in its reports using information and communications technology (ICT) which includes mobile smartphones, a laptop computer, digital audio recorder and a digital camera.

Unfortunately, at present there are no suitable mobile phones or laptops available to the committee to use when out of the office and this greatly concerns committee members. The issue of appropriate ICT support for committees has been raised a number of times with management, and the committee is optimistic that in the very near future arrangements will be made for committee staff to have access to suitable laptop computers and other ICT resources, which staff require to do their jobs effectively and safely when out of the office.

In addition to its NRM responsibilities, the committee generally aims to undertake an additional inquiry. For the 2014-15 period, the committee had resolved on 17 October 2014 to inquire into aquaculture in South Australia. However, shortly after this, the committee was referred an additional inquiry into unconventional gas (fracking) by the Legislative Council. This was on 19 November 2014 and on the motion of the Hon. M.C. Parnell MLC, as amended by the Hon. T.A. Franks MLC, pursuant to section 16(1)(a) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

Due to overwhelmingly strong interest in the fracking inquiry, the aquaculture inquiry has been delayed temporarily and members are looking forward to getting back to it in 2015-16. The terms of reference for the inquiry into unconventional gas include inquiring into potential risks and impacts in the use of hydraulic fracture stimulation (fracking) to produce gas in the South-East of South Australia and, in particular:

1. the risks of groundwater contamination;
2. the impacts upon landscape;
3. the effectiveness of existing legislation and regulation; and
4. the potential net economic outcomes to the region and the rest of the state.

After the inquiry was advertised on 26 November 2014, more than 175 separate submissions were received and evidence was taken from 32 witnesses at 10 public hearings held in Adelaide and in the South-East of South Australia. Much of the evidence received has been of a high quality and important to the committee's reports in developing recommendations, which are still to come.

In February 2015, the committee made a fact-finding visit to Millicent in the South-East to take evidence from local communities and to visit sites relevant to the inquiry. In total, two fact-finding visits have been undertaken in 2014-15—one to the Kangaroo Island NRM region and one to Millicent—to take evidence as part of the committee's inquiry into fracking and unconventional gas.

I would like to commend the members of the committee—the member for Napier, the member for Kurna, the member for Flinders, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC and the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars MLC—for their contributions. All members have worked cooperatively throughout the year.

In addition, I would like to thank other members who have been supporting our committee. Particularly, sadly, the late Hon. Bob Such, the former member for Fisher, was always someone who was interested in what we were doing and making suggestions on how we could work more efficiently, and the former member for Davenport, Iain Evans, was also very close to our committee, so we thank him for his contribution.

There are also a number of members who are in the chamber and also in the other place I would like to acknowledge, particularly the member for Bragg, the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Finnis, the member for Chaffey and the member for MacKillop. I thank them for working with us and helping us. I forgot to mention the member for Hammond, but I also thank him.

Particularly in this chamber, everybody has been really helpful to us, understanding that some of the references we get are very difficult. Also, our former members—the member for Stuart and the member for Little Para—have continued to help us on our way, so thank you to them. In the other house, the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC and the Hon. Terry Stephens MLC have also assisted with our committee. I commend this report to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: NATIONAL BROADBAND NETWORK

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:22): I move:

That the 88th report of the committee, entitled National Broadband Network, be noted.

The National Broadband Network has been front and centre in Australian policy-making for the best part of the last decade. Originally conceived by the Rudd Labor government, the NBN was intended to provide state-of-the-art optical fibre connectivity to more than 90 per cent of the Australian population, with the remainder to receive a combination of fixed wireless and satellite services.

Since the election of the Coalition government in 2013, the network and its fundamental structure has undergone significant alteration. The original rollout of the fibre to the premises has been replaced by a combination of technologies, known as the multi-technology mix model. This model combines small elements of the original fibre to the premises rollout, but the large majority has been replaced by fibre to the node and other technologies.

Given the magnitude of the changes to the NBN and its potential impact on South Australia, the Economic and Finance Committee resolved, on a motion from the member for Kaurua, to inquire into the NBN from a South Australian perspective. Among other things, the inquiry would allow proper appraisal of several issues, including the current status of the network, prospects for the future and the likely effects of the change from fibre to the premises to the multi-technology mix model.

The final report which I note today contains 19 recommendations covering four main areas: the NBN rollout in South Australia, the NBN and the role of state and local government, the benefits for health and education and the benefits of broadband for South Australia. As part of this inquiry, the committee resolved early on that we would take our inquiry out of Parliament House, and it made several field trips, touring facilities and hearing from witnesses in our northern and southern suburbs and in regional areas and also trialling teleconferencing technology to speak to experts and witnesses interstate.

The committee received evidence and heard testimony from a large range of witnesses concerning the progress of the NBN rollout and also the nature of the technology likely to be used in different parts of the state. This included the likely allocation of the various technologies to different areas of South Australia and the use of satellite in more remote regions.

As we have seen testimony to recently in the media, the committee received worrying testimony concerning the state of the copper network and its suitability for the ever-increasing demands that will inevitably be placed upon it. The major shift in the new multi-technology-mix model is, as I said, away from fibre to the premises and towards fibre to the node, and this of course is a particular concern because fibre to the node, the principal plank of the new multi-technology-mix model, is critically dependent on the existing copper network.

The importance of proper communication and consultation, especially for community and business, about the development and implementation of future digital policies was a significant finding of the inquiry. Therefore, several recommendations were made in light of these concerns, including:

- That the South Australian government advocate to the commonwealth government that it continue the rollout of fibre to the premises, rather than fibre to the node, to deliver high-quality connections for households, businesses, schools and hospitals in South Australia;
- That the South Australian government encourage NBN Co to publish detailed information on the condition of South Australia's copper network; and

- That the South Australian government advocate to NBN Co that it improve its communication with local government and community and business groups with additional on-the-ground staff.

We as a committee found that, until the general public and other stakeholders are able to observe the real benefits of broadband technology, uptake would remain at low levels and the notion of instant switching on of the population—an 'if you build it, they will come' approach—is simply wishful thinking.

Therefore, the need for active government participation in the adoption of digital technologies was raised by several witnesses, as was the need for government not to stand in the way by imposing excessive red tape. Indeed, government should serve as an exemplar for the benefits of broadband technology by embracing new technology and work practices, such as teleworking by the Public Service. The recommendations made in relation to the role of state and local government, therefore, include:

- That all South Australian local governments implement a digital economy strategy and monitor its performance;
- That the South Australian government embrace teleworking, both supporting state public servants to telework and encouraging other businesses to adopt more flexible practices; and
- That the South Australian government investigate implementing a program to help small businesses connect with nearby ICT providers that can improve their digital presence and utilisation.

We found that digital technology is expected to play an increasingly vital role in the delivery of health services, particularly in remote areas of South Australia—a point emphasised from both the teaching and medical practice perspectives.

The successful nature of several e-health trials was described for the committee, but the critical element required for e-health or telehealth to realise its potential is access to reliable high-speed broadband, and this is especially so in the rural and remote regions of this state.

The increasing importance of the education and VET sectors to South Australia's place in a digital future was stressed by several witnesses—in particular, the increasing importance of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) subjects. We also found that there is a need for government promotion of ICT training at both VET and university levels, particularly to cope with the projected worldwide demand in the ICT sector.

We were pleased to visit several schools and we witnessed the incorporation of many aspects of digital education in the curriculum at various age levels. We observed early primary school students learning about coding and utilising digital learning tools such as Bee-Bots, which are robots the children can program themselves.

We also saw high school students incorporating elements of the gaming culture, such as Minecraft, into their learning. It was explained to some of us who are not as au fait with this technology as others that the more enjoyable the students found these digital lessons the less intimidated they felt, and we saw this ourselves.

The teething issues encountered by early adoption schools, though, were highlighted. It is vital that solutions to these problems are shared as more schools come online, so recommendations in the health and education sphere include:

- That the South Australian government actively promote and, where possible, facilitate the implementation of telehealth programs in the delivery of primary health care and acute hospital services;
- That the South Australian government increase ICT training programs through the VET sector and encourage a similar increase in the university sector to meet the expected increased demand;

- That the South Australian government, through the public education system and the VET sector, increase the provision of science, technology, engineering and maths subjects to meet the projected demand; and
- That the Department for Education and Child Development, using the lessons learned from early adopter NBN schools, prepare promotional material highlighting the benefits of being NBN connected for both teachers and students.

Access to high-speed broadband in semi-rural regions of the state, such as Willunga, has resulted in many people relocating to avoid issues associated with more concentrated urban environments. The shift to such regions is expected to increase as they become connected to the network. There is considerable opportunity, therefore, to promote regional growth in the state through the accessibility of reliable high-speed broadband. The committee therefore recommends:

- That the South Australian government, in conjunction with local government, actively promote those areas of the state that have been connected to the NBN; and
- That the South Australian government use the NBN and its benefits to promote regional growth in South Australia.

It is imperative that we have a broadband network that not only meets the state's current demands but is also flexible enough to meet future demands, many of which have yet to be conceived.

I want to thank the members of the committee for working so hard on this fairly lengthy inquiry, particularly the member for Kaurana, who instigated this inquiry. I know he has a real and genuine interest in innovation and new technologies and the potential they have to create jobs in the future, which of course is the main game. I also want to thank the members for Wright, Colton, Unley, Stuart and Bright.

The committee also went through several changes of personnel during its lengthy inquiry. I want to thank Susie Barber and Lisa Baxter for their input early on and for their excellent advice. I also want to thank Kendall Crowe, who came in in the middle of the inquiry and picked up really well where they left off and guided us through the state on our journey. I also want to thank our research officer, Dr Gordon Elsey, who also came fairly late in the piece as the permanent research officer.

Many people came to us with information and evidence, and I want to thank them all. I want to make particular mention of the school communities who allowed us to visit and who were so generous with their time. I am sure we all learnt a lot. I commend the report to the house.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:31): I will be very brief in my comments. I very much enjoyed this inquiry. It was excellent. People in this house would know that I know as little as anyone else—in fact, less than anyone else—about the interweb and all those things that—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: He plays a game. He pretends: I don't pretend. Notwithstanding that, I do understand the importance of technology to this nation and the transformational nature of what the NBN is meant to achieve, and it is meant to transform our nation and transform it significantly. I do hold concerns that maybe in some areas, from the evidence we received, we are getting a second-best or third-best product with the deviation from the initial proposal to have, in the majority of cases, fibre directly to the home. We know that is no longer the case, save and except for greenfield sites that exist in areas such as the member for Kaurana's area.

What I particularly enjoyed was visiting the schools and seeing the difference that those early adopters, such as Willunga High School, were able to achieve for their students through the use of this technology. Particularly outstanding were the young dynamic teachers who were delivering courses to the students utilising this form of technology.

I am not an educator, but I do know that education is about getting the hook and hooking students in such a way that they enjoy what they are doing, and this technology was engaging students who previously had trouble being engaged to do some fantastic work. It is that hook that has got them to where they are, and it was really terrific. That was also the case at Aldinga Primary

School, where they were working with the Bee-Bots. I can tell you that the six and seven year olds were far better at coding those Bee-Bots than I was.

Also, our visit to Port Augusta was terrific where, again, we visited schools, but also we were visited by members of the business community. I make this point, and it was made in the comments by our chairperson: it is the responsibility of governments across all levels and, indeed, the community to properly prepare itself for the advantages and benefits that we know will exist through the National Broadband Network rollout.

I do express some concerns that funding in those regions was withdrawn by the commonwealth government that was meant to assist, if you like, the community in properly preparing itself to take advantage of the NBN rollout. With that funding withdrawn, it is the responsibility of the state government, local governments and the community to make sure that we are doing everything we possibly can to support and properly prepare our communities to take advantage of this technology.

I too like our Presiding Member, express concern about the evidence that we received about the state of the copper network and, in particular, fully endorse the recommendation that says that a review be undertaken of the state and quality of our copper network here, which we will be reliant on for NBN access, given the change from the commonwealth government's view on what will be connected and to where. It was a really good inquiry, and I congratulate the member for Kaurna for putting it up. I learned more than I ever thought I would about the NBN. Notwithstanding that, I understand and acknowledge that for many other people across Australia it will be of great benefit, perhaps just not for me particularly.

I will finish off by thanking all the members of the committee for their diligence and their work during this period. I would also like to thank our executive officers Lisa Baxter and Susie Barber, and of course our current executive officer Kendall Crowe and researcher Gordon Elsey. They were able to bring home the bacon with respect to this report but would not have been able to do it without the foundation put in place by people who previously served that committee. I commend the report to the house and urge everyone in the chamber to do whatever they possibly can to encourage the commonwealth, and indeed encourage the state government, to ensure that collectively we are doing what we can to maximise the benefits that I know will accrue through the implementation of the National Broadband Network.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:36): I commend the report on the National Broadband Network to the house. When I first proposed an inquiry into this subject matter I do remember that the former member for Davenport, the Hon. Iain Evans, who served on the committee, was enthusiastic, but a few others questioned whether or not this was the right thing for a state parliament to be looking at, giving that it was predominantly a federal policy issue. However, I think by the end of the committee's report—which was a unanimous committee report—everyone was supportive that this was a worthwhile endeavour for us to look at, and we have come up with a series of good recommendations that, we think, will take the state a lot further.

This was a very significant inquiry, as has been discussed already. There have sometimes been occasional comments about whether or not the Economic and Finance Committee is hard working, but I think this committee report shows how hard working the committee has been throughout this process. It has conducted nine hearings, interviewed and heard witnesses, including 46 people and 29 organisations, and had five school visits. It has also conducted visits out to Port Augusta, the northern suburbs of Adelaide and the southern suburbs of Adelaide. So it has been a very thorough process that has been undertaken.

The committee has come with a very detailed series of recommendations that I encourage everyone to read and that I hope the state government will take note of. Firstly, in regard to the NBN rollout, this is very important for our future infrastructure in South Australia. If this is not done well we will be paying a price for that in future years. There are areas across South Australia, including most of my electorate of Kaurna, that are getting the fibre to the premises rollout at the moment; in fact most of my electorate—pretty much everywhere except for the suburb I live in, Port Noarlunga—has fibre to the premises rolled out. So Seaford, Aldinga and associated suburbs are all connected to fibre to the premises, and we are seeing that making a huge difference for people's households, for people's local businesses, but also for important institutions such as schools in the area.

Unfortunately, that is not what is going to happen across the rest of South Australia. We are now going to have what has been called a multi-technology mix. Appropriately, that is pulling in some of the infrastructure that is available through pay TV—in particular Foxtel cables and the previous Optus Vision cables—and I think there is great opportunity there. However, in regard to fibre to the node, what we are going to see is people having a second-class connection in those areas, and we are calling upon fibre to the premises to be the preferred model and hope that the state government will be advocating to the commonwealth about that.

A lot of the evidence we heard on this committee was about the state of the copper network, and we heard some very worrying evidence in regard to the state of that network, particularly through some of the measures that have been taken over previous decades. They were well-intentioned measures at the time, such as Telstra's sealing the CAN program, that have inevitably led to quite a lot of that copper being corroded over time. We have heard evidence that in some hospitals in country South Australia, places like Orreroo and Laura, if it rains the copper connection ends and those hospitals are no longer connected, both to phones or the internet. That is a significant worry if we are relying upon that copper for the future of the internet network in South Australia.

We have also heard a lot of evidence with regard to satellite services. I know members who represent remote areas will be very interested in this because, inevitably, if you live in a remote area then satellite is what you are going to have to rely on for your connection to the internet in the future. That is increasingly important for all sorts of services, particularly things like School of the Air in remote areas. At the moment, there is an interim satellite solution and we are seeing that as a very clogged service. People are getting very slow download speeds, the service is very expensive to run and it means that the opportunities available for people in remote areas are nowhere near as much as they could be. There are new satellites being launched by NBN Co, but we have heard evidence that if too much of South Australia, or indeed Australia, has to be reliant upon that satellite connection then we will have the case where those speeds become slower over time and the price becomes more expensive and people in remote areas will miss out.

We also heard a lot of evidence about how the NBN is being rolled out to communities. A lot of the funding for facilitation and community engagement has been cut over the past two years by the federal government. That means that we have gone from a number of staff being employed to work with community groups, to get out there and explain to businesses how to connect, to one or two people in South Australia doing that job, which across such a broad state it is almost impossible for them to adequately provide that level of service.

There was also, originally, a lot of lead sites being promoted across the state where local governments were being funded to run engagement projects and to set up community hubs to lead the NBN rollout. Unfortunately, all of that funding has been cut. When we went to Port Augusta and spoke to the Port Augusta City Council they explained what their plans were under the previous model where they were going to be funded to set up a lot of community hubs, including, importantly, for the Aboriginal community in Port Augusta. All of that cannot happen now because there is no more funding from the commonwealth to make that happen. So, that forms a recommendation in our report as well. We are also calling for better information on where the rollout is going to be. NBN Co has made some steps in that regard, but we want to see that stepped up in the future.

A large part of the report dealt with what the opportunities for South Australia are in this regard. This is something that I am very passionate about. As this technology is rolled out we do not want it to be used just to watch TV shows, we want it to be used for education purposes, for employment purposes, for developing new businesses and for improving services like health care across South Australia. This is what forms the vast majority of recommendations in our report. For instance, we want South Australia to be a leader when it comes to teleworking, and this has already been led by many businesses across Australia and by many individuals where they can use fast broadband connections to operate from anywhere in Australia.

Ideally, if we can do this well we can have people working for national or international firms or for national or international clients, based in South Australia, either in Adelaide or across regional South Australia. That, of course, relies on having a good broadband connection but it also relies on us taking some steps to be a leader in this regard, and we are hoping that the public sector can be a leader when it comes to that. We also want to see more start-ups, more home businesses in

South Australia. As the NBN is rolled out to households there is greater opportunity for people to set up businesses in their own homes. We are hoping that some of the red tape that could apply to that, from a planning perspective, could be cut through.

One of the huge opportunities is with regard to education. As I mentioned, we visited some five schools across South Australia, some who have the NBN and some who desperately want the NBN (as the Port Augusta High School said to us). I think the highlight for me was visiting Willunga High School. They were one of the leaders, they were one of the first schools in Australia to get the NBN, and it actually took quite a lot of work for them to get up to the stage now where they can demonstrate how this fast broadband connection has impacted across the curriculum at their school.

We want to see that delivered to schools across the rest of South Australia because that will mean that students will have greater opportunities to use the technology of the future, to learn the languages they will need in the future—things like coding, which we would like to see expand to every school in South Australia—and also to prepare for the jobs of the future. We heard a lot of evidence about how the number of ICT professionals in South Australia is going to grow over the future years, and we need to make sure that the training for that steps up to the mark.

There is a lot that government can do to take full advantage. We want to see schools actively engaged in the rollout, not just by plugging it in but by having programs and learning the lessons of other schools. We want to see those coding skills rolled out. We want to promote areas of the state that have the NBN so that they can be more attractive for business and more attractive for tourists as well. We also want to sort out videoconferencing, which is used well in some places and not well in others, and we want councils to come on board as well.

I would like to thank everybody who gave evidence to the committee and also the committee's staff—Lisa Baxter, Susie Barber, Gordon Elsey and Kendall Crowe—for their hard work and for providing excellent advice. I encourage all members to read the report. This is something that we are going to continue to look at in the future as we grow our economy in South Australia.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: CBD DISABILITY RESPITE FACILITY

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 535th report of the committee, entitled CBD Disability Respite Facility, be noted.

(Continued from 18 November 2015.)

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:46): I rise today to make a small contribution to the 535th report, entitled CBD Disability Respite Facility. This is a really important project to meet the increasing need for respite services. A significant number of people living with a disability are located in regional South Australia and required to travel to visit Adelaide for treatment and respite. This is a situation that every country MP comes across regularly.

As it stands, there is currently short-term accommodation for people who require specialised accommodation with support services, but the long waiting list to access these facilities is concerning. Due to the shortage in respite supply, existing disability institutions, such as Highgate Park, are being used to meet the demand. A shortage of accommodation for people with disabilities travelling to Adelaide for recreational purposes is also an issue.

As of 30 September 2015, there were 605 people with a recorded unmet need for respite services on the DCSI Unmet Need Register. In June 2014, the state government committed \$7.44 million (GST exclusive) to establish a new disability respite facility. This is a proposal for 18 disability respite apartments located in the CBD, to be redeveloped by Uniting Communities, initially proposed at 43 Franklin Street. The estimated cost for the full project is between \$60 million and \$66 million and, while demolition will occur mid next year, the project is not due to be completed until September 2018.

It is disappointing that this project will not be completed until 2018. It will be a win for the people with a disability, it will be a win for their families, their friends, the care providers and volunteers. I know, having endured the wrath of people who are caring for people with a disability,

that it is an area where those people do need respite and it is an area where those people do need the support. This facility is long overdue; it will not be completed until September 2018, but it is going to be a great boon for the disability sector.

During the hearing, the committee was told that South Australia's level of respite service is below many other jurisdictions, and there is an expectation that services will need to double under the NDIS. My concern is that the long-term project is still in its very infant stages. However, it was approved by the committee and I look forward to watching this project develop. I commend the report to the house.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:50): Thank you to all the members who contributed to this debate. This is a visionary project and it is certainly a collaborative project, thanks to Uniting Communities, to see the development of 18 disability respite apartments in the heart of our city, centralising that particular care.

I note that the member for Chaffey said that he is disappointed with the progress and timing of the project. Nevertheless, we have this visionary project that we have supported at the Public Works Committee and we will see it unfold, and I am sure this will not be the last of this type of project. With that, I thank the Public Works Committee, the executive officer and admin officer, and all those witnesses who came to give us evidence on this project. I recommend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR NORTHERN CONNECTOR PROJECT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 536th report of the committee, entitled North-South Corridor Northern Connector Project, be noted.

(Continued from 18 November 2015.)

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:51): I rise to speak on the 536th report of the Public Works Committee regarding the North-South Corridor Northern Connector Project. The north-south corridor is one of Adelaide's most important transport corridors, as it is the major route for north-south traffic, including freight vehicles running between Gawler and Old Noarlunga. The corridor is also a major access route for interstate freight from Perth, Darwin and Sydney.

The upgrade to the Northern Connector is a federal and state government project. It is an 80:20 partnership in the \$985 million project. This is a project that has been on the agenda for more than a decade, and planning finally started in 2008, with the preliminary concept completed in 2011. It will reduce travel times by seven to eight minutes and remove major freight traffic from Port Wakefield Road, making it safer for local traffic movements. Not only will it make it safer but it will create a free-flowing traffic stream, reduce carbon emissions and frustrations on the road, and wear and tear on vehicles. I think it is a project long overdue. The report for the project states:

Once completed, the 78 kilometre corridor will comprise the following road links:

- Northern Expressway from Gawler to Port Wakefield Road...
- Northern Connector from Port Wakefield Road to the Port River Expressway...
- South Road Superway, from the Port River Expressway to north of Regency Road...
- Upgrade of South Road from the South Road Superway to the north of Torrens Road,
- Torrens Road to the River Torrens...
- Upgrade South Road from the River Torrens to Darlington...
- Darlington Upgrade from Ayliffes Road to the Southern Expressway..., and
- Southern Expressway from Darlington to Old Noarlunga...

The Northern Connector project aims to provide a nonstop expressway between the Northern Expressway, the Port River Expressway and the South Road superway in the south. Having driven around regional South Australia and coming into the city, particularly heading south of

Adelaide or south of the metropolitan area, I know that it will be a boon. It will be a cost saving for every transport operator and every person who uses that corridor.

There are many utility services along the way that cross over this proposed connection, including several high-pressure gas pipelines, power networks, optic fibre and stormwater drains, so there are some barriers that will need to be overcome. This construction requires a lot of land acquisition and a lot of it is government land. It is a project that is well needed, well wanted and well supported by the committee. In conclusion, I commend the report to the house.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:54): I rise today to also offer a few comments on the Northern Connector project. It has been identified as basically a billion dollar project, of which 80 per cent of the funding has come from the federal government. It is something that our leader, the member for Dunstan, was calling for in his budget reply speech earlier this year, and it is great that his call for the project has been heeded.

Having done a bit of research on this topic, I note some of the issues and conjecture around the Northern Expressway as it was built and completed. Back in 2006, we saw a \$200 million cost blowout to the project. There seem to be some familiar themes here in terms of cost blowouts with this government. Basically, Pat Conlon, as the then infrastructure minister, needed to go cap in hand to the government to ask for that extra couple of hundred million dollars.

The Northern Expressway was a great project that has helped to really reshape the way people visit and enter the Barossa. Prior to that, the Barossa Valley Way via Gawler was the prime way that people went into the Barossa. From the perspective of the cellar doors and tourism facilities in Lyndoch, Williamstown or Rowland Flat, they enjoyed almost first dibs on the tourists as they came up.

Gomersal Road, which was otherwise known as a bit of a tradesman's entrance into the Barossa, was bituminised, and it was supposed to take 1,000 cars a day, but it ends up now taking about 8,000 cars a day. If you combine the bituminising of Gomersal Road with the Northern Expressway, you create from the centre of Adelaide to the main street of Tanunda a singular pathway that takes about an hour. In a practical sense, people view the Adelaide Hills or McLaren Vale, for example, as easier to get to, but the Barossa with the Northern Expressway and Gomersal Road as extremely important.

However, it has reshaped the way that people visit the Barossa. So, instead of people coming up via the Barossa Valley Way, they come via Gomersal Road and go straight into Tanunda. That has had an impact on the southern Barossa communities and their ability to have their share of the tourism visitors. I am very much looking forward to it, and even though I know that the Gawler East Link Connector Road, or whatever they are calling it today, is not necessarily for through traffic—it is designed for local traffic—unlocking the gridlock from Murray Street in Gawler will be a very good thing.

As well as connecting with the Northern Expressway and making it even easier for members of the western suburbs to come to my electorate, it is also a way for freight to go the other way. We see huge wine industries, agricultural industries and a lot of our agricultural exports flowing down the Northern Expressway and going out to the Port River and the docks to be loaded onto ships and exported. The Northern Connector project will help to make that a lot easier.

It is definitely something my industry supports. Indeed, Brian Smedley of the South Australian Wine Industry Association, a man who is across all the issues and someone I rely on for solid advice on all issues wine, has talked about the benefits. He said:

[It will] complete the road which goes from our wine regions of the north right down to the port of Adelaide so it is an important aspect to facilitate trade and reduce costs...

This is especially so at this time, when we are a higher cost producer when it comes to wine versus the rest of the world. This is an important project. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (HOME DETENTION) BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 September 2015.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:00): I am pleased to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Home Detention) Bill and put a point of view on behalf of the opposition. The government engaged in a discussion paper process, which they called 'Transforming criminal justice: better sentencing options'. They released that paper in June 2015, and they then had a community advisory panel, organised by an organisation called democracy Co, which had 19 people selected as a representative sample of the community to have a look at it, and they had a key partners workshop with stakeholders.

On 10 September, one of the outcomes was that the Attorney-General indicated that legislation would be introduced to provide greater flexibility in the use of home detention as a sentencing alternative and to reduce existing restrictions surrounding home detention for suitable prisoners. This bill really deals with those two aspects separately. They both deal with home detention, but they are in two different bills and so there are two different processes and procedures that have been set up.

There are a number of positive things that this bill does and there are some that the opposition strongly believes need improvement to warrant the approval of the parliament. We hope that the government will take our suggested amendments on board and, indeed, support them. A number of matters probably might be dealt with in questions the Attorney can either deal with in his second reading response in 20 minutes' time or, alternatively, we can deal with them at the committee stage. I indicate to the Deputy Speaker that we will probably need a committee, especially given that there are amendments on file from the opposition, and I believe the government also has an amendment that we will be dealing with.

As the Deputy Premier indicated in his press release on 10 September, the bill is supposed to provide for greater flexibility in the use of home detention, presenting an alternative sentencing option for low-risk and nonviolent offenders. That is the Attorney's claimed intent for the bill. The bill actually allows for a broader application, in that it does not exclude nonviolent offenders. The only overriding consideration is whether they are considered to be low-risk.

Of course, we have had submissions to this parliament before—indeed, the government put forward a proposition just months ago in relation to parole laws—that somebody who might have committed an offence of extreme violence and murder may well be considered to be a low-risk prisoner. If the circumstances that led to the murder no longer exist, sometimes those prisoners can be assessed from a security point of view as low risk.

I do not think I am just presenting the Liberal Party's view here. I am fairly confident that I am presenting the entire community's view that it would be inappropriate for a violent offender, such as a murderer, to be given the opportunity to serve their sentence in home detention rather than in gaol. I identify that the Deputy Premier did initially claim that this was just for nonviolent offenders, so when we get to the committee stage we will have amendments to exclude violent offenders, murderers, terrorists, rapists and other serious sexual offenders, from having the opportunity to serve their sentence in home detention rather than in prison.

In relation to the things that the bill does, it amends the Correctional Services Act to expand the home detention program in the following ways: it removes the requirement for offenders to have served 50 per cent of their sentence before being eligible for home detention, and it removes the requirement that offenders can only serve 12 months on home detention.

I think it was the Law Society (I will check in a moment) that identified that, currently, home detention provisions are available in our community only for those prisoners who are identified by the CEO of the Corrections department as potentially being able to serve the end part of their term

in prison. I think it was the Law Society that identified that that largely is an administrative arrangement and, of course, there are significant restrictions.

It is restricted to less than 50 per cent of the sentence duration and for no more than 12 months, and there are further restrictions capable of being placed on the Corrections CEO by way of ministerial direction. Presently, that ministerial direction excludes murderers, excludes terrorists and excludes rapists and other serious sexual offenders. Again, returning to the amendments we propose to move to the court sentencing aspect of the bill, we would propose that that instruction that is given by the minister to the Corrections CEO should in fact be imposed by the act on the courts as well.

This amendment, by removing the requirement for offenders to have served 50 per cent of their sentence, and removing the requirement that offenders only serve 12 months on home detention, will allow a greater number of offenders to be eligible for home detention. Whether this is its purpose, or whether there is a more altruistic philosophical purpose, I will leave for the government to explain, but it will potentially relieve some of the burden of the current prison overcrowding situation the government has to deal with. There is a financial benefit to the community of that because, whether or not there is electronic monitoring on the prisoner in home detention, there is of course a level of supervision, but that level of supervision has a significantly lower financial cost than having that convicted offender in prison.

Potentially, there are also opportunities to give offenders the opportunity to reconnect with their community through continued employment, study or indeed just through the fact that they are spending time with their family rather than being in a cell with other convicted criminals. There is clearly the benefit for the offender there and potentially, we would hope, the benefit for the community, in that in an environment where they have maintained that connection with the community they will be less likely to reoffend. Fundamentally, that is a very serious consideration and a very important consideration for us all because the best outcome of any situation where somebody has committed a crime is that they do not commit another offence.

The conditions that are on a prisoner identified before may include electronic monitoring. Again, I note that the Deputy Premier, in his news release of 10 September, suggested that those prisoners who are on home detention conditions are subject to electronic monitoring. Currently, I identify to the house that there are 124 prisoners (these are figures I have been given within the last month or so; it has been a little while since the bill was introduced) undertaking the last part of their sentence on home detention. Only 76 of those 124 are subject to electronic monitoring, so 48 are presumably under intensive supervision without there being felt the need for there to be the ankle bracelet assisting that supervision.

Obviously, any breach of home detention carries with it its own negative repercussions for the prisoners, and these things are managed on a risk management basis, so one would presume that there ought to be a reason for the 48 at the moment not having the electronic monitoring. I hope that the Attorney can give some comfort in his second reading response that he is indeed satisfied that the arrangements they are operating under are currently satisfactory. There is nothing in the bill to identify that there must be electronic monitoring on those prisoners who are then put under home detention.

It will be up to the court, of course, to mandate whatever conditions the court sees fit, and that may include electronic monitoring. I indicate to the house that in recent times we have increased from 400 the number of electronic bracelets (and I think it will eventually get to 600) that the Corrections system and youth justice and the courts have access to, and they are all in use at the moment. The government is going to need to buy a whole bunch more of these if they want to make the claim that anyone to be released on home detention will continue to have that electronic monitoring. There is not a large number of spares in the system at the moment.

There are approximately 18 offenders for every Community Corrections staff member and it is, of course, necessary, as has been identified by the Law Society and the Public Service Association, that if the number of people in home detention increases, as it surely will with the passage of this bill, staffing will need to increase. As I have indicated before, there is of course a lower financial cost to the taxpayer to the community and to the government compared with having them in prison, so that is a positive.

However, as I think the Law Society made very clear in their correspondence and their submission, if one were just to take the cost saving of having people in home detention rather than in prison and try to operate under the existing resources without ensuring adequate supervision and, indeed, without using some of the savings to make sure that suitable re-engagement and rehabilitation programs were undertaken, then the government is not taking the opportunity to reap the benefits of reducing that future recidivism risk.

The bill also seeks to amend the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act, and this is the more significant change, I would suggest. It will give a court the option to sentence an offender to a period of home detention as a middle ground between the harsher custodial sentence and where a suspended sentence would be unsatisfactory. In effect, the bill does not exclude any particular class of offence or length of imprisonment from being eligible for a home detention sentence. The discretion is entirely in the sentencing court's hands.

The paramount consideration for a court imposing a home detention order must be the safety of the community, which is explicitly included in the bill at new section 33BB(3). As I identified earlier, the safety of the community, when interpreted in these fields, does not necessarily exclude any particular class of offender or any particular crime: it takes into account, rather, the assessed likelihood of that offender committing a further offence against the community.

New section 33BB(4) lists some other matters a court must take into consideration when determining whether to make a home detention order and 33BC outlines conditions that a home detention order may be subject to. Section 33BF creates an offence for contravention of, or failure to comply with, the conditions of a home detention order, punishable by a significant fine or further imprisonment.

The Attorney-General identified that his argument is that this bill will minimise the harm and economic loss associated with imprisonment and allow offenders to retain community ties and benefit from greater rehabilitation opportunities. That does, of course, presuppose the government's provision of those opportunities but, broadly and conceptually, those claims are supported by the opposition, as long as the government does its bit.

While a middle ground option for sentencing is, on face value, a good initiative and the improved flexibility for the courts is supported, one cannot help but note that this came up at a time when the government is scrambling to catch up with the rate of prison growth through the addition of 100 extra cells at Mount Gambier, a group extra at Port Lincoln and Port Augusta—continued expansion of our existing prisons to keep up with the rapid rate of prisoner growth they failed to keep up with over a period of years due to their own lack of planning. This bill will, hopefully, alleviate some of that burden on the taxpayer because, of course, when you do have people in that excess capacity area, they do cost more to deal with.

Publicly, as I have said before, the Attorney-General has promoted this bill as being very narrow in its application to offenders. On 27 June 2015, he was quoted on the ABC News as saying:

We're talking here about a relatively small group of people who are not violent offenders.

Further, he went on to say:

Those convictions of traffic offences, minor drug matters, could be among those eligible for home detention arrangements.

Of course, they are eligible, but so are the murderers, rapists and terrorists under the bill as it stands at the moment. Indeed, in his second reading speech the Attorney-General was explicit in stating:

The bill does not exclude particular classes of offences or lengths of terms of imprisonment in its application.

The discretion of the courts is significant there. They are restrained by new section 33BB(3) which states:

The paramount consideration of the court when determining whether to make a home detention order must be the safety of the community.

Then new section 33BB(4) requires that the court also considers the impacts on the victims and the defendant's spouse, or anyone else who might be living at the residence they are at. We are pleased that consideration is to be given to the impact on victims, but it is, of course, not the overriding

consideration. The only overriding consideration is what the court views as being the safety of the community.

Of course, if a court were to take the view that a murderer, terrorist or a serious sex offender was a suitable candidate for home detention, under this bill that would be available as a sentencing option, even though those categories of offenders are not eligible for consideration for home detention at the discretion of the Corrections CEO at the moment due to the direction from the minister I identified previously. The Liberal Party's view, my view and, as far as I can see, the community's view, is that those offences should continue to exclude an offender from consideration for home detention, whether it is by a court or, indeed, as is currently the case, by the CEO of Corrections.

I would like to thank those community stakeholders and public officers who have assisted the opposition in our consideration of this legislation. I identified that the government did some consultation prior to the bill, but a number of these stakeholders saw the bill for the first time when it was tabled in parliament. They gave consideration to it fairly rapidly because consideration of the aspects that are in the bill, in a number of cases, led to their having a different submission to the open question they were previously presented with as a result of the discussion paper. I thank those groups for putting forward suggestions, including the Victim Support Service, the victims of crime commissioner, the Law Society and the Parole Board chair, and of course the Public Service Association made some public comments.

I want to touch base on a couple of the things the Law Society has raised, and they reflect some of the matters that were raised in other submissions. Before I do so, I would like to thank the staff and officers in the Attorney-General's office and department for their assistance in briefing and providing information to the opposition subsequent to that briefing. They did so in a timely fashion, for which we are grateful.

The Law Society submission, which came in a few weeks ago in late October, firstly identified that the society expressed its general support for the bill, as I alluded to before. It said:

Until now, home detention has been a management tool of limited application for prison administrators. Its success over nearly 30 years has undoubtedly prompted the extension of the administrative powers of the Department for Correctional Services...and the creation of new powers for courts to make home detention orders as part of a sentencing order.

Of course, as I identified before, the opposition shares that general support for the bill, but they do raise some specific issues to which the Attorney may turn his mind when he very shortly responds to the second reading. The society suggests that it has some concerns with the bill in its current form not allowing sufficient flexibility for variation of a home detention order; for example, if a person is no longer able to reside at the nominated residence without triggering an application for breach under proposed section 33BD. They write:

Circumstances will frequently arise where a person is no longer able to reside at their nominated address, or wishes to vary their nominated address, while subject to an order. In particular, many Aboriginal people reside in short-term or insecure accommodation.

That is a point that was raised by a number of stakeholders. Of course, while there are some limited bail accommodation opportunities, and there have been some limited further bail accommodation opportunities funded by the government, we are not talking about very large numbers. So the Attorney, who I know has been listening intently, might consider responding to that, whether the bill does in fact have that restriction in its rigidity that the Law Society has identified and whether there is potentially any further improvement that can be considered between the houses or at a later time.

The society has a view that the exercise of the CEO's discretion to revoke a home detention order under proposed section 33BE might require careful monitoring, and of course the Attorney can respond to that suggestion if he wishes. In relation to home detention bail, the Law Society suggests that:

The parliament might give consideration to a provision which allows the court to have regard to any period that a person has been on home detention bail if that person is then ultimately sentenced to a home detention order. This would be with a view to reducing the length of the home detention order, or allowing a back-dating of the order to the date when the person was released on home detention bail.

I make no comment other than the fact that the Law Society volunteers put a lot of work into these bills, so when they make a suggestion I think it is worth noting for the record, and for the government's consideration to be noted as well, so I invite the Attorney to respond to the society's views on home detention bail.

The Law Society raises a number of other issues in relation to the effective operation of the bill likely requiring increased housing support including, if appropriate, bail hostels or other residential facilities where home detention orders can be served. The society's view is, further, that protocols as to the processing of 'direct home detention' prisoners will be required. They suggest:

Suitable information for both victims and families of prisoners will be of great assistance in establishing early trust in the system.

The government will need to ensure sufficient administrative support for the extended home detention program. To offer such an option to both administrators and judicial officers and fail to back it up with appropriate funding for support would be undesirable.

Obviously those are policy matters which are not necessarily relevant to the detailed consideration of the bill or its amendments, but the Attorney might like to respond.

The critically important matters that we wish to deal with today include that there has been a proposition put forward that this bill is to apply to only low-risk and non-violent offenders. To that extent it is supported. What is not supported is that offenders who, I think, the community would be appalled—as the Liberal Party is—at the prospect of them receiving a home detention order rather than gaol time (such as terrorists, murderers, rapists and other serious sex offenders, as defined in section 33 of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act), would receive home detention rather than gaol.

That is an appalling proposition. I urge the government to support the amendments the opposition has put forward that would restrict a court's capacity to give such an offender home detention, just as the government has restricted the CEO of the corrections department from giving such an offender home detention. I look forward to the passage of the bill with these amendments supported by the government.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12:25): Mr Speaker, I seek to raise a matter of privilege. In response to questions on Wednesday 18 November, I asked the Minister for Emergency Services, the Hon. Tony Piccolo, a supplementary question concerning the SES and CFS charters.

The SPEAKER: He is the Minister for Emergency Services. We do not need a subordinate clause with his baptismal name.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your guidance. I asked a supplementary question concerning the SES and CFS volunteers charter being put into legislation, not just regulation. On the following day, Thursday 19 November, I again asked the minister a question along the same lines and quoted from a document that had been released as part of the emergency services sector reform. In both of his answers the minister denied that he intended to incorporate the volunteers charter in the Fire and Emergency Services Act, but rather keep them as regulation.

It is my contention that the minister has knowingly misled the house by denying his former intention to place both of these charters in the Fire and Emergency Services Act. Any reasonable person would understand that when a minister talks about legislation, that means incorporation into an act of parliament, not a regulation attached to that act. This was the understanding of both volunteer associations and many others I have spoken to.

I have documents here, Mr Speaker, that clearly show where the intention was to have the charters placed in legislation, which, as I have said, was interpreted by everyone who read these documents to mean incorporated into the act. For the minister to now say that he does not mean that, to say it was only regulation, means that he has, at the very least, misled 14,000 CFS volunteers and 1,600 SES volunteers.

It is my contention, and I have people from the volunteer associations willing to appear before any further investigation of this matter, that people clearly understood the minister to mean incorporation into the act. I believe the minister was intending to put the charters into the act, hence the term 'legislation'. To turn around and say 'just regulation', I think, is very hard to believe. I believe there was indeed a breach of privilege and I seek your ruling on this matter.

The SPEAKER: On its face it just appears to be political argy-bargy, but I will study the documents and see if, as the member for Morphett asserts, the minister has deliberately or knowingly misled the house, and I will get back to the house with a ruling, as I have in the past.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (HOME DETENTION) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:28): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Home Detention) Bill 2015. The shadow minister has outlined our position with respect to this matter, but can I just add the following: this whole exercise reminds me of that famous phrase, which is something like, 'Houston, we have a problem.' The situation that we now come to in this parliament is that after 14½ years of a Labor government, including under the administration of two attorneys-general, of a rack, stack and pack policy of sending anyone to gaol, except for shoplifting, is just ridiculous.

The chickens always come home to roost with these things, and what has happened? We have got an absolutely jam-packed prison system, so much so that the government, firstly, announced that it would build a prison at Murray Bridge and then it cancelled it. Then it added on containers converted into prison cells in our regional prisons, and it has put in two for one in some of the cells in our correctional facilities.

It is absolutely absurd that 14½ years later the government, in recognition of its policies, has produced this disgraceful situation, both for those who are in prison and who would have some opportunity for rehabilitation and for those who, frankly, could have had an opportunity in rehabilitative services outside the prison system have been denied that, and the government has a problem.

So, it has come to us to say, 'Aren't we good. We have looked at it and reviewed the situation of how we might better deal with the sentencing options for prisoners,' when in fact it is code for, 'We are heavily in the poo and we need some help.'

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pool!

Ms CHAPMAN: A good word, I thought—sensitive. We are here because the government is in a mess and our correctional services operations are in a mess. They are overloaded and the workforce is under pressure every day. And, sadly, those who are in our correctional facilities have almost no access to the relevant rehabilitative programs that are necessary for them to become decent, civilised persons to live next door to us when they come out of prison. That is the situation we are in.

The government's idea is to say, 'Well, we're going to let some out. We'll cancel that idea about having to service a percentage of their sentence,' which was the mandatory insistence that it was coming into the parliament to deal with. 'We will relieve the restrictions on the period of detention that someone can actually do under a home detention order'—which was also under the mask of its being tough on law and order—and, in recognition of the opportunities that are there for home detention, we will make this more available.' What a nonsense!

We have always known that this is an option available in sentencing that is a very important one, especially for young offenders. It just breaks any kind of common sense that the government has been so insistent for its own political motives to have insisted locking up whomever it can find whenever it can and then come back to us under the guise of giving a toss about these people and how they might be returned into the community.

In the end they all get out. In the end one, way or another, people leave prison and they are left, more often than not, sadly, broken and not adequately prepared for living in an employment world and in a world in which they can have respectful relationships with others. Why? Because they have been locked away without any help.

I at least welcome the fact that there is some relief and opportunity for people to have access to home detention as a civilised option in the sentencing toolkit at an earlier stage and more often. But I am totally with, of course, our shadow minister on the importance of ensuring that people who are convicted of serious offences are not in that category, because this was the other con that the government attempted to present to the public with this approach, and that is that it would only be those at the blunt end of the pencil—not the pointy end, not the serious offenders.

Clearly, that has been exposed, and the government in its haste to relieve itself from this burden of these overcrowded prisons is making, really, the home detention sentencing option available for those for serious offences. So, the foreshadowed proposed amendment by the shadow minister ought to be sending out signals for two things. One is that the government finally wakes up to itself and actually accepts it and understands the importance of it, leaving aside the mischief it attempted to pursue by blinding the public into this idea that it suddenly cares about the rehabilitation of prisoners—that it is dealing with serious offenders.

That is a threshold that we are not prepared to move to, especially as there are now parole and other opportunities to be considered under the usual course in dealing with a sentenced offender. Secondly, it is to destroy the myth of them actually caring about these people in an attempt to self-indulge in their own importance about how they deal with this important issue of rehabilitation. I thank the shadow minister for his wise consideration of this matter.

I will say one other thing in relation to the question of how the chief executive manages prisoners. We have dealt with amendments to the correctional services law in this parliament on a number of occasions since I have been in here. We have dealt with the smaller but important matters, such as the security of personal items of prisoners, the day-to-day management of prisons and the like. We have dealt with the increasing capacity for a chief executive to have a role, including the capacity to discipline prisoners, so that they can better manage all the prisoners, for the safety of the employees and the safety of other prisoners.

I suggest that got very close to the edge of what was acceptable, and we had a long debate about whether there should be the power for the chief executive to require a prisoner to be in solitary confinement. I will not repeat today all the law and international treaties that require that isolation not be used as a punishment tool and the protection of prisoners in those circumstances. However, I make the point that it is reasonable for whoever is in charge of the prison, for what we call 'operational matters', to have the capacity to be able to manage.

I consider that one of the biggest problems for those in charge of prisons has not only been the overcrowding per se but the fact that the government, with its big rack, pack, stack and tough on law and order approach, has destroyed the hope of a number of our prisoners of ever being rehabilitated or released. That is because of their disgraceful abuse of executive power in dealing with those who are convicted of murder.

We have been through some legislation recently to deal with that. However, that has been dealt with at a time when we already have a massive accumulation of those in prison, so we add to the burden of the capacity of the chief executive, who is responsible for the day-to-day management. I think it has been unsurprising that as a result we have had to come back here and better facilitate that to occur.

Where the government gets close to the line—and I think probably goes over it, but we still have to consider this question ultimately—is in introducing the chief executive into the sentencing regime of making decisions; whether it is home detention, or any other option for sentencing in the development of the post period of release, is a decision I think that should always remain with an independent party—not with the gaoler but with either the court or, in our case, the Parole Board, which has a valuable role in this area.

We have a very significant reliance on those in charge of the prisons to provide information on what the prisoner has been doing, how they have progressed in their rehabilitation, their general conduct, their treatment of other prisoners and the like. That information is very helpful in making the ultimate decision about whether someone can progress to a home detention.

Additionally, it is also very valuable when we consider the day release of prisoners, which of course is again a very important program in helping prisoners to obtain employment and secure it and become financially independent, learn in a very real and meaningful way how to interact with, in that case, a workplace environment and, hopefully, some other family connection, so that when they are free of the incarceration they are better able to deal with it rather than just being emptied out from the prison at the time of their release.

All of the information about how the prisoner has performed or failed to perform is absolutely critical, but it remains of concern to me that chief executives come into the role of making the determination. I understand there has been some aspect of this bill which will ensure that that cannot be abused. I indicate that we will be supporting the bill with the valuable amendment to be proposed by the shadow minister.

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) (12:41): Thank you to those people who have contributed to the debate. First of all, I know the member for Morialta has moved a number of amendments. On the face of it, I am not devastated and shocked at these amendments, but I would like the opportunity to consider them between here and the other place.

I understand what the honourable member is trying to do, but I would like the opportunity to reflect on it a bit more. I do not wish anything I am saying to be interpreted as a rejection, necessarily, of the member's suggestions contained in the amendments, but I would like to reflect on it. As I said, on the face of it, it does no great disservice as far as I can see, but I would like to be certainly clear about that.

The second thing is that in general terms the judge or judicial officer hearing a particular matter is usually the best placed person to make decisions of the type that we are talking about here. After all, they have seen the accused person in their courtroom, they have personally observed the way the individual conducts themselves, they have heard the evidence of the witnesses, and they have heard the evidence directly from any character witnesses or any medical professionals who might be providing advice, so they are clearly in a far more informed position about each individual than the member for Morialta and I ever will be.

Mr Gardner: If that's the case, why have a mandatory life sentence?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Indeed; and that is a reasonable question. I am just saying that as a matter of general proposition I think we have to try to give the courts room to exercise discretion. That said, there are limits to that; I totally agree with that, but I am just saying that as a general proposition they are in a better position than either of us might be or, indeed, dare I say this, some of the people who write for *The Advertiser* might be, who frequently go into print pontificating upon the merit or otherwise of a judgement and often only recording a very short paragraph: 'The judge said this person was not very nice,' and then they go on.

Mr Gardner: Name them.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They know who they are; I do not need to do that. I gather the member for Morialta also spent some time reflecting on the Law Society's concerns. Again, the Law Society has a job to do and it does it well. It does not necessarily mean at all times one finds oneself in agreement with the Law Society; but it would be a dull world if we all agreed all the time, wouldn't it?

I want to make some remarks in respect of the comments made by the Law Society. The Law Society has expressed concern that the bill in its current form may not allow sufficient flexibility for the variation of a home detention order, in particular in relation to the nominated residence, without triggering an application for breach of a condition under the proposed section 33BD.

Proposed section 33BC(3) of the bill gives a court a power to vary or revoke a condition of a home detention order. This subsection will allow a person subject to a home detention order to vary

his or her place of residence without giving rise to any application for breach of proceedings, or at least that is what is intended. If the nominated address becomes unavailable or unsuitable and no other suitable address can be found, the court must revoke the home detention order and order that the sentence of imprisonment for that person be carried into effect.

The requirement of the bill to give paramount consideration to the safety of the community when imposing a home detention order means that an order cannot remain in force if there no longer exists, obviously enough, a suitable address at which the offender can be housed and monitored because part and parcel of the safety of the community is, in fact, a known address for those particular purposes.

However, the bill gives the court a power to excuse a breach if it is found that the failure to comply with the conditions of the home detention order was trivial or that there are proper grounds on which the failure should be excused. Where such a finding is made, a court may refrain from revoking an order and may impose a further condition or vary or revoke an order. The provision will thus allow a court, when appropriate, to impose an alternative residential condition on an offender where that alternate address has been secured a short time after the breach occurred.

In practical terms, a court will likely not dispose of a breach application immediately. This will allow an offender some time to secure alternate accommodation. Where an offender has not been able to secure alternate accommodation, and the period of imprisonment is called into effect, there is no impediment on the same offender being released at a later date at the discretion of the chief executive to serve the balance of a sentence on home detention.

The Law Society raises the question of whether an offender will be remanded in custody or released on bail when charged with a breach of home detention conditions. The bill does not prevent a person charged with a breach of a home detention order from being released on bail pending determination of the proceedings. Indeed, a release on bail is explicitly contemplated by proposed sections 33BD and 33BE. It will be a matter for the court in consideration of all relevant facts and circumstances to determine the question of custody status of an offender who was charged with a breach of a home detention order pending the outcome of those proceedings.

Having said that, I would add as an aside that if one of these offenders were breaching by reason of having left the nominated address, and there having been found no alternate nominated address, that would, of course, would be a relevant consideration in the bail application because, obviously, it is difficult to bail somebody to no fixed abode. It is rather complicated.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And not very safe either.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: And not very safe, indeed. The Law Society asks that parliament give consideration to a provision that allows a court to have regard to any period that a person has spent on home detention bail if that person is ultimately sentenced to a home detention order. It is a well-established sentencing principle that a court has the discretion to take into account the time an offender has spent on home detention bail when imposing a sentence of imprisonment.

This bill creates a regime whereby a period of imprisonment can be served on home detention. It requires a court to set a term of imprisonment and then turn to the question of whether an offender is a suitable person to serve that term of imprisonment on a home detention order after, of course, considering and disposing of the question of suspension.

In imposing the sentence of imprisonment under proposed section 33BB, a court will have regard to relevant sentencing law as it would when imposing a custodial term of imprisonment or ordering a sentence of imprisonment to be suspended, including time spent on home detention bail or in custody. There is no intention for a court to adopt a different approach under the provisions of this bill.

I think there were some other matters raised by the member for Morialta, including: will this free up a large number of prison beds? The answer to that, which I think I have already given earlier, is I do not expect that will be the case although, obviously, if there are people in prison who can be safely managed in the community, then it is a good thing that they do become people who are managed in the community rather than remaining in prison. That is as good for them as individuals as it is for us as well, because the rest of us should be happy in the knowledge that people who can

be safely managed in the community are less likely to wind up reoffending and less likely to wind up in prison again, so I think that is all to the good.

On the question as to whether the Corrections people currently have suitable arrangements in place, it is my understanding that Corrections, obviously, are preparing and prepared for this eventuality. They have obviously been consulted in the process of the development of this measure and, therefore, I am confident that Corrections will be able to manage this. It may well be, because this is a new initiative, that the estimates that have been made by Corrections up until now about the numbers of people involved may be marginally high or low and, to the extent that they are marginally high or low, there may be some finetuning in due course, but that is a matter we can deal with as we proceed.

The question about rehabilitation of offenders I think is a very good question. Can I just make this point, and I am I guess straddling portfolios a little bit here, but in my—

Mr Gardner: It will be useful to have the knowledge of that portfolio remain in the cabinet.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just ignore him because he is interjecting, and we don't take any notice of interjections.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And we don't respond to them either.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I am not responding: I was just about to straddle portfolios. I was going to say—and it might be of some assistance to the member for Morialta, who I know is genuinely interested in these matters—in the context of the present process that I am attempting to undertake and accelerate of devolving a large number of currently Housing SA properties out to the not-for-profit sector, part and parcel of that, I hope, as we get further down the track, will involve some of the not-for-profits who are able to add value services becoming engaged with that process. Some of them might indeed be able to offer very useful rehabilitation-type programs or other support programs.

Ms Chapman: They do now.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Beg your pardon?

Ms Chapman: That's what they do now—the NGOs.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, but I am talking about a—sorry, I responded to that. I am talking about a particular context, Madam Deputy Speaker, the context being that we are increasingly, and at a fair clip, engaging with a group of not-for-profit organisations—Junction, for one—with whom in the past we have not really had much to do at that level and on the scale that we are presently wishing to engage with them.

I have to say, my conversations with my counterparts in New South Wales have told me that you can have some very, very useful engagement with some of these NGOs and have very significant improvement in the sort of range and depth of services they are offering to people who are in public housing. My point is many of the people we are talking about here, inevitably, are going to be in public housing. I am just saying that there are many things going on in many different areas which, hopefully, will be the—

Mr Gardner: You are juggling Housing, Corrections and—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Gardner: —Attorney-General's, and straddling them all at once.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's it. The whole is more than the sum of the parts—that is where I am heading. I think that is the denouement of that particular conversation. Anyway, I do thank members for their contributions. I think all of us in this place really are of a mind that we would like to see a more tactile corrections system which is offering a more particularised response to individual offenders, with that response maximising the opportunity, where there is any opportunity, of that

person being rehabilitated and conducting themselves in a way which contributes to everybody else and to them as well.

I personally am of a view that there are some people in our Corrections system for whom any amount of rehabilitation is going to be a complete waste of time. The sooner we identify those individuals and get over the fact that they might be locked up for a very long time and stop wringing our hands about that the better.

Those who have either been down on their luck, or they have been just stupid or made some poor decisions in life, those are people we should be trying to engage in such a way as to take them out of that little cul-de-sac they have got themselves into and put them back into a 'useful member of the community' category, which is where they should be. I see this and many other measures we are taking as being small but cumulatively significant steps in that direction.

I do welcome the fact that the opposition has been, in general terms, supportive of these initiatives. I think this is one of those areas of public policy where, happily for the people of South Australia, the government and the opposition are broadly in agreement about where we would like to go, so it is quite a constructive situation. I think it bodes well for, in particular, this type of conversation about Corrections that we have this degree of cross-party support. I thank members for their contributions.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Mr GARDNER: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Gardner-1]—

Page 3, after line 22 [clause 6, inserted section 33BA]—Insert:

serious sexual offence has the same meaning as in section 33(1);

terrorist act has the same meaning as in the *Terrorism (Commonwealth Powers) Act 2002*.

(2) For the purposes of this Division, a reference to an *offence of murder* includes—

- (a) an offence of conspiracy to murder; and
- (b) an offence of aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring the commission of murder.

(3) This Division does not apply in relation to—

- (a) a defendant who is serving or is liable to serve a sentence of indeterminate duration and who has not had a non-parole period fixed; or
- (b) a defendant who is being sentenced—
 - (i) for an offence of murder; or
 - (ii) for a serious sexual offence; or
 - (iii) in relation to an offence involving a terrorist act.

I direct the casual reader of *Hansard* to my comments during the second reading debate as to its effects.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I formally oppose the amendment, but I also direct people to what I said before. That does not mean that I think this proposition has no merit at all; I just want to look at it. I oppose it here, but I am going to entertain it with them.

Mr GARDNER: We look forward to that entertainment, and I hope the Attorney-General will support it in the Legislative Council through his proxy. I note that usually he prefers to do it here, but

in this case we will not take offence at the immediate opposition because I know that, with his grand proxy in the upper house, hopefully they will support it there.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

Amendment No 1 [AG-1]—

Page 8, after line 21—Insert:

- (2) However, if, after the commencement of this Part, a sentence imposed on a defendant before the commencement of this Part is quashed on appeal and a new sentence imposed, the amendments to the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988* made by this Part do not apply in relation to sentencing the defendant to the new sentence.

Mr GARDNER: Without necessarily indicating that it is going to hurt the bill in any way, we will consider it between the houses, as the Attorney is considering ours.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 16) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (12:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

COUNTRY SHOWS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey): Presented a petition signed by 194 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reverse the decision to withdraw \$40,000 of funding from country shows across South Australia and recognise the importance of providing ongoing financial support to ensure regional and rural shows remain a vital part of local communities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

An honourable member: And warn him.

The SPEAKER: I can't very well warn him if I have not called him to order first.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today members of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Association, who are guests of the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. I also welcome students who were here earlier from St Bernadette's Primary School at St Marys, guests of the member for Waite.

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—Mount Barker District Council Annual Report 2014-2015

By the Minister for Housing and Urban Development (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Architectural Practice Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2014-15

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

Coast Protection Board—Annual Report 2014-15
South Australian Water Corporation—Erratum Annual Report 2014-15

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

Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, Department of—Annual Report 2014-15

*Ministerial Statement***BAIL ACCOMMODATION SUPPORT PROGRAM**

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:07): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Earlier this afternoon I announced that Anglicare SA has won the tender to deliver a 30 bed Bail Accommodation Support Program. The Bail Accommodation Support Program, or BASP, will provide short-term accommodation as an alternative to custody for alleged offenders granted bail by the court who would otherwise lack a suitable place to stay.

The availability of accommodation for alleged offenders appearing before a court can be the determining factor between being remanded in custody or remaining in the community on bail. Therefore, the BASP provides alleged offenders the opportunity to maintain links to family, employment, education and government services while awaiting the outcome of their court matter.

The program will be supervised by Anglicare and the Department for Correctional Services. The building will be staffed around the clock, and participants of the program will be expected to meet their court-imposed bail conditions and follow strict house rules, such as curfews.

The program is based on proven and successful models from the United Kingdom, and similar models with the accompanying support programs that have already been implemented and working successfully in New South Wales and Victoria.

Anglicare SA won the tender for this project, and I am confident that, with its long and proud history of service provision, it will manage the program effectively. The program is a great example of government partnering with the non-government sector to provide a valuable and cost-effective community service.

The facility will be located in Dale Street, Port Adelaide, with construction being undertaken by Badge, a South Australian-owned company. The project is scheduled to be completed in early to mid-2017. The program marks an exciting time for justice sector reform in South Australia, signifying a rethink on how we manage alleged offenders released by the court on bail and how we provide viable alternatives to custody.

While this initiative supports alleged offenders remaining in the community, along with other alternatives to custody, I can assure this place and the broader community that those offenders, alleged or otherwise, who present a risk to society will continue to be remanded in custody.

RAJASTHAN SISTER-STATE RELATIONSHIP

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:09): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: On Thursday 19 November 2015, the South Australian government formalised its economic and cultural ties with the Indian state of Rajasthan. A sister-state relationship, signed at a ceremony in Jaipur, has its origins in the South Australian India Engagement Strategy, released in October 2012.

In visits to India during 2014 and 2015 by the Premier and Deputy Premier, the state of Rajasthan was identified as an opportunity for economic cooperation. In August this year, I led a business mission to the region and started discussions with the Chief Minister of Rajasthan, Vasundhara Raje. These discussions advanced rapidly, and the assistance of Austrade and South Australia's Department of State Development was provided.

Cabinet resolved in October 2015 that a relationship should be formalised at a signing ceremony at the Resurgent Rajasthan Partnership Summit in 2015, where Chief Minister Raje's stated objective was that Rajasthan become the most developed state in India. Resurgent Rajasthan's two-day partnership summit was attended by global industry heavyweights, including Cyrus Mistry of Tata Sons; Adani Group Chief, Gautam Adani; Reliance Group Chairman, Anil Ambani; and Anand Mahindra of the Mahindra Group. They were joined by senior ministers in the Indian national government and thousands of business and cultural representatives from around the world.

Bearing witness to the event were representatives from the South Australian business community, including Sydac, SAGE Automation, NN Occupational Health, AAMC Training, the South Australian Cricket Association and Rubicon Water. The delegation was assisted by Australia's High Commissioner, Patrick Suckling; the Department of Foreign Affairs; and officials from Austrade. In my discussions with the Chief Minister, she outlined plans to encourage new ideas and relationships which will lead to investment and job creation.

On behalf of the South Australian government, I affirmed our willingness to establish partnerships and collaborations in Rajasthan that will mutually benefit both regions. The state government recognises that South Australia's ongoing prosperity depends on our trade and investment in growing international markets. The sister-state relationship is based on a two-way exchange of research, policy and technical capabilities. It provides partnership and collaborative opportunities across key sectors for the region where South Australian businesses can offer services and product support.

The new trade relationship arises as global trade becomes easier. The digital age, along with faster and easier air travel, is bringing nations and cultures together. At the touch of a screen, we share information, data and experiences. This has opened up a growing area of international trade—the services sector. Service providers can grow their business with institutions in other countries through joint ventures and partnerships to their mutual advantage. In this new era, we will see an increase in two-way trade and two-way investment between our two states. I note that minister Robb is negotiating with the government of India at the moment for a free trade agreement. It is not just what we can do in each other's markets; it is also what we can do together.

Currently, there are 65,000 South Australian jobs that are linked to exports. Our aim is to increase that number through relationships such as this with Rajasthan. The next step in the partnership has seen officials from both states begin work on a cooperative action plan to identify and deliver key projects. Collaboration on sustainable water management will facilitate investment in South Australian water research, policy and technical capabilities in a number of areas, such as groundwater research, water quality, aquifer recharge, and education training and capacity building.

Rajasthan comprises about 10 per cent of India's land mass and about 5 per cent of the country's population, but it has marginally over 1 per cent of the country's water resources. Water conservation and management and environmental sustainability are key priorities for the current and

future prosperity of the region. For the business sector, there are opportunities across these fields. There is an inbound mission from India planned for January and an outbound mission from South Australia in August to India. I will update the house on further developments. The South Australian government commends the cooperation—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —of the state of Rajasthan in promoting this partnership, and we commend the assistance of the Australian and Indian national governments.

The SPEAKER: I draw to the attention of the member for Hartley, who departed yesterday under the sessional orders, standing order 142:

While a Member is speaking, no other Member may make a noise or disturbance or converse aloud or speak so as to interrupt the Member speaking except on a point of order.

Accordingly, the house having given leave to the minister to make that statement, I call the member for Hartley to order.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:15): I bring up the 17th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Mr WILLIAMS: Mr Speaker, I am seeking a point of clarification. I have just been handed by one of the attendants an answer to a question that I asked on 18 June this year of the Minister for Health. I have just been handed this today, on 2 December, but it is signed by the Minister for Health in September 2015. I am wondering whether there is some delay either in the minister's office or in the parliament.

The SPEAKER: My understanding is, from my time as a minister, that all answers to questions on notice had to go to cabinet before they come to the parliament.

Question Time

FIREARMS REFORM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Police. What progress has the South Australian government made in implementing the recommendations of the joint commonwealth/New South Wales review into the Martin Place siege in keeping with the COAG agreement?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:17): I would have to get some advice on that from the commissioner. In terms of where we are at, obviously myself and other members of cabinet get a briefing from time to time but, as to the exact status at the moment, I will get an answer for the member.

FIREARMS REFORM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Supplementary, sir: has the South Australian government conducted an audit of its firearms data holdings, as recommended by the Martin Place siege review?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:17): First of all, my understanding is that that was a recommendation to the New South Wales government but, having said that, we have before this parliament at the moment a firearms bill which, hopefully, with the support of the opposition upstairs—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Well, the purpose of the bill is to make sure that we actually remove from the general community firearms which pose a risk to the community, and those firearms are the ones which we don't know about. We already know—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: We already know from the advice from the Australian Crime Commission that there are about 250,000 firearms unaccounted for in this country—long arms—and 10,000 handguns unaccounted for. Of course, the whole strategy behind the Firearms Bill is to ensure that number—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: firstly, under 98, the minister is not being relevant to the question in relation to the audit of the data holdings, and—

The SPEAKER: Yes, and?

Mr GARDNER: —secondly, reflecting on debate in another place I suspect is also probably in there.

The SPEAKER: I will take advice on the second point, but I will listen carefully, as to the first point, to what the minister has to say. Minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, all I can add is that this government is focused on making sure that we don't have firearms in the community which are not licensed.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold the second point of order. The mischief that it is directed at is that you are not to canvass or agitate differences between the two houses in their approach to a bill. Leader.

FIREARMS REFORM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Thank you very much. Can the minister outline to the house what the government's response to this report is which was tabled in January of this year in response to the Martin Place siege and discussed at COAG throughout multiple meetings? What is the state government doing to implement the 17 recommendations contained in this report, which is also the subject of plenty of work interstate?

The SPEAKER: The member is just to ask a question, not adduce facts in support of a question. That is what the standing orders say.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:20): As the member would be aware, the number of recommendations would be at an operational level, so I am happy for him to be briefed by the Commissioner of Police on those matters.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The commissioner puts those things into operation. I am happy for the member to be briefed by the commissioner.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health is called to order.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am more than happy for the member to be briefed by the commissioner.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Can you update the house on recent steps the government has taken in support of improvement and renewal of the state's Housing Trust homes?

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) (14:21): I thank the member for her question. In fact, the two of us were fortunate enough the other night to be at Mitchell Park with a group of her constituents. The member for Mitchell was there and His Worship, the Mayor of Marion, was there and it was a very fine occasion. That is highly relevant to this question because local communities are already beginning to notice the benefit of more than 1,000 Housing Trust properties being transferred to the management of the not-for-profit sector.

This is part of the government's strategy to build a stronger housing system to increase the supply of social and affordable housing. The transfer of some public housing properties to community housing providers is a key component in this strategy. Management responsibility for the 608 former Housing Trust properties in Mitchell Park has now been transferred to Junction Australia. It was just last week, as I said, that the member for Elder and I attended that function, along with the member for Mitchell.

In addition to that, management of 479 Housing Trust properties in Elizabeth Grove and Elizabeth Vale has also been transferred to AnglicareSA. This is just part of a broader Renewing our Streets and Suburbs program that will see the regeneration of all Housing Trust homes that predate 1968 within 15 years. This change is designed to more effectively manage social and affordable housing and provide a holistic service to local communities.

Community housing providers have access to a range of residential subsidies from the Australian government, tax and other benefits that public housing does not. Those funds are used to increase the supply of social and affordable housing, improve existing properties, and for other initiatives to benefit people living in those communities. We have now successfully transferred 1,100 homes to the management of the community housing sector as part of our plan to transfer a total of 5,000 homes to that sector by the end of 2016. Anglicare and Junction Housing invest the extra funds available to them into upgrading the properties and providing tenant support.

Junction Australia, a leading independent provider of integrated housing and social community development services, now manages 1,700 homes across South Australia through its registered community housing provider Junction and Women's Housing Limited. In the first 10 days of managing these Mitchell Park properties, Junction Australia addressed 67 maintenance issues. Twelve local contractors were involved in this work and materials were all purchased locally.

Anglicare Housing, another leading not-for-profit community housing provider, now has responsibility for the management of the 479 Housing Trust properties in Elizabeth and Elizabeth Grove. AnglicareSA has opened a dedicated housing service centre in Elizabeth Grove Shopping Centre. There, tenants can immediately resolve a specific housing issue and access broader Anglicare services. I have to say I am very, very pleased with the progress we are making with the not-for-profit sector. Already, the feedback we are getting from the tenants is that they are extremely well pleased with the new arrangements.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary, member for Adelaide.

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:25): Back to the Deputy Premier, were the community housing providers aware that there would be \$19 million of repairs and maintenance before signing the contract for the 1,100 houses?

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) (14:25): I don't know where those numbers come from. I have, in the past, been in receipt of questions with various numbers attached

to them which don't turn out to be based in any fact. What I can say is this: there was a very rigorous and extensive period of discussion between these providers and Housing SA.

In fact, on the initial 1,100, the discussions have been going on for an extremely long period of time—extremely long. It might be a year or more—very lengthy, anyway. It's been going on for an enormous period of time, and I am absolutely certain there would have been a thorough canvassing of issues between the not-for-profit people who were going to be taking over those properties and Housing SA. But, just in case there is a kernel of truth to the question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, because I am confident—

Mr Marshall: A kernel?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's right. The question suggested that Housing SA was in some way being cute or not revealing information to the not-for-profits before the transfer occurs, and I find that a slightly unhelpful suggestion, if it is not absolutely correct. What I am going to do is try to find out whether or not there is any truth to the assertion, as it would appear implicit in that question, that Housing SA was in some way withholding relevant information from these not-for-profit providers.

I will seek to find out the answer to that question, but I come back to the point I made originally: both in the case of Anglicare and in the case of Junction, there were extensive discussions between the state and those agencies. I would be very surprised indeed if matters of maintenance and so on were not discussed, but I will seek a further answer to that question.

Ms SANDERSON: Supplementary?

The SPEAKER: Before a further supplementary, I call to order the member for Stuart, the deputy leader and the Minister for Agriculture. I warn the member for Hartley. By all means, continue the improvisation.

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:27): Thank you. A further supplementary: when the minister is seeking clarification over the figure, could he please confirm that, for the 479 homes transferred to Anglicare, there was an \$8 million repair and maintenance backlog which was expected to be reduced over 10 years, and that the 609 homes that were transferred to Junction had an \$11 million repair and maintenance backlog which is expected to be extinguished over three years?

The SPEAKER: I have raised this with the member for Adelaide before, but a supplementary is supposed to arise from the content of the minister's answer. The member for Adelaide has just read her question off a mobile phone, which rather undermines the claim of spontaneity.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: I realise that you are not familiar with the way that modern technology works, but people actually use phones to write notes these days.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned, as is the member for Morialta for an entirely bogus point of order. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (14:29): Mr Speaker, I think I did, as you so insightfully summarised a moment ago, provide an answer to that question before, and the consequent question is in fact a further interrogation of the first question to which I have already given an answer, which is I will get an answer. I don't have a random question generator available to me, nor a random answer generator.

COUNTERTERRORISM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is again to the Minister for Police regarding my earlier series of questions. How is the police commissioner responsible for the carriage of recommendation 12 from the report? Recommendation 12 states:

All States and Territories should review relevant legislation, in particular with respect to privacy and health, to ensure appropriate access by ASIO, with a report back to COAG by mid-2015.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:30): It is a matter for COAG but, putting that aside for the moment, I will get back to the question.

Mr Marshall: Every state's responsible.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Just listen to the answer. First of all, it is not unusual for the agencies to review on behalf of the government legislation and bring up recommendations which come from the national forum. There's really nothing new about that and the commissioner will bring to my attention, or even to the Attorney-General or any other minister, legislation that will deal with the terrorism matters and advice on how any legislation may be required to be changed.

That aside, matters of COAG, etc., are coordinated through in this government, and I suppose the Leader of the Opposition wouldn't know because he hasn't been there yet—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: It is interesting that people—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Coming from you, that's a bit rich.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes, a person who had to be sacked by a Facebook message from his leader.

Mr Pengilly: Time will tell.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I'm sure it will: time tells all.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Pengilly for leader!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Pengilly for leader. The DPC will coordinate it and an appropriate response will come through.

The SPEAKER: Given that the minister was somewhat provocative, I won't impose any warnings. Deputy leader.

COUNTERTERRORISM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): My question is to the Attorney-General. Has the government drafted legislation requiring a bail authority to take into account an accused person's links with terrorist organisations or violent extremism when considering a bail application as per the review referred to?

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) (14:32): I will have to actually check where we are up to. There are a number of matters pertinent to the question of terrorism and these things are moving at a fairly rapid pace.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: People may not be surprised, I hope, to realise that since the outrage that occurred in Paris not so long ago there has been quite a bit of activity in this space around the country and there have been various moves made both at a national level and elsewhere. As to whether the particular matter that is referred to in the question is the subject of an existing draft, I will need to check.

COUNTERTERRORISM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Supplementary: given the rapid response of the government on this, will the Attorney-General rapidly get an answer and report back to us tomorrow?

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) (14:33): I will rapidly get an answer as soon as it can be rapidly obtained from the relevant rapid authorities and I will bring it back.

COUNTERTERRORISM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Police. Will the South Australian government establish a dedicated counterterrorism command to reduce the likelihood of a terrorist attack in South Australia, as recommended in the Martin Place report in January of this year?

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) (14:33): I think it has been made fairly clear by the minister that, in relation to this—

Mr Gardner: This is another example of straddling portfolios.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And the members for Davenport, Mount Gambier and Schubert are called to order.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And the Treasurer is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I was saying, I think the minister has said on more than one occasion—and I thought he has actually been saying it pretty clearly—that we would be seeking advice in relation to this array of questions about responses—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think, because I do not know the answer to that question—

Mr Marshall: Why don't you let the police minister answer the question?

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think it is very important that we answer all these questions about this whole topic, and that we give correct answers—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think it is very important that the government give the parliament accurate answers to these questions. I would even be happy—and this might assist the Leader of the Opposition—for him to read out the rest of his questions into *Hansard* so that we can move on to the next topic. I would take all of them away tonight and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: You can ask whatever questions you like about terrorists, the answer will be the same in here—

Ms Chapman: How do you know? He might actually have some answers.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell is warned.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for the second and final time, which puts him in the same category as the member for Unley and the member for Morialta.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Being compared to the member for Unley is a long stretch, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley and the Treasurer are at risk of leaving together.

Mr GARDNER: Sir, you would have named the member for Unley if he had done what the Treasurer just did. Surely, undermining your authority and interrupting the house in that way must be dealt with.

The SPEAKER: It will not be the last time.

SOUTH ROAD UPGRADES

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:36): My question is directed to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on recent works associated with the Torrens to Torrens project?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:37): I thank the member for her question and for her interest in this project. As members who may have recently driven down South Road or Port Road would be aware, works on the Torrens to Torrens project are well underway. As I have previously reported to the house, this is a project championed by this government, including in the lead-up to the last state election, and for good reason. The \$896 million Torrens to Torrens project will have significant benefits for the freight industry and for all traffic moving on this part of the north-south corridor on South Road. Of course, it has a very strong positive cost-benefit ratio of approximately 2.5.

However, as with any major project, particularly with works associated with existing roadways, the government recognises that this project will cause some inconvenience to motorists at times. While it is a condition of the contract for the project consortium that capacity during peak hours is maintained throughout the works, we know that there will inevitably be inconvenience. At times there will be lane and speed restrictions in the project area.

To provide real-time information to motorists about traffic conditions and travel times, I am pleased to advise the house that six new variable messaging signs have been installed—and indeed turned on today—in the western and north-western suburbs. The signs are located at Grange Road at Flinders Park, Park Terrace at Brompton, Port Road at Woodville Park, Torrens Road at Kilkenny, Port Road at Thebarton and South Road at Richmond. Using the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure state-of-the-art Bluetooth technology, these signs have the ability to display travel times to the city by alternative routes. We are also installing variable speed signs on Port Road near the Entertainment Centre to improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers in the vicinity, giving a capacity for speed limits to be adjusted in response to prevailing traffic conditions.

As part of the \$896 million project, the government is also operating roads to provide alternatives to motorists during these major works. These include the duplication of James Congdon Drive and upgrades to Richmond Road, as well as the widening of Park Terrace and Fitzroy Terrace. I am advised by DPTI that these works are expected to finish by the end of this year.

I am also pleased to advise the house that works have now commenced on a new \$1.7 million pedestrian/cycling bridge across the River Torrens in West Hindmarsh, connecting the electorates of both the member for Croydon and the member for Hindmarsh. This is an important project as it will provide connectivity during the Torrens to Torrens construction process and will leave a great piece of infrastructure for the local communities on both sides of the river. They will benefit from better connections between Linear Park and other cycleways in the area and encourage more people to take up these recreational activities of walking and cycling.

The bridge will also provide better access to community facilities, such as Thebarton Senior College, Thebarton Community Centre, St Joseph's School and local shopping precincts and, hopefully, will encourage more people to leave the car at home. I am advised that lighting will be installed on the bridge and along existing paths, improving safety and security at night. I was particularly pleased to see that South Australian company SMB Civil won the contract to build the bridge and I am advised that works will be completed in 2016. I look forward to continuing to update the house in the new year as the Torrens to Torrens project progresses.

The SPEAKER: The Speaker notes that this project has always been opposed by the Greens political party and would remain in its current unfinished state indefinitely were they in executive government. The leader.

COUNTERTERRORISM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Police. How many South Australian police officers are dedicated to counterterrorism duties in South Australia and has this number increased this year?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:41): I would suggest that all of our police would get the appropriate terrorism-type related—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: If you let me finish. All—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: All of our police would be made aware and receive the appropriate training for any terrorism or unrelated matter. In terms of the exact number of officers—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: In terms of the exact number of police today working in that unit, I will get the details for the member.

COUNTERTERRORISM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Supplementary, to the Minister for Police: does the minister think that the Victorian decision to invest \$49.4 million to hire 88 counterterrorism specialists and to make provision for equipment supporting counterterrorism is a good idea?

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) (14:42): Neither the Minister for Police nor any of us is accountable to this parliament for the behaviour of the Victorian government.

SPORTS VOUCHERS

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Minister, can you update the house on how the sports vouchers program has fared in 2015?

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

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) (14:42): I thank the member for Kurna for the question and acknowledge the great advocacy and the role he plays for the sporting groups in his electorate. He does a terrific job. He still hasn't been able to get a flag for the Aldinga Sharks, but it is early days. We are hoping that these sporting vouchers will help get more young people into sporting clubs, including the Sharks. I notice that Auskick, this year in South Australia, has seen a 10 per cent increase in membership right across the state. So, that's a good result. We have seen some other increased membership right across the state. We are still trying to work those figures out so that, hopefully, I will come back to the house in the new year to explain just what sort of increase we have seen.

In the member for Kurna's area, the Moana Surf Life Saving Club, one of four life-saving clubs in the seat of Kurna, their Mini Moes (which is age 5 to 7) \$125 membership fee, with a sports voucher, is reduced to \$75. The under 18s at the Southport Surf Life Saving Club, \$100 is reduced to \$50 with a sports voucher. The Port Noarlunga Tennis Club, the \$100 membership fee is reduced to \$50 with a sports voucher. So, this is a way that we as a government are assisting families and sporting clubs at the same time. We came up with this as an election commitment in March of last year and we started rolling out the first of the vouchers in March of this year.

I want to congratulate all of those people in the Office for Recreation and Sport and all of our clubs as well for the way they have worked together to make sure that this scheme has been rolled out very quickly and very efficiently, but most importantly, in a really cost-effective manner because we want to deliver as much as we can of these valuable taxpayer dollars straight to the clubs and straight to the families concerned who have primary school aged children.

So far, we have helped 35,500 people claim the sports voucher, which is an outstanding achievement. If we look at the other states and territories that have done this—Western Australia, Queensland, Northern Territory—

Mr Whetstone: How much have they paid?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I'm glad you asked. We ask the dixer here, mate. I'll tell you. We add all those three states and territories together and 35,500 is more than what those three states and territories did in their entire first year, so I thank you for your interjection, member for Chaffey. Keep on going.

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor will desist from her reeling in gesture—yes, that gesture—and is called to order. The minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: This was a commitment over four years and I want to thank the Treasurer for standing by this commitment. We have allowed \$7.7 million over four years for the sports voucher system, which is open to any primary school aged student who wants to be involved in club sport. It is \$7.7 million over four years and \$1.7 million has been spent so far this year and, as I said, 35,500 children have claimed the voucher already.

We encourage people that, if they haven't claimed them, they can still do so until 31 December. The really good news is that we are going to stand by this commitment for the next three years, at least, because it is a good system. It helps ease the pain and financial hardship on families and also helps create more membership in clubs around the state.

While I am on sports clubs, thank you very much to the Glencoe footy club for hosting us last week for the community cabinet. It was a fantastic spread of food. My Auntie Margaret's cream puffs went down a treat with the Premier. Angela Tweedle, my cousin, made great scones.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary from the member for Morphett.

SPORTS VOUCHERS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:46): Can the minister tell the house how many children with disabilities who are at primary school but above the 13-year-old age cut-off have received the sports grants?

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) (14:47): Everyone who is at primary school is eligible for these grants. I will get those figures for you. It would be nice to hear from the other side some sort of bipartisan agreement that this is actually working very well because—

The SPEAKER: The minister will not try to make Her Majesty's opposition responsible for the administration of this program.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank goodness they are aren't responsible, because they wouldn't have come up with the idea in the first place, nor would they have the capacity to deliver the sort of money to the clubs that we have delivered. Thirty-five thousand five hundred primary school students—

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order. I believe the minister is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: I can't hear the minister so I can't hear whether he is debating it or not.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: I was, sir.

The SPEAKER: You were debating it? Accordingly, I warn the Minister for Sport.

COUNTERTERRORISM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Police. Is there a formal memorandum of understanding between the South Australia Police and the department of public prosecutions governing the review of all bail decisions as recommended by the Martin Place siege review?

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) (14:48): I will make whatever inquiries need be made of the DPP and I will find out the answer to that question.

COUNTERTERRORISM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Police. Have the media been offered access to government-led training exercises to further improve cooperation in the event of future terrorism incidents, as recommended by the review?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:48): I will need to get that advice for the member, and—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: What I can say to the house is that our police are part of the Australia-New Zealand Counter-Terrorism Committee and they cooperate with both other states and—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —also with New Zealand. The other thing we need to remember is that, in terms of South Australia, the terrorism risk here is different to that in New South Wales and Victoria.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Well, no—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Well, it is sad that actually the member for Bragg does not understand what 'alert' means. She has no idea what that means, because clearly the commissioner has, on the radio a number of times, explained what that means.

The SPEAKER: The minister will not respond to interjections and the deputy leader will not make them.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, I will seek that information for the member.

COUNTERTERRORISM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): If the issue is so little risk in South Australia, why did we in this parliament extend the terrorism legislation for another 10 years as a result of the heightened risk for terrorism in this state?

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: It's fine. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (14:50): Yes, thank you, Mr Speaker. I notice the passion attached to the question that has just been asked by the deputy leader, but if we can just cool it down a little bit. Not so long ago in this very chamber we had a conversation in the form of the parliamentary procedure attached to the passage of a bill, that bill being a bill to extend the time in respect of the current counterterrorism legislation, which was a uniform scheme, if you like.

I think, Mr Speaker, you were probably attorney at the time of the original passage of these measures, and each of the states was invited by the commonwealth to pass legislation; and, at the time for reasons that you might recall but it was before my time, there was an agreement that there would be a 10-year window on the operation of that sunset clause.

Of course, in but a blinking of an eye, 9½ years have gone by and we have all sorts of serious events going on around the world. We have the events in Sydney at the Lindt Cafe, and everybody says, 'Well, look, my goodness, why don't we renew this for another 10 years,' a self-evidently reasonable proposition.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It may surprise the deputy leader to know that the Minister for Police is aware of this, and the Minister for Police, along with pretty well everyone in this room, participated in a very thorough debate. I recall the deputy leader made a lengthy contribution, which is unusual because normally she is quite brief. On this particular occasion she went into quite a bit of detail, and ultimately—

Mr Marshall: I hope you listened.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I always do.

Mr Marshall: I hope you learned something.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I always learn something when the deputy leader addresses a matter in here, because the thoroughness with which she approaches the task of confronting a piece of legislation, particularly—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned; he has been doing it all day.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There are instances where—

Ms Vlahos interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There are instances, Mr Speaker, where the thoroughness is, quite frankly, breathtaking. On occasions we begin right at the very beginning. Anyway, the point is this: I gather that there was a discussion amongst members of parliament, I think involving some people from the other place, and my recollection of where we got to was that there would be a 10-year extension with a periodic review.

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order?

Mr PISONI: I refer you to 119: reflections on votes of the house. It is clear that the minister is reflecting on what happened in this house in regard to a vote in the house.

The SPEAKER: When was the legislation? Is it of this session?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It was this session, Mr Speaker, but it is not in this chamber anymore, to the best of my knowledge, otherwise the deputy leader would not have asked a question out of order like that.

The SPEAKER: I don't think it is normally a quarrelsome reflection on legislation to say that everyone supported it. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am just trying to be of assistance to the parliament because the deputy leader asked a question about why it was the government thought it was a good idea to extend this legislation, and I am trying to explain that we do think it is a good idea, and the whole parliament, as far as I know—

Ms Chapman: You said a high risk, a very high risk and he doesn't care.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for the second and final time. Would someone on the opposition side like to ask a question?

Mr Gardner: Sir, you've got a list; it's there to see.

The SPEAKER: Normally I do have a list but normally the member whose turn it is rises. The member for Stuart.

TECHPORT AUSTRALIA

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:54): Thank you, sir. My question is for the Treasurer.

The SPEAKER: I am always very generous to people who rise to ask a supplementary.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: What is the current value of the state's interest in the Techport facility and how much remains owing on this facility?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:54): I don't have that answer in front of me. I will have to get a detailed answer for the member and get back to him.

SUBMARINE PROGRAM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:54): My question is for the Treasurer again. Now that the competitive evaluation process deadline is closed for the federal government's Future Submarine program, will the Treasurer outline what the state government has offered to each of the bidders?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:55): I would have thought—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: A minister has risen to answer the question. The next person on two warnings who interjects will be out. The minister.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I would have thought the shadow minister for defence industries would know that the Minister for Defence Industries has responsibility for this matter; he has been here long enough to work that out. The competitive evaluation process—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Chaffey, Davenport and Mount Gambier are all warned.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I assume they are interested in an answer to the question, sir. The competitive evaluation process for the submarine project C1000 is being managed by the commonwealth. The state government has offered no special package of financial incentives to any of the three bidders, which was the thrust of your question. We are waiting to hear from the commonwealth their response to the three bids they received on 30 November.

Of course, the government has provisioned extensively and invested extensively in Techport—something that is well known to members opposite. We have built significant infrastructure and capability to support naval shipbuilding, but we have not been asked nor have we provided at this particular juncture any specific basket of financial incentives to any of the bidders. We will have to see what the commonwealth comes up with in the future in way of response to the bids.

But I would simply say that there is no more important jobs decision that this country and this state has faced since World War II than to see naval shipbuilding in Australia put back on its feet. These are very important decisions for our state, for workers today, for their children and for their grandchildren, because this will go on for 30 to 40 years.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Stuart.

SUBMARINE PROGRAM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:57): Can the minister advise the house whether he lobbied the Treasurer or the Premier for the state government to provide any support for the three bidders?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:57): I am not going to answer any questions about discussions that may have gone on in cabinet or privately between ministers about any matter. In fact, it's not a very sensible question to ask in parliament; I would have thought the shadow minister would know that to be the case. I would simply say that I am really delighted to see that the opposition have finally discovered that this is an important matter, because they were silent for 18 months.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: The minister is in breach of standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Does the minister have anything to add?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: No, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart, supplementary.

SUBMARINE PROGRAM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:58): Would the minister advise the house whether any of the three bidders asked the government for any particular support so that they could build submarines here in South Australia?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:58): I am not going to discuss any confidential matter that may or may not have been discussed with any of the bidders. I would simply say this: the state government is in very close consultation with each of the three bidders.

I have been to each of the shipyards. I have spoken to each of the tenderers. I can tell you that, were it not for the state government's engagement on this matter, these submarines may already have been decided to have been built overseas by the Liberal Party—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —because that's what you wanted to do and you didn't care less. It's a lack of leadership from your leader on this for 18 months.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Well, isn't the member for Morialta being something of a wet blanket? Isn't everyone having such a good time?

Mr GARDNER: No, I just draw your attention, sir, that I think there's a problem with the microphones.

SOUTH-EAST SURGICAL SERVICES

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Health. With only four weeks to go on their contracts, when will the surgeons in the South-East be informed of their fate?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:59): As soon as possible. I've certainly made it clear that I haven't been happy with the length of time this process has taken, and it has been I think unfair on those involved that it has taken so long, and I have made those feelings quite clear to Country Health.

I expect next time we go through a process similar to this that we'll be doing it far better in getting the processes right. I will reassure the member for Mount Gambier and people living in the South-East that the whole purpose of this is to get more surgical services available in the Mount Gambier Hospital. This is about making sure that we get better bang for our buck and provide an expanded range of services as long as it is clinically safe to do so in the South-East, and I'm confident, through this process, that's what we will get.

MURRAY COD RESTOCKING PROGRAM

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. What is the status of the Murray cod restocking program announced in 2014 alongside the Minister for Regional Development and when and will it go ahead?

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: You should say 'will' and then 'when'.

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned for the second and final time. Grammatical points are the preserve of the member for Heysen.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:01): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and I thank the member for Chaffey for the question and the great work he does for his local area. I will be up there on Friday at Loxton, visiting the Riverland once again. It's a very important part of the state.

The Murray cod restocking project is something that is still going ahead but, as I understand it, there's a lot of preliminary work that has to be done along the way, and some of that is quite technical. I am happy to give you some more information of exactly where it's up to, but I know that it's something that we did announce a while ago and that there is a lot of work to be done before we actually get to the stage of doing the restocking into the river.

MURRAY COD RESTOCKING PROGRAM

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:02): Supplementary: minister, have the cod fingerlings been ordered or procured, and when will the first cod be released?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:02): Again, I thank the member for Chaffey for the question. They are details that I will

have to follow up, but I know that when we announced the scheme there was a long lead time because of technical things that have to be done as you breed up the cod before you can release them into the river.

NATIONAL WATER INITIATIVE

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:02): My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, why did you invoke in your most recent budget the impactor pays principle of the National Water Initiative when the Department for Water has not fulfilled its obligations under that same initiative to identify the cost of water planning and management, and have those costs independently verified and published?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order, sir: the member for MacKillop does not have leave to make an explanation in his question. He is inserting fact and argument into his question.

The SPEAKER: Will the member for MacKillop repeat the question?

Mr WILLIAMS: With pleasure, sir. Why did the Treasurer invoke the impactor pays principle of the National Water Initiative when the Department for Water has not fulfilled its obligation under the same agreement to identify the costs of water planning and management, and have those costs independently verified and published?

The SPEAKER: Well, that contains a fair whack of comment or opinion, but we will let it go on this occasion. Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:04): I will check on the veracity of the statements made by the member, about his assertion that certain criteria have not been met, and I will get back to the house with an answer.

NATIONAL WATER INITIATIVE

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:04): Supplementary: does the Treasurer accept that the National Water Initiative imposes obligations on government to ensure that water users are paying fair and equitable amounts for cost recovery?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:04): He is asking for my opinion on the presentation of a policy. What I will do is consider the question and come back to him with a fulsome answer because what I suspect he is attempting to do is set a trap where I say something—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know, but it is in the traditional Liberal Party method—"We are coming to get you. Here's a trap. Please walk into it." What I will do is consider the question asked by the member for MacKillop—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will consider the question and the assertions made and the opinion sought in the question and get back to the member.

The SPEAKER: The member for Little Para.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: I think it is going to be a bogus one.

Mr PISONI: Perhaps I will consider it.

EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the government's investment in education and its importance to school communities and students' learning?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:06): I am delighted to be able to bring the house up to date with some of the investments that have occurred in our schools and preschools. In fact, I have now, come the end of next week, celebrated an entire school year of being the Minister for Education as I was appointed the Minister for Education in about week 1 of the school year. I have visited just on 100 schools and preschools in that time, and while there are many still to visit, it has given me a real sense of the breadth of the quality of our education system, and also the extent of the investment that has occurred and the extent of investment that is still required in the future.

I understand that the government has, since it first came to office in 2002, spent something like \$2 billion on infrastructure in education and I have been the lucky minister to be present for the opening of several of those investments—new wings on schools, new buildings, refurbishments, and so on, many of which, of course, were initiated by my predecessor, but it is my good fortune to have my name on the plaque. I went to Salisbury East last week where over \$7 million was put into establishing a new arts centre, both for performing arts and also visual arts and multimedia.

What is so important about these investments is not simply that, as any owners of property, you need to make sure that you are continuing to invest in keeping them well maintained and looking good, but that what we are doing is providing new environments for more appropriate teaching styles and methods. There have been enormous changes in the ways in which teaching is done across the world, as well as in this state, so that it is not simply a matter of having people sitting in rows of desks facing the teacher and essentially being the recipients of high content. What it is now is an interaction between teachers and students, and between students. While that is possible in almost any shaped room, it really comes alive when you are able to invest in the different styles of rooms and spaces.

As members will be aware, the most recent budget also included some \$50 million extra in capital expenditure which will be used not only to add to our number of children's centres but also on a number of schools, such as the soon to be renamed Playford International, previously known as Fremont Elizabeth, which will, I think, really become an ornament for the north.

But there are other reasons why this infrastructure expenditure really matters. The pedagogy is an important one—how you teach and the environment in which you teach. It is also important for the community perception of our schools. For many people, their understanding of schools is limited to what they see when they go past the gate. If they do not have children attending that school, they form a view, and the more that we can give a sense of how good the quality is inside through what the school looks like from the outside, the better.

The final reason that it matters so much is that it gives very strong messages to the students themselves. What it does say is that they are worth having good quality infrastructure and also it sets a sense of expectation. I have seen that in schools where the infrastructure spend hasn't been big, but it's been aimed at bringing a level of standard to that school that those students will rise to—a standard that says that, 'You merit it, and we also expect high things of you.'

LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister advise if the language maintenance and development program will continue to fund Greek and Italian language classes in state government schools?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:10): I thank the member for his interest in all things multicultural as well as in education. The first languages program to which the member refers is one of the ways in which we teach language. We teach languages as whole language programs which are part of the Australian curriculum, and Greek, Italian, French, German and Chinese sit in that category.

We then have an ethnic schools program where, usually on a Saturday morning, communities get together and teach both language and culture, which is highly important to maintaining a very strong sense of cultural heritage. Again, languages such as Greek are taught there and many others as well. There is also the Adelaide School of Languages, which teaches languages after hours but usually on school premises, and that is also a way for students to be able to—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir. I ask you to bring the minister back into the context of the question, which was specifically about the language maintenance and development program in schools, not the School of Languages or the ethnic schools program.

The SPEAKER: I think the member for Unley is being rather rugged there. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Thank you, sir. I was endeavouring to give the house the full context of the ways in which these language programs interact. The final element is that we have had for some time a first languages program, which is essentially aimed at maintaining the language that is spoken at home.

When people are newly arriving in their home, they are speaking a language such as Farsi, then they are going into school and they are rapidly learning English in order to be able to function completely in an education setting in English. In order to maintain the quality of their first language so that they are not at risk of reducing their knowledge of that language to only the limited interactions at home but are maintaining the vocabulary and the grammar in order to be good first speakers of that language, we have offered this program.

We have undergone a review that was initiated, I think, two years ago and completed earlier this year, which looked at whether we were in fact doing what that program was intended to do. What it was intended to do was to provide first language where first language is being discussed at home, and we have realised that there were a number of communities who were missing out. So, we have rejigged it for the number of newly arriving communities who haven't been able to avail of that support—Punjabi, for example, is now able to be taught through first languages—and that will start to roll out for next year.

There is an issue for some schools, for example with Greek, where, because that is not the environment in which Greek is spoken in our country, it is no longer a newly arriving first language community, we are transitioning that so that, while we will continue to offer Greek to school students, we will largely do that through either whole language programs or through the School of Languages.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary, member for Unley.

LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:13): Which languages will no longer be supported under the language maintenance and development program under the First Language Maintenance and Development program?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:13): I will bring back to the house detail because, if a language might not be on one list, it might be on another, which is why I took the house through a fairly lengthy explanation of the different ways in which we teach language. I will bring back a comprehensive answer.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the minister expect numbers of nurses working on the wards at Modbury Hospital to decline under the government's Transforming Health plan and, if so, how many positions will be lost over the next three to four years?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:14): We are a long way from determining those exact workforce number changes, but can I say that what we will be doing with Transforming Health is having an expanded role for nurses. I want nurses to move from just working on wards to actually working out in the community, helping us deal with people with chronic illness.

I want nurses working to their full scope of practice. I want nurse practitioners in our emergency departments, as we have at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. We have a nurse practitioner there taking people who are waiting, dealing with their matters and expediting their treatment. I want nurse practitioners working right throughout our health system.

Transforming Health, without a shadow of a doubt, sees an expanded role for nurses. I want nurses and midwives working to their full scope of practice, and I want more nurse practitioners in our health system doing some work which, traditionally, has been done by doctors.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): Supplementary: does the minister confirm then that, in the reduction in acute ward nursing services, those nurses who will lose their job there will be placed in a community or other nursing service at no less pay?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:15): I can make quite clear that no nurse is going to be sacked. We need more nurses in our health system. We need them doing different things beyond just traditional ward roles. There will be nursing staff, of course, who we will be asking to take on new and different roles and expanded roles.

I don't think under the EB we would be able to move them into a role where they would have a reduced salary. I will have it double-checked, but I'm very confident that simply the enterprise bargain would not enable us to transfer someone to a position where they would be on a reduced salary. I certainly would not expect that, but I'm happy to double-check just for the sake of certainty.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): Further supplementary: given the minister's confirmation in respect of the current agreement, is he prepared to indicate that there will be a binding provision in the next enterprise bargaining agreement that no nurse will lose their job in the term of the next agreement?

Ms Bedford: He just said that.

Ms CHAPMAN: He did not, and you know it.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:16): Whether it's in the EB or not—

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey, disappointed that she didn't get to ask her question, is called to order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: When the day comes that nurses need the Liberal Party in this state to fight for them, that would be a pretty sad day. That would be a pretty bleak day because we all know what the nurses federation said at the last state election about the Liberal Party's health policy. She made some rather—

The SPEAKER: Point of order!

Members interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Standing order 98 would prevent the minister from behaving like this.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health is warned for debating the question and for not being seated upon my granting the member for Morialta the right to make his point of order. Has the minister finished?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: No, there's more.

The SPEAKER: But wait, there's more!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Of course, with regard to the enterprise bargaining, indeed, we will be beginning our enterprise bargaining discussion process. I'm not going to be foreshadowing in this place what will be in the enterprise bargaining, how the negotiations will proceed and what we will be seeking. Certainly, that's not the way we do things. If the deputy leader had ever been in

government, she might know that. Nonetheless, I have certainly made quite clear on many occasions that no nurse is going to be sacked as a result of the changes we're making in Transforming Health.

Grievance Debate

BUSHFIRE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:18): I rise to talk about issues to do with traffic control that came out of the Sampson Flat bushfires earlier this year. It is obviously a very hard time to be talking about measures that come from the management of fires. Families that are deeply connected with members of this house are grieving this week, and of course all members of the house grieve with them. It is a very challenging time for those communities.

Those communities, hurt as they have been hit, are resilient communities and will continue to work together, rebuild and reconnect. They will not be destroyed by those fires. This is of course an issue that arises in our scorched land, in our unique environmental circumstances in South Australia, and we deal with it every year.

In the electorate of Morialta, of course, we were very significantly hit by the Sampson Flat bushfires at the beginning of this year as, indeed, we were hit by the Cherryville fires in May 2013. Our community in Morialta is resilient and has worked to overcome those issues, but the loss of life that has occurred over the last week and the very serious injuries incurred puts them in a category separate even from that.

That said, I do want to touch on a couple of the things that have arisen out of the Australasian Fire and Emergency Services Authorities Council's independent review and, in particular, a couple of things arising from the Sampson Flat fire that have regularly been raised by members of my community. I thank the shadow minister for emergency services, the member for Morphett, who attended a public meeting with me in Cudlee Creek a week and a half ago, at which we talked about a number of these matters. That community was grateful for his support during the initial period of the Sampson Flat fires and, indeed, for coming out again in November.

One of the issues regularly raised by constituents of mine on a significant number of occasions following the Sampson Flat fires was that of access. Many constituents were frustrated in the different application of the rules relating to whether they could get in and out of the area their properties were in, leaving their homes to avoid danger only to be given inconsistent treatment upon their attempt to regain entry to the fire zone. There were many anecdotes provided at the public meetings, and I have traversed some of those in the house before, but the different situations seem to range from being able to access the fire zone at a roadblock only to be told, at the same roadblock but by a different police officer, that they would not be allowed back in if they left, to one ridiculous case of someone towing a trailer who was not allowed to cross the roadblock in his car but was allowed to cross it on foot, pull the trailer across, and then attach it to another car on the other side of the roadblock.

While that was the most extraordinary situation related, it was not the only unusual interpretation and application of the rules. The Australasian Fire and Emergency Services Authorities Council (AFAC) recognised this was an issue in its independent review of the fire, and it specifically addressed it as part of its terms of reference. The AFAC report found:

The State Emergency Management Plan identified that returning communities to normality following an emergency incident in a timely manner assists in the healing and recovery process. It is appropriate to enable certain groups of individuals into the incident area, where it is reasonably safe, and doesn't adversely impact upon operations or other legislative obligations.

As such, recommendation 15 was made, which recommended the implementation of the Tasmanian three-tier model of access. The three tiers can be described as emergency services access only, essential services access only, and authorised access, which means access for local residents, other recovery workers and potentially the media. By the way, I implore all media outlets, when dealing with these matters, to be incredibly sensitive to the feelings of the people whose images they are taking, whose properties they are taking images of. A number of people in my community found themselves additionally traumatised by the way their property was trampled on, by people who had no personal connection to them, to take footage.

When this report was tabled, the Minister for Emergency Services stated that some of the recommendations had been accepted by the CFS, but as yet we are still in the dark as to which ones. I call upon the minister to fully disclose which recommendations have been adopted and whether recommendation 15, in particular, has been adopted. My constituents were left with an inconsistent approach to traffic management and, whilst I hope there is no need for traffic management to be implemented due to a major fire any time soon, a recommendation has been made and I call on the government to adopt it.

HEALTH RESEARCH

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:23): Two areas of health research are foremost in our minds this week: they are asbestos-related diseases and HIV AIDS. Asbestos Awareness Month was November and it was World AIDS Day on 1 December. I understand that Adelaide was lit up in red on 1 December at venues such as the Festival Theatre and the Rundle Mall Lantern.

The Minister for Health hosted staff from South Australian Mobilisation and Empowerment for Sexual Health (SAMESH) and Shine SA early this morning, and it was great to hear SAMESH tell us about the new state body, which is up and running and working collaboratively with the Victorian AIDS Council. They are off to a great start.

A former South Australian resident, Dr Jim Hyde, was, for many years, head of the Victorian AIDS Council and although he no longer works there I acknowledge his contribution over many years in this very important area. SHine continues to do great work, building on the solid foundation of the work led by Kaisu Vartto, now retired, and I acknowledge her contribution in that area. Worryingly though, Wills Logue from SAMESH informed us that there is another spike in newly reported AIDS infections. So, there remains a need for vigilance and community education programs in this area.

Asbestos disease deaths are also on the rise, as symptoms can lay dormant for as much as 50 years, by which time it is too late for much to be done at all, or has been until recently when studies of the use of turmeric have shown Dr Sonja Klebe that there are some very interesting results to be had. The Asbestos Victims Association ceremony, held annually by the City of Salisbury in Pitman Park, was again led this year by council's Nichola Kapitza in the presence of Mayor Gillian Aldridge and former mayor and now Makin MHR Tony Zappia, who is a patron of the Asbestos Victims Association, as is our Premier Jay Weatherill.

AVA is led by Terry Miller, a wonderful man who has done great work with his group of volunteers, who are also excellent. One recently bereaved widow has begun the AVA Friendship Group. From firsthand experience, Lesley Shears has established a vital link for people travelling on this same long and painful road. Whilst asbestos diseases have been known to workers through the use of asbestos and working in the production of asbestos (through companies such as James Hardy), it is also the wives of these workers, responsible for the washing of work clothes, who are now dying.

Now we have a new wave of victims through home renovations. Do not ever be complacent. Always check before doing your work. Asbestos registers in places of work are essential, so use these whenever in doubt. Government regulations are strict for obvious reasons, but this cannot stop the terrible practice of dumping by unscrupulous people who have removed asbestos but are not willing to follow the regulations for its disposal. There is no excuse for this irresponsible behaviour.

At the ceremony each year, the number of crosses (each representing a life lost) put up by AVA volunteers has grown. Asbestos diseases are preventable but incurable at the moment. That is why the work of people such as Dr Klebe is so important. I wish her and other researchers the very best as they progress with their work to give a better quality of life to victims and eventually to save lives, the lives of people such as Jack Watkins, someone I was lucky enough to know as a local activist and lifelong unionist working in occupational health and safety, especially on all things asbestos related. He is remembered by both the AVA and the Asbestos Diseases Society of South Australia.

ADSSA holds a commemorative breakfast at the Jack Watkins park in the City of Port Adelaide Enfield every year and Mayor Gary Johanson was in attendance again this year, which was also hosted by Ian Sheppard. The event is sponsored by SA Unions and I acknowledge Joe

Szakacs and his team of helpers, who were there. They should be thanked for all they do. It was a great day. We heard this year of the diagnosis of an Ingle Farm woman. Now 27, she was 25 when she learned why she was short of breath, and along with her partner, who also has health problems, they are facing a very uncertain future together in the bravest of ways. After the formalities we all released a sea of balloons, each one representing the life of someone lost.

Each of us here in this place would know someone with either HIV/AIDS or asbestos-related disease. We know the pain and grief these diseases bring to such a wide number of relatives and friends. I know that each of us in here hopes the researchers, already hard at work, soon to be and the ones to come, will make discoveries in the not too distant future to make these diseases a thing of the past.

NATIONAL WATER INITIATIVE

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:28): Today, I rise to talk about the principles of recovery for the cost of water planning and management activities. Today, I asked the Treasurer a question and I think one supplementary on this matter. He declined to give an answer on the basis that he thought I was setting a trap for him. I was not setting a trap, I just want the government to show some accountability in this area, and I will explain why I want to see some accountability.

The NRM board in my part of the world, in the South-East of the state, is seeking to impose an additional levy collection on the region of some \$3.7 million in the next financial year. That is a substantial increase. The excuse for this is that the government wants to impose the 'impactor pays' principle in the National Water Initiative. Indeed, at a drought forum that the Minister for Agriculture held in Naracoorte in my electorate last Monday, he even asserted that this was an imposition by the federal government. That was incorrect, and I pointed it out at the meeting.

The National Water Initiative is an agreement between the water ministers in all the states. A set of principles was established under this agreement, which was signed off way back in 2004, and I will read to the house from them:

In the context of the [National Water Initiative] and for the purpose of cost recovery, water planning and management are those activities undertaken by, or on behalf of governments as a result of water use...only.

It goes on to say in another point:

Governments have committed in the [National Water Initiative] to publicly report the total cost of water planning and management and the proportion of the total cost of water planning and management...attributed to water access entitlement holders and the basis on which this proportion is determined.

Furthermore, it goes on in principle 3, Cost-effectiveness test, to say:

Having identified water planning and management costs to be recovered from water users, in whole or in part, activities should be 'tested' for cost-effectiveness by an independent party and the findings of the cost-effectiveness review are to be made public.

Principle 4 says:

Costs are to be allocated between water users and governments using an impactor pays approach.

It notes that:

An impactor is an individual, group of individuals or organisation whose activities generate costs, or a justifiable need to incur costs.

Then it goes on in principle 5 to say:

Water planning and management costs are to be identified and differentiated by catchment or valley or region and by water source where practicable.

I bring this to the house's attention because, as I said in my opening remarks, the NRM board (natural resources management board) in the South-East is seeking to increase the levy collected in that region by some \$3.7 million, \$2.4 million of which they claim is to reimburse the department of the environment for these water planning and management costs.

That is notwithstanding that, historically, that NRM board already receives substantial moneys from water licence holders through a water-based levy—which is in addition to the land-based levy imposed by the same board on my constituents. Water users—those who hold a water

licence—already pay a levy, ostensibly, for water planning and management costs. Indeed, it is the NRM board that has developed the water allocation plan in the South-East, which work has been paid for by water users already through their levy. I am questioning why there is this increased demand and, indeed, what work the Minister for Water has done to comply with his obligations under the National Water Initiative that I have just read out.

I did an exercise of working out the amount of levies collected by the NRM board in the South-East over the last 10 years and I can tell the house that the total revenue from the 2006-07 year until the current financial year, some 10 years, has increased by 95 per cent, whereas the CPI is only 24.5 per cent. Indeed, if next year's proposal goes ahead, there will be a total of 241 per cent increase in the revenues of the NRM board in the South-East over that 10-year period, or the equivalent of 10 times the CPI. I think the government should be answering how it is justifying these additional costs.

Time expired.

ST PATRICK'S TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:33): I would like to speak today on the privilege I had to attend the St Patrick's Technical College graduation ceremony on Friday 27 November at the Adelaide Convention Centre. St Patrick's Technical College began its operation in 2007 as an Australian technical college in northern Adelaide, an initiative of the then Liberal Australian government in partnership with Catholic Education and the Northern Adelaide Industry Consortium. In 2009, the college management was passed directly to Catholic Education SA and the school was renamed St Patrick's Technical College, and a magnificent institution it is.

The college currently has an enrolment base of 229 students and is based in Edinburgh North in the electorate of Taylor. More than 75 per cent of the enrolled students are from northern Adelaide, with most of the students coming from about 45 nearby schools. It is a specialist training school which gives students the opportunity to learn skills and to actively participate and to prepare them in employment for many emerging areas in the South Australian economy.

Their focus is on trade, work and employment, and this is what sets them apart from many of the other schools in the area. Employers tell us that it is the first place they look to if a business is looking for an apprentice. The college also facilitates the completion of school-based apprenticeships. Two-thirds of students who undertake schooling at St Patrick's Technical College are successful in obtaining an apprenticeship once they graduate, and to date 671 apprenticeships have been placed since its opening.

The programs on offer include automotive, building and construction, electrotechnology, food and hospitality, hair and nail, metals and engineering and plumbing. These courses and programs enable a smoother transition from school to work, giving the northern suburbs students the bright futures they deserve whilst they are working hard to achieve personal goals.

St Patrick's also works closely with local industry private partners to identify ways in which they can best assist their students in gaining lifetime employment in their skills area. My official duty on the night was to present the 2015 Volunteering Award for Outstanding Service, awarded to Mrs Susan Rowland, and the College Spirit Award, awarded to Mr Shane Marshall.

I would like to thank principal Robert Thomas, the staff and all the board members for their hospitality and good work over the years, but particularly for the job they do every day. They are a beacon of excellence in the northern suburbs. Their students and staff are outstanding and committed to success, and I look forward to seeing many of these students return as successful business owners looking to hire more apprentices in the decades to come.

SEACLIFF RECREATION CENTRE

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:36): Today I want to take the opportunity to put on the public record some information about a very vibrant community organisation in the heart of my electorate, and that is the Seacliff Recreation Centre in the heart of Seacliff.

I had the opportunity on Friday 27 November to go along to the Seacliff Recreation Centre's annual general meeting and to be able to take Nicolle Flint, the new Liberal candidate for the seat of

Boothby, along with me, too. It was excellent to have her along and to show her this great community organisation as well.

Deputy Speaker, I know that you will be very interested in this, and I have been waiting for two years to talk to you about this in particular, because the Seacliff Recreation Centre is made up of five sporting organisations: martial arts, KinderGym, Judo, gymnastics and calisthenics, your favourite. Also, the local Seacliff Neighbourhood Watch meets there, YogaWorks and the Adelaide All Star cheerleaders. Led by the incredibly able Beverley Manns, the organisation has been going from strength to strength in recent years, building on its heritage as a popular community venue, which has grown from a small tin shed on the site to a vibrant community hub.

I noted during the AGM (and this is probably my Scottish nature coming out; I always like to turn to the profit and loss statement) that the club is exceptionally well managed financially with Ute Jeffries, the treasurer, ably managing that organisation's finances, and it is in a very healthy state. I was also pleased to hear that, during the past year, local artists Ricky Spier and Matt Dopheide have completed a mural on the western side of the facility, which is adjacent the Seaford railway line and which is often targeted by graffiti vandals. It was great to hear that, since that mural has gone on there, no graffiti tags have been placed on that side of the building, and so it is not only brightening the place up but having a crime prevention feature as well.

It was good to see that Clare Moase was given life membership of the Seacliff Recreation Centre for her long-term contribution to the organisation and particularly to the KinderGym there. But in particular today, I want to take the opportunity just to congratulate someone who has been working, volunteering and contributing to the Seacliff Recreation Centre (previously known as the Seacliff Youth Centre for many years), and that is Mrs Carolyn Daly from Hallett Cove, who joins us in the gallery today with her son Anthony.

It is a privilege for me to be able to congratulate people in our community who go above and beyond in their role as community volunteers, who have become part of an organisation and stayed part of it for many years, contributing actively to making that organisation what it is today. Carolyn first became involved with the Seacliff youth centre, particularly the KinderGym, 18 years ago. Only at the end of last year did she step down after 18 years of loyal service, and her son Anthony continues today as the publicity officer of the organisation.

On Friday night, at the annual general meeting it was my privilege to be able to congratulate Carolyn on her many years of service to the KinderGym and the recreation centre and to provide her with a certificate thanking her for that contribution. As Carolyn is here today, I think it is appropriate to put on the public record my thanks to her for her contribution. I know many of the members of the Seacliff Recreation Centre who have been actively involved for many years, both currently and in the past, would echo my sentiments when I congratulate and thank Carolyn.

In closing, I would also like to thank the board of management for all they do for the Seacliff Recreation Centre: the president, Beverley Manns; Ute Jeffries, the treasurer; Melissa Watts, the secretary; vice president, Jason Kari; Anthony Daly, the publicity officer; Megan Simpson, Debby Scheepers, Marilyn Rayner, Brian Richardson and Tayla Jeffries for all they do. It is a fantastic organisation and a very important part of the community I represent. It would not be what it is without the hundreds of volunteer hours that go into that organisation every year.

NAPIER ELECTORATE

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:41): Today I rise to speak about a number of people who have made significant contributions to our northern community; firstly, two of our dedicated school principals, Ms Lynne Symons and Mr Mark Taylor. Ms Lynne Symons was appointed principal of Mark Oliphant College in 2008 following 10 years as principal of Ocean View College in Taperoo. Lynne worked to design the new school and set up the model of education. She started running the school across two sites until the students and staff moved into the new state-of-the-art college in term 2 of 2011.

Lynne has seen the school grow, from around 700 students to over 1,600 students. Over the past five years, Lynne has been a strong leader for this tough and diverse school where students face many challenges. She has driven excellence for students and staff and increased the SACE completion rate, from less than 30 per cent to 100 per cent this year—a great achievement.

Lynne and her dedicated team have worked hard to ensure that students receive the best education and support through extracurricular activities, innovative teaching and taking a firm but fair approach. Lynne is moving on at the end of this year and will be sorely missed, as she is an excellent principal. Lynne is not considering retirement but is going to further her skills to mentor other principals and continue to ensure that students across the north get the best chance to excel.

Mark Taylor has been principal of Playford Primary School since 2004, having spent time at five rural schools, including Bordertown, where he was pleased to host former prime minister Bob Hawke. Playford Primary School is a unique school, as it shares the library, hall, an oval and playground with the Catherine McAuley Catholic Primary School. Playford Primary School has grown, from 300 students in 2004, to 745 today. Mark has fought hard to get new koala crossings outside the school and has always ensured that the students and staff receive opportunities to excel and that their achievements are celebrated.

Mark has been a big supporter of sports and has encouraged students to get involved with science, maths, English and computing competitions. He has also strongly supported commemorations of ANZAC Day and Remembrance Day in conjunction with Catherine McAuley. Mark will be missed by the community when he finishes as principal at the end of this year. Mark, like Lynne, is not retiring but will continue to work in education next year.

I will now talk about two hardworking women at Northern Connections, Lea Stevens and Bev O'Brien. The Hon. Lea Stevens is retiring from public life this year after 40 years' service to the community as a teacher, principal, member of parliament, health minister, director of Northern Connections and many other roles. Lea was appointed in 1989 as the principal of Elizabeth West High School and transformed it into Elizabeth West Adult Campus, which is now Northern Adelaide Senior College. She pioneered adult education in South Australia and went on to serve in parliament for 17 years, including nearly four years as health minister. In 2011, she was appointed as director of Northern Connections and continued to serve the north.

Dr Bev O'Brien has worked at Northern Connections for the past six years and she has been chair of the Para West Adult Campus and now the Northern Adelaide Senior College Governing Council. Dr Bev O'Brien and principal Colleen Abbott have both been crucial in the negotiations to relocate the college and the other challenges it has faced over the past few years. Bev is moving to a role with the City of Port Adelaide Enfield. I thank Lynne, Mark, Lea and Bev for their contribution to my community and wish them all well for the future. I also thank all the principals and teachers who work hard every day for the students in my community.

I now wish to recognise the huge contribution that Marge Rogers has made to the northern community through her work at the Northern Domestic Violence Service. Marge started with the service in 1985, when she assumed duties as a relief and weekend worker. She has since become manager of the service and an invaluable leader in women's and children's safety services. Marge is a key driver of community initiatives in which the service participates. She has been instrumental in building the fundraising base for the service.

Marge is very focused on developing strong relationships with third-party providers for the benefit of the NDVS. Marge's name was last night added to the South Australian Women's Honour Roll for her work with the NDVS in supporting women and children who have experienced domestic abuse. I sincerely congratulate her on this achievement and thank her for the work she has done and continues to do for the women and children across the north.

I want to thank everyone involved with the Playford Alive Community Reference Group, Renewal SA and the City of Playford, who worked hard to stage the recent Playford Alive Community Fun Day in the new Playford Alive Town Park. Over 5,000 people enjoyed music, food and activities. Lastly, I congratulate the recipients of the 2015 Playford Alive Initiatives Fund grants: the Davoren Park Youth and Community Club, Para Worklinks and the Northern Communities of Hope Church.

*Bills***MENTAL HEALTH (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:47): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Mental Health Act 2009; and to make related amendments to the Advance Care Directives Act 2013 and the Health Care Act 2008. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:47): 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.

I am pleased to bring before the House the Mental Health (Review) Amendment Bill 2015. The *Mental Health Act 2009* (the Act) is based on contemporary rights, mental health service provision and legislative practice. Section 111 of the Act required a review of the operation of the Act by 30 June, 2014.

In 2013 and 2014 the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist carried out that Review, which was focused on how the rights of people with mental illness, their families and carers, and the service delivery capacity of agencies, could be enhanced.

The Review found that the Act required amendment rather than major redrafting based on the first four years of the operation of the Act, feedback from the people of South Australia, developments in international human rights and the review and commencement of mental health legislation in other Australian jurisdictions.

There are sixty three proposed legislative amendments within the Bill. Four remove duplications and obsolete provisions, five improve clarity enhancing understanding of and compliance with the Act, seventeen change definitions and language, and thirty seven enhance rights and reinforce clinical best practice.

Of the thirty seven amendments, there are three in particular which the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist will work in close collaboration with mental health services and other stakeholders in order to improve understanding of the intent and impact of the changes.

Firstly, Level 1 Community Treatment Order provisions have been amended to remove the existing structural barriers for mental health services and General Practitioners to make this Order type, and to bring the use of this Order into line with the least restrictive principles of the Act and clinical best practice.

Secondly, Patient Transport Request provisions have been amended to allow mental health services to request the assistance, if it is safe and appropriate to do so, of SA Ambulance Services and South Australian Police to provide medication to a patient subject to a Community Treatment Order in their own home, rather than taking the person to a hospital for their medication and then returning them to their home. This amendment will lessen impact and inconvenience for patients and their families and allow services to be delivered more effectively, and will align with the least restrictive principles of the Act and clinical best practice.

Thirdly, changes to the Community Visitor Scheme provisions and regulations to increase the facilities and services within scope of the Scheme, within existing budgets and resources, to include Community Mental Health Centres, Community Rehabilitation Centres and Intermediate Care Centres. This will allow consumers who access services within the community to be represented and heard as well as those who are in acute settings.

Mental health legislation must change over time in order to reflect contemporary attitudes and approaches to acceptance and treatment of mental illness. It must be expressed in a way that provides maximum flexibility to enable individuals with responsibilities and powers under the Act to carry out their roles effectively.

The amendment of the Act provides an opportunity for the Government to improve the rights of people with mental illness, enhance the capacity of mental health services to provide treatment and care, enhance the capacity of government agencies to collaborate, provide clarity for matters that are currently ambiguous and remove provisions that are stigmatising or discriminatory.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Mental Health Act 2009*

4—Amendment of Long title

The long title is to be amended to reflect current language relating to persons with severe mental illness.

5—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The amendments will insert a number of new definitions (including, *authorised community mental health facility*, *voluntary community patient* and *restrictive practice*); and makes amendments to a number of current definitions of a consequential nature. The definition of *patient* is to be substituted so as to be defined in relation to the provision of mental health services and to include, where the context so requires, a person to whom section 56 applies and a person with a mental illness (within the meaning of the principal Act) who is liable to a supervision order under Part 8A Division 4 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*. The definition of *patient at large* is to be deleted and, instead, the principal Act will refer to patients being *absent without leave*. Provision is also made in the section for forms approved by the Chief Psychiatrist to be published on the Department's website.

6—Amendment of section 4—Application of Act

Section 4 is to be amended so that it makes provision for an obligation under the principal Act to give information to a patient who is under the age of 16 years to be met by providing the information to the patient's parent or guardian. The amendments also clarify that, subject to an express provision to the contrary in the principal Act or another Act, the principal Act is in addition to and does not derogate from—

- *the Advance Care Directives Act 2013; and*
- *the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1995; and*
- *the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993.*

7—Amendment of section 5—Medical examinations by audio-visual conferencing

This amendment is consequential.

8—Insertion of section 5A

5A—Decision-making capacity

This new section is similar to what is provided for in the *Advance Care Directives Act 2013* and sets out the presumption relating to persons and decision-making capacity and how to assist in determining whether a person has, in respect of a particular decision, impaired decision-making capacity.

9—Amendment of section 6—Objects

This amendment is consequential.

10—Amendment of section 7—Guiding principles

The amendments to this section clarify the guiding principles to be used by persons involved in the administration of the principal Act. The section is also to be amended so that the guiding principles are extended to the provision of mental health services to voluntary community patients.

11—Amendment of section 9—Voluntary inpatients to be given statement of rights

This amendment is consequential.

12—Amendment of section 10—Level 1 community treatment orders

A number of the amendments to section 10 are consequential. A new paragraph is to be substituted in subsection (1) to include as a pre-condition to the making of a level 1 community treatment order, the fact that the person in relation to whom the order for treatment is to be made, has impaired decision-making capacity relating to his or her appropriate treatment of the person's mental illness. Subsection (4) is amended to extend the period after which an order must expire from 28 to 42 days. Substituted subsection (5) sets out the procedure to be followed once a level 1 community treatment order has been made.

13—Amendment of section 11—Chief Psychiatrist to be notified of level 1 orders or their variation or revocation

This amendment is consequential.

14—Amendment of section 12—Copies of level 1 orders, notices and statements of rights to be given to patients etc.

This amendment is consequential.

15—Repeal of section 15

This clause repeals section 15 of the principal Act.

16—Amendment of section 16—Level 2 community treatment orders

This clause amends section 16 so that the meaning of harm includes harm that is physical or mental. Section 16(1)(c) is substituted with new paragraph (c) so that the Tribunal may make a level 2 treatment community treatment order if it is satisfied that the person has impaired decision-making capacity relating to appropriate treatment of the person's illness.

17—Amendment of section 21—Level 1 inpatient treatment orders

A number of the amendments to section 21 are consequential. A new paragraph is to be substituted in subsection (1) to include as a pre-condition to the making of a level 1 inpatient treatment order, the fact that the person in relation to whom the order for treatment is to be made, has impaired decision-making capacity relating to his or her appropriate treatment.

18—Amendment of section 22—Chief Psychiatrist to be notified of level 1 orders or their revocation

This amendment is consequential.

19—Amendment of section 23—Copies of level 1 orders, notices and statements of rights to be given to patients etc.

The amendments made by this clause are consequential.

20—Amendment of section 24—Treatment of patients to whom level 1 orders apply

This clause amends section 24 of the principal Act so that treatment for any illness that may be causing or contributing to the mental illness of the patient may be given to the patient to whom a level 1 inpatient treatment order applies.

21—Amendment of section 25—Level 2 inpatient treatment orders

A number of amendments to section 25 are consequential. The clause includes an amendment that corresponds to earlier amendments relating to the making of treatment orders and the impaired decision making capacity of a person with mental illness. This clause amends section 25 to enable a psychiatrist or authorised medical practitioner to extend a level 2 inpatient treatment order for a further maximum period of 42 days.

22—Amendment of section 26—Notices and reports relating to level 2 orders

This amendment is consequential.

23—Amendment of section 27—Copies of level 2 orders, notices and statements of rights to be given to patients etc.

This amendment is consequential.

24—Amendment of section 28—Treatment of patients to whom level 2 orders apply

This clause makes an amendment to section 28 of the principal Act that corresponds to an earlier amendment about the treatment of any illness that may be causing or contributing to the mental illness of the patient to whom the treatment order applies.

25—Amendment of section 29—Level 3 inpatient treatment orders

This clause makes amendments to section 29 of the principal Act that correspond to earlier amendments.

26—Amendment of section 31—Treatment of patients to whom level 3 orders apply

This clause makes a consequential amendment and makes an amendment that corresponds to an earlier amendment about the treatment of any illness that may be causing or contributing to the mental illness of the patient to whom the treatment order applies.

27—Amendment of section 34A—Confinement and other powers relating to involuntary inpatients

This clause amends section 34A to enable treatment centre staff to restrain the patient and use force as reasonably required in the circumstances when taking measures for the confinement of the patient.

28—Amendment of section 35—Transfer of involuntary inpatients

This amendment is consequential.

29—Amendment of section 36—Leave of absence of involuntary patients

This amendment is consequential.

30—Amendment of section 37—Persons granted leave of absence to be given statement of rights

This amendment is consequential.

31—Amendment of section 38—Cancellation of leave of absence

This amendment is consequential.

32—Amendment of section 39—Treatment and care plans for voluntary patients

This clause amends section 39 of the principal Act to make it clear that a treatment and care plan should describe the services that will be provided or made available to the patient. The amendments also expands on the people or service providers connected to the patient to be consulted when preparing and revising a treatment and care plan. The clause defines the term voluntary patient for the purposes of section 39.

33—Amendment of section 40—Treatment and care plans for patients to whom community treatment orders apply

This clause amends section 40 of the principal Act in a way that corresponds with an earlier amendment to require the preparation and revision of a treatment and care plan to be done in consultation with certain people and service providers connected to the patient.

34—Amendment of section 41—Treatment and care plans for patients to whom inpatient treatment orders apply

This clause amends section 40 of the principal Act in a way that corresponds with an earlier amendment to require the preparation and revision of a treatment and care plan to be done in consultation with certain people and service providers connected to the patient.

35—Insertion of Part 7 Division A1

This clause inserts Part 7 Division A1 into the principal Act to establish the Prescribed Psychiatric Treatment Panel. The Panel has various functions in relation to the regulation, review and authorisation of prescribed psychiatric treatments.

Division A1—Prescribed Psychiatric Treatment Panel

41A—Prescribed Psychiatric Treatment Panel

441B—Conditions of appointment to Panel

41C—Functions of Panel

41D—Constitution and proceedings of Panel

36—Amendment of section 42—ECT

This clause amends section 42 of the principal Act to make provision for a substitute decision maker to consent to the treatment where the patient has an advance care directive in place and the patient is incapable of making the decision on his or her own behalf. The provision retains the capacity for a medical agent, guardian or Tribunal to make the decision where no substitute decision maker has been authorised.

The clause inserts a provision that outlines the limits that apply to treatment authorised by a consent provided under this section. The clause also requires the notice of the administration of treatment under section 42 to the Chief Psychiatrist be given whether the treatment is given with consent under subsection (1) or without under subsection (6).

37—Amendment of section 43—Neurosurgery for mental illness

This clause amends section 43 to add a requirement that the Prescribed Psychiatric Treatment Panel authorise the neurosurgery for treatment of the illness. The clause makes related amendments to ensure that the Chief Psychiatrist is given notice of the proposed neurosurgery. The clause makes provision for the requirement that a written report be given to the Chief Psychiatrist within 3 months of the neurosurgery being carried out.

38—Amendment of section 44—Other prescribed psychiatric treatments

This clause inserts a requirement that the recommendation of the Prescribed Psychiatric Treatment Panel prior to the making of a regulation declaring treatment to be prescribed psychiatric treatment or regulating the administration of any such treatment.

39—Amendment of section 45—Assistance of interpreters

This amendment is consequential.

40—Amendment of section 46—Copies of Tribunal's orders, decisions and statements of rights to be given

This amendment is consequential.

41—Amendment of section 50—Community visitors

This clause amends section 50 by removing the requirement that a person cannot be a Principal Community Visitor or a Community Visitor for more than 2 consecutive terms.

42—Amendment of section 51—Community visitors' functions and powers

This clause gives community visitors the additional function of conducting visits to and inspections of authorised community mental health facilities (including visits to and inspections of any hospital that is an incorporated hospital under the *Health Care Act 2008*).

43—Insertion of section 51A

This clause inserts new section 51A to enable the Principal Community Visitor to delegate powers or functions to a community visitor.

51A—Delegation by Principal Community Visitor

44—Amendment of section 52—Visits to and inspections of treatment centres

This clause amends section 52 to make changes to the requirements imposed on community visitors for the periodic visiting and inspection of treatment centres.

45—Insertion of section 52A

This clause inserts new section 52A to provide for the visiting to and inspection of authorised community mental health facilities by community visitors.

52A—Visits to and inspection of authorised community mental health facilities

46—Amendment of section 54—Reports by Principal Community Visitor

This clause amends section 54 of the principal Act to ensure that the performance of the community visitors' functions is incorporated into the report of the Principal Community Visitor to the Minister.

47—Insertion of section 54A

This clause inserts new section 54A into the principal Act.

54A—Issuing of patient assistance requests

Proposed section 54A enables a medical practitioner or mental health clinician to issue a patient assistance request so that they may treat a patient who does not comply with a community treatment order. The proposed section ensures that the patient be given a copy of the patient assistance request and a statement of rights.

48—Amendment of section 55—Issuing of patient transport requests

A number of amendments made by this clause are consequential. The clause also makes amendments to ensure that the patient to whom a patient transport request is made is given a copy of the request and a statement of rights.

49—Amendment of section 56—Powers of authorised officers relating to persons who have or appear to have mental illness

A number of amendments made by this clause are consequential including amendments that are consequent on the insertion of section 54A by clause 47.

50—Amendment of section 57—Powers of police officers relating to persons who have or appear to have mental illness

A number of amendments made by this clause are consequential including amendments that are consequent on the insertion of section 54A by clause 47.

51—Insertion of section 58A

This clause inserts new section 58A into the principal Act to require authorised officers to keep certain records relating to the exercise of their powers under the principal Act.

58A—Officers to keep records about exercise of powers under Act

52—Amendment of section 61—Interpretation

This clause inserts and amends definitions used for the purposes of Part 10 of the principal Act. In particular, it expands the meaning of corresponding law to include a law of another jurisdiction that makes provision for the treatment and care of persons with mental illness and corresponds (or substantially corresponds) to the principal Act.

53—Amendment of section 63—Requests or approvals relating to actions involving other jurisdictions

This clause amends section 63 of the principal Act to extend the capacity to take or approve specific action (as the case may be) if the action is not disallowed by a Ministerial agreement.

54—Amendment of section 64—Powers of South Australian officers

This amendment is consequential.

55—Amendment of section 66—South Australian community treatment orders and treatment in other jurisdictions

This clause makes amendments to section 66 of the principal Act to ensure that the power exists to treat South Australian patients to whom a community treatment order applies interstate.

56—Amendment of section 67—Powers of interstate officers

This clause amends section 67 of the principal Act to enable interstate officers to have the power of forcible entry in South Australia if the interstate officer is a police officer.

57—Amendment of section 68—Interstate community treatment orders and treatment in South Australia

This clause amends section 68 of the principal Act to ensure that certain powers may be exercised in relation to a patient in South Australia to whom an interstate community treatment order applies. The clause inserts requirements relating to the provision of a statement of rights to the patient and other requirements relating to the notification of guardians and relatives.

58—Amendment of section 69—Making of South Australian community treatment orders when interstate orders apply

This clause makes amendments to section 69 of the principal Act that correspond to earlier amendments relating to the provision of a statement of rights and the notification of guardians and relatives.

59—Amendment of section 70—Transfer from South Australian treatment centres

This clause makes amendments to section 70 of the principal Act that correspond to other amendments that substitute references to the director of a South Australian treatment centre with references to the Chief Psychiatrist. It also makes amendments that are consequential. The clause will insert subsection (7), which enables the transfer of a patient interstate to occur despite subsection (6) in circumstances where the necessary consents to the transfer have been provided.

60—Amendment of section 71—Transfer to South Australian treatment centres

This clause transfers the power to approve the transfer of a person to a South Australian treatment centre from the director of the treatment centre to the Chief Psychiatrist. It also makes amendments to section 71 of the principal Act that correspond to earlier amendments relating to the provision of a statement of rights to the patient and the notification of guardians and relatives of the patient.

61—Amendment of section 72—Patient transport requests

A number of amendments made by this clause correspond to earlier amendments and transfer the authority to make the necessary patient transport request from the director of a South Australian treatment centre to the Chief Psychiatrist. It also makes amendments to section 71 of the principal Act that correspond to earlier amendments relating to the provision of a statement of rights to the patient and the notification of guardians and relatives of the patient.

62—Substitution of section 73

This clause inserts new section 73 into the principal Act and establishes the powers of South Australian and interstate authorised officers in respect of a person who is subject to a patient transport request.

73—Powers when patient transport request issued

63—Amendment of section 74—Transport to other jurisdictions when South Australian inpatient treatment orders apply

This clause amends section 74 of the principal Act by requiring the approval of the Chief Psychiatrist before a patient to whom the section applies may be transported to an interstate treatment centre or delivered to an interstate authorised officer for transport. The clause also alters the powers that may be exercised by interstate authorised officers who are police officers.

64—Amendment of section 75—Transport to other jurisdictions of persons with apparent mental illness

Amendments made by this clause to section 75 of the principal Act are either consequential on or correspond to other amendments.

65—Amendment of section 76—Transport to other jurisdictions when interstate inpatient treatment orders apply

This amendment to section 76 of the principal Act corresponds to earlier amendments. The amendments require the approval of the Chief Psychiatrist before certain action can be taken under the section. The clause also makes amendments that correspond to earlier amendments relating to the provision of a statement of rights to the patient and the notification of guardians and relatives of the patient. The clause also alters the powers that may be exercised by interstate authorised officers who are police officers.

66—Amendment of section 77—Transport to South Australia when South Australian inpatient treatment orders apply

Amendments made by this clause to section 75 of the principal Act are either consequential on or correspond to other amendments.

67—Amendment of section 78—Transport to South Australia of persons with apparent mental illness

This amendment made to section 78 of the principal Act by this clause correspond to other amendments relating to the powers that may be exercised by interstate authorised officers who are police officers.

68—Amendment of section 85—Tribunal must give notice of proceedings

This clause amends section 85 of the principal Act to ensure that the Chief Psychiatrist is given notice of hearings of proceedings before the Tribunal in circumstances where the proceedings relate to an application for consent to prescribed psychiatric treatment.

69—Amendment of section 90—Chief Psychiatrist's functions

This clause amends section 90 of the principal Act to reflect changes in terminology. The clause makes amendments that give the Chief Psychiatrist certain powers to enter the premises of an incorporated hospital in relation to the conduct of inspections under the section. This clause imposes fines for a failure to comply with certain requirements and hindering or obstructing the Chief Psychiatrist in the exercise of the Chief Psychiatrist's powers under proposed subsection (5).

70—Amendment of section 93—Authorised medical practitioners

This clause amends section 93 of the principal Act to replace the Minister with the Chief Psychiatrist as the person with the power to determine that a specified medical practitioner or class of practitioners will be authorised medical practitioners. The clause inserts a requirement on the Chief Psychiatrist to maintain records of the Chief Psychiatrist's determinations and any conditions or limitations attached to each such determination under the section.

71—Substitution of heading to Part 12 Division 4

This clause substitutes the heading of Part 12 Division 4.

72—Amendment of section 94—Authorised mental health professionals

This clause amends section 94 of the principal Act to replace the Minister with the Chief Psychiatrist as the person with the power to determine that a specified person or person of a specified class will be an authorised mental health professional. The clause inserts a requirement on the Chief Psychiatrist to maintain records of the Chief Psychiatrist's determinations and any conditions or limitations attached to each such determination under the section.

73—Amendment of section 95—Code of practice for authorised mental health professionals

The amendments made by this clause are consequential.

74—Amendment of section 96—Approved treatment centres

The amendments made by this clause are consequential.

75—Amendment of section 97—Limited treatment centres

The amendments made by this clause are consequential.

76—Insertion of section 97A

This clause inserts new section 97A into the principal Act. The proposed section will enable the Chief Psychiatrist to determine that a specified place will be an authorised community mental health facility.

97A—Authorised community mental health facilities

77—Repeal of sections 98 and 99

This clause repeals sections 98 and 99 of the principal Act.

78—Amendment of section 102—Offences relating to authorisations and orders

This amendment is consequential.

79—Amendment of section 103—Medical practitioners or health professionals not to act in respect of relatives

This amendment is consequential.

80—Amendment of section 109—Evidentiary provision

This amendment is consequential.

81—Amendment of section 111—Review of Act

This clause amends section 111 of the principal Act to extend the year within which the Act must be reviewed from 4 to 5 years.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Amendment of *Advance Care Directives Act 2013*

1—Amendment of section 12—Provisions that cannot be included in advance care directives

This clause amends section 12 of the principal Act to expand the meaning of mandatory medical treatment to include medical treatment provided under section 56 of the *Mental Health Act 2009*.

Part 2—Amendment of *Health Care Act 2008*

2—Amendment of section 68—Preliminary

This clause amends section 68 of the principal Act to expand the meaning of designated authority to include the Chief Psychiatrist in certain specified circumstances.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Speirs.

MOTOR VEHICLES (TRIALS OF AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 December 2015.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:49): I rise to speak to the Motor Vehicles (Trials of Automotive Technologies) Amendment Bill 2015. The bill enables the minister to authorise trials of automotive technologies and issue exemptions from the relevant provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959—and this is obviously the act we are amending here today—and any laws that regulate a driver's use of motor vehicles on roads.

The government is seeking to place South Australia ahead of the technological curve and be a lead jurisdiction in real-life trialling of driverless vehicle technology in South Australia. Certainly, I note that, while this is the first jurisdiction in Australia to be trialling driverless cars on our roads, it is certainly not something new internationally. These trials have to be individually approved by the minister because this bill does not permit driverless cars to operate on these roads unless they are individually approved.

The figures that the government are putting out are saying that it is estimated that the driverless vehicle industry will be worth \$9 billion in Australia in 10 to 15 years' time. It will be interesting to see how many jobs that will create in South Australia because we certainly need thousands of jobs to come to this state.

In briefings by the department, it was made clear that this bill is purely for the trial of autonomous vehicles and not for commercial legalisation, and that legislation was not required for the trials that were run on the Southern Expressway because it was closed. But what this legislation does is open more easily regulated avenues for future trials, although we have not seen any announced at this stage.

In regard to the automation of driverless vehicles and autonomous vehicles, it can range from full autonomy, where no human intervention is required, to vehicles where human intervention may be required under certain conditions. Different countries and different companies are using different terms to describe these new technologies. Systems are distinguished by their degree of autonomy and by the functions that are autonomous; for example, whether it is keeping the vehicle in a lane at constant speed or automatically braking to avoid obstacles, which I think there needs to be a bit more work on.

Autonomy has been scaled from 1 to 5 and a local Holden Commodore fits in category 3 so there are some operating items on Commodores which are certainly classed as part of the system. A Volvo, which was at the driverless conference, is a category 4 car and there has not been a category 5 driverless car shown here at this stage. This legislation is about potentially luring car manufacturers here to road-test their vehicles. The hope is that having car makers testing here, they can generate and grow tech industries.

Cohda Wireless is a company based in Adelaide and they are involved. South Australia is already very much at the cutting edge of this technology across the world. Certainly, driverless car

technology has been put in place through Google, Uber and other car makers. A lot of advancement in driverless cars and the technology was achieved years ago, so therefore the real benefit for South Australia was if we had locked in three or four years ago on some of the ground floor research and development that could have been done in this state.

I acknowledge that some of the work that was done by commercial overseas companies was displayed at the Driverless Car Conference in early November and, essentially, we are road-testing overseas cars. I certainly believe that there are growth opportunities in the vehicle to vehicle, and also the vehicle to infrastructure, radar and connected technologies, but there has not been investment in this area by the government at this stage.

There are already certain functions of cars where they are quite driverless to a degree and there are other jurisdictions that are well advanced in this space, but the real benefit will come when vehicles can talk to each other and we do not need traffic lights, and I think we are a fair way off that.

There was a great deal of thought going on around the world in regard to what laws will be necessary for the general operation of driverless vehicles. Their widespread operation will pose complex legal challenges, in particular to determine liability in the event of any accident. I believe completely new legislation will have to be drawn up to allow driverless cars on our roads outside of this testing.

In regard to other jurisdictions, in the United Kingdom, the green light for testing driverless cars on public roads was given on 11 February this year, 2015. Already, in the United Kingdom, advanced driver assistance systems are breaking into the market, improving car safety and leading to lower insurance premiums. These announcements show the United Kingdom's strong intent to take the technology to the next level and investigate how vehicles that can take greater control could improve our driving experience and increase safety further.

In the United States, there has been an article by the Stanford Law School that states that current United States vehicle codes generally do not envisage, but do not necessarily prohibit, highly automated vehicles. However, to clarify the legal status and otherwise regulate such vehicles, several states have enacted or are considering specific laws. Four US states have successfully enacted laws addressing autonomous vehicles and their trial use on public roads.

There has certainly been consultation throughout various sectors here in South Australia. SARTA and other industry bodies have discussed the concept of autonomous vehicles at some length through the National Transport Commission to review laws to provide for driverless trucks. It is noted that the industry is not opposed to the notion; however, it is a long way off, and they see a series of problems that need to be overcome. A huge challenge would be how to keep a truck driver who is doing nothing but watching technology alert enough to spot a problem and react quickly.

Concerning autonomous cars, the trucking industry would like to ensure that the driverless cars are programmed in a way that does not replicate the problem that already exists on our roads with some motorists cutting in front of trucks just because they can fit, reducing braking space and increasing the risk of accidents. It is certainly something that I see many mornings coming down the hill into Glen Osmond from the freeway.

People do not give enough room to trucks that wish to turn right to go up Portrush Road on the freight route around Adelaide. It could be loads of grain, stock, etc., or general freight. They stay in the left lane as long as they can, put their indicator on and want to get to the right, and people just do not give them room.

I had to do it years ago when driving trucks into Adelaide. They do not give you room. You pick the spot where you reckon you can fit the length of your truck, and you just have to swing it in the gap because they do not give you space. They soon learn that they are not going to win if they do not pull up, so they really should take notice, but that only happens when people are absolutely stuck for a spot to get into. SARTA certainly believes that it is essential that the protocols and standards involved will deal with this; however, some direct dialogue between the trucking industry and the vehicle industry would be required.

I note a comment from Cohda Wireless that driverless cars are a disruptive technology and, as such, it is difficult to predict exactly what that might mean for South Australia. We know that in this

state there is both high-tech expertise and automotive expertise and, certainly, if we can create the right environment, then, as Paul Gray from Cohda has indicated, amazing things will happen.

Flinders University gave a presentation at the International Driverless Cars Conference in November, where they showcased their autonomous vehicles. One is an autonomous catamaran and the other is a small, archive box-sized autonomous robot vehicle called Husky. Flinders University would like to see future autonomous vehicle trials integrated into the Flinders campus as a series of buses connecting the campuses; however, that goal is a while off.

The Centre for Automotive Safety Research generally support this bill. As the area is evolving so rapidly, as technology unwinds around the world, it is important that fast action is taken to permit large global companies the opportunity to come to our state, to enhance the opportunities for further commitment and engagement with local companies. We certainly want to make sure that, once these big companies have the opportunity to come to South Australia, they do not pack up and go elsewhere but stay and develop those technologies here to their full fruition. Certainly, CASR believe there is some great capability in this state, and they hope it will capture some of the manufacturers' attention.

The Motor Trade Association of South Australia has reviewed the bill and has some recommendations and concerns. They believe that stakeholders must be consulted prior to the passage of legislation that goes beyond this legislation because this only deals with the trial stage, but they are also concerned that required insurance may not cover all foreseeable risk situations. Furthermore, proper driver capability is required to override technological errors where they may occur.

The MTA believes that, before the minister makes an exemption to another law for the purpose of a trial, the relevant stakeholders should all be consulted. The MTA is also concerned that the maximum penalty for breaching the laws is only \$2,500. From some of the correspondence I have received recently from one or two constituents, I note that you can get a fine not far from that for some fairly simple offences committed on our roads. The MTA believes that this penalty seems low when the risks associated with a break in the technology may lead to serious consequences.

Carnegie Mellon University has expressed that they are interested in working in this space. They are quite advanced in the United States and would like to convey their work into South Australia in order to springboard their advancement. They are seeking a \$US25 million commitment—\$1 million to build an autonomous car at the university, with the rest spread out over five years to carry out research into connectivity and driverless technology which would allow cars to speak to intersections and other vehicles. The university's plan is to produce PhD and master's students for the industry. Carnegie Mellon sees this as a long-term investment in South Australia for industry growth and more local jobs.

The RAA put out a media release in July 2015. They are well and truly interested in the technology and the potential it has to remove human error and save lives. They believe that, as the issues around the new autonomous technology become better understood, we will start to see some more stringent legislative changes. They also recognise that there is a lot of money internationally in emerging driverless technology, and they believe that this legislation is an important step in enabling investment in South Australia.

The member for Flinders brought up the issue of the global positioning system technology that is used on farms. Sometimes it is used to set up a base station and can be operated within a kilometre or two of a base station. A lot of it is obviously linked directly to satellite, and I believe it is vital to get that connectivity absolutely right.

In the agriculture sector, as long as it is all working, the connectivity is so good that you can have an 18 metre front—and the fronts can be up to 60 feet now, which is about 18 metres in the new language; they still talk feet because a lot of these machines are made in the United States—and you can have a computer from the harvester talking to the tractor towing the chaser bin basically instructing it where to drive, so it is hands-free for the chaser bin operator to get the grain out of the harvester.

That is pretty flash technology. From my experience, when I was doing it, there is not much room between the edge of the comb, and you can soon have some chaos if you do not keep your

eye out: you can end up running over the front of the harvester. There is a lot of opportunity here and it just shows how far we have come in this state.

At the turn of the 20th century, nearly all our transport needs were satisfied either by horses or horses and carts, and that has transferred over time. Right through World War I and World War II, there was still a reasonable amount of horse traffic on the roads but, as cars and trucks came on board, it was like a new world. You could make this comparison: this may be the brave new world people were facing over a hundred years ago as the technology advanced right around the world. It is amazing when you think about it. We have come a long way from the first cars, where people were not sure how to control them so they had a man with a red flag walking in front—they obviously did not go too fast—to keep them on the straight and narrow.

Obviously over time that went away, but in later times we see speed limits no matter where you are in this state or in the country. On the open road speed limits are usually 100 or 110 km/h, and the more roads around the state that we can keep at least at 110 km/h, so that they are safe, is what we need to do. I know the road safety minister has had a bit of a campaign in regard to this, but what people need to understand is that just because the money is not being spent to keep these roads up to scratch and the maintenance being done, that cannot be used as an excuse to cut back roads to 100 km/h. Technology in cars these days is so far ahead of cars that were driven in the fifties through to the seventies—in the main we are not driving clunkers anymore and we have pretty good vehicles—that we need to keep up road funding in regard to maintaining safe traffic and safe passage for all.

I think there is going to be a lot of work to be done and a lot of technology to be put in place with the myriad issues that can happen on the road in regard to a full driverless vehicle. I have a bull bar, or a roo bar, fitted to my work car for a reason. This car was only a few weeks old and bang, there it goes, coming home from Karoonda from a night meeting. They jump straight out in front of you—and I know the Minister for Transport is well aware of kangaroos that do not get out of the way. It is a real issue and, sadly, I have done it several times. These things, kangaroos, just come out of nowhere at the last minute, and you just look at that steel eye for what seems like a few seconds but is a very short space of time, and you think, 'Oh well, let's see how much of a mess this makes of the car.' At least with that roo bar, or bull bar, you can drive home.

I guess everyone was a little amused when the minister had his road trial with the inflatable kangaroo and, for some reason, it did not happen the way it was meant to. It is the sort of moment the media love, but the minister seemed to hold his cool as the car took out the inflatable kangaroo; he just smiled and looked at the driver as if to say, 'What was all that about?' I did send him a text later that day saying, 'I could do with that car down the Coorong,' because it might get rid of a few other pests that are floating around. I think the Premier was a bit concerned about going in the car the next day, so I guess he put the Minister for Transport out there as the bunny. He took the rap, but I think he took it with good humour.

However, this just shows that we need good technology. If it is going to make a mistake right at the moment when you do not need it to make a mistake, it just shows that there is a lot of work to do. It shows that there is great work that has been done in this field, but there is so much more work that needs to be done, especially with cars that will be on long, lonely roads that not only have to put up with the vagaries of traffic—whether that be cars or trucks—but also where there is suddenly stock out on a road or where there are animals like kangaroos and wombats and the like.

I think it is a great idea, but I think we have a long way to go. In my mind, I compare it to when cars first started coming onto our roads well over 100 years ago. Certainly, in 50 years' time we will probably be sitting back and saying, 'Well, that was easy, wasn't it?' We have a lot of work to do yet, but I certainly support the bill.

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) (16:09): From the outset I would like to thank the opposition for its support of this bill. This is an important reform, albeit a partial reform, to some of our transport laws to enable this technology to be trialled out on our roads.

I am pleased to hear from many of the comments from members opposite that they acknowledge that South Australia is leading the nation in trying to push this technology further forward more rapidly for the benefit of the community. When the Governor mentioned in his speech that we would be looking to reform transport legislation to, amongst other things, provide the opportunity for vehicles with this technology to be able to use the roads in South Australia, it was greeted with derision, with mirth, with accusations that this was 'a Labor trick', that this is something which is as fanciful as the cartoon, which I think harks back to the 1960s, *The Jetsons*.

Since that time, I am very pleased that those same members who were making those remarks publicly and also within the chamber have had a change of heart. They have realised that this is something very real, this is something that has been pursued for several years overseas, this is something which, in varying degrees, and we should be upfront that there are varying degrees of this technology, as members opposite have commented this is something which is being deployed on roads globally as we speak and that the full iteration, if we can put it like that, of this technology, the fully automated vehicle where the entire driving task is removed from the occupant of the vehicle, is likely to be sooner rather than later.

The member for Mitchell made the comment that some experts he referred to have said that it might be as far out as 2030, and that may well be true for some car manufacturers. There are other perhaps more technology focused companies which anticipate bringing this technology onto our roads much more quickly. I was fortunate enough to be invited by Google to be present at their Mountain View campus and receive a demonstration of their fully automated demonstration vehicle. The project leader, in the presentation to us and the other jurisdictions from around the world that were there, gave the example of his son, who he said was, at that time, 12 years old and eligible to apply for and potentially receive a licence to drive at the age of 16. It was his and his project team's aim to make it so that his son would never need to obtain a driver's licence, which is an incredibly aggressive time frame.

Shortly afterwards, not in response to that comment but coincidentally to that comment, Elon Musk, head of the Tesla Corporation, announced that he was looking to bring fully autonomous cars onto the roads within three years, rather than four years. Whether that occurs remains to be seen. I think that what many of the comments made by members opposite, and also, indeed, members on this side of the chamber, recognise is that there is a fair bit of water to pass under the bridge before that occurs. Perhaps to be more specific about it, before that occurs successfully there are likely to be the technological challenges of this technology being able to be deployed reliably and successfully into the future.

There are other more challenging conundrums to be negotiated, that is, how the rest of the community manage the interaction and integration of these technologies on our roads. I think this was a matter which the member for Davenport paid some particular attention to, the issue of: how will the rest of us on the roads react to this? Will it be a seamless integration or will there be challenges? I agree with his assessment, there will be challenges.

What could be referred to as one of the foremost global experts, who was brought out for the government's driverless car conference last month, made the comment to me that in the main, not completely but in the main, it may take a good 10 to 15 years to see fully autonomous vehicles successfully deployed and proliferated throughout our transport networks globally.

He encounters those same issues, that is, there are likely to be incidents, perhaps some false steps, amongst some people who are looking at trialling different aspects of this technology, and that will challenge communities within different jurisdictions where those incidents occur, and that is to be anticipated. That is certainly the experience that has been encountered as other types of automotive technology have been brought to bear over the past 110 or so years.

I remember speaking with the technical director of Volvo's global program when he was here for the test on the closed Southern Expressway and he said that Volvo as a corporation remembers the community concerns about first having radios in cars and whether they would be so distracting that people should be forced to pull over to the side of the road if they wanted to listen to a radio broadcast in their vehicles. He also made the comment—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I guess it depends what you are listening to, doesn't it? He also made the comment that there were fears when the windscreen wiper was first introduced. I am casting my mind back to an article that I saw some time ago. I think it was an American engineer from one of the major motor companies, perhaps in the 1940s or 1950s, who first developed the technology of the windscreen wiper, and there were concerns globally about whether this would have a hypnotic effect on the driver while they were trying to attend to the driving task with it switched on.

Nonetheless, the necessity to try to promote and promulgate this technology amongst our communities is upon us, and the reasons are clear. We have heard in the debates from members on both sides the anticipated benefits for road safety. Estimates put the number of collisions and so-called accidents that occur on our roads at up to 90 per cent being caused by some form of driver error. Surely, there are likely to be substantial road safety benefits in removing some or all parts of the driving task from the driver through this technology.

There is, of course, the other opportunity which has been identified (I forget by which member) about increased productivity for the occupants of the vehicle which may be travelling under autonomous systems. They may have the ability to engage in tasks other than the driving tasks.

There is the opportunity for fuel efficiency of these cars which are better able to interact with other likewise technologically capable cars and, as some members have mentioned, what we call intelligent transport systems—connected cars, connected infrastructure, vehicle-to-vehicle technology, vehicle-to-infrastructure technology or, I think, as the member for Mitchell rightly referred to it, V to X technology, which is being developed quite extensively around the world.

One of the things I must say which drives my interest in this area is the potential for reductions, or at least ameliorations in the longer term, of congestion on our roads. Adelaide is a relatively modest sized capital city compared to some of our Eastern States capital city counterparts. We know and are very proud that Adelaide has all the benefits of a larger city, including culture, lifestyle and institutions, but it is not yet beset by some of the problems that also come with having a large city. High populations lead to high demand for what can, at times, be scarce amounts of infrastructure. We see in Melbourne and Sydney the need to invest very substantial amounts of money, both public and private, into the duplication, if not the expansion, of existing road networks in order to try to accommodate what seems to be ever-increasing amounts of road infrastructure.

What these connected vehicles can do, putting to one side the autonomous capabilities of future vehicles, is to better utilise the infrastructure that we currently have. Words like 'platooning' have been used in the chamber in discussing this bill, and that is an obvious example of how these vehicles can occupy collectively less road space per capita of vehicle than what we currently do as we, perhaps, 'manually' drive the vehicles ourselves.

These cars with sophisticated sensing technology, as well as automated braking and acceleration technology, can run much closer together to one another. Estimates globally have been put somewhere between the range of running twice the number of vehicles to up to five times the number of vehicles on given amounts of road space. For a city like Adelaide, where, to be honest, the only experiences that we have had in the last 15 years of having to spend vast amounts of public resources on expanding our road infrastructure has been dealing with what has been a priority for governments of all persuasions over the last 50 years, and that is expanding our north-south road corridor.

Perhaps there is an exception to that and that is the work which was done between—and the deputy leader will be swift to correct me if I get this wrong—the Olsen state government and the Keating federal government on the Heysen Tunnels and South Eastern Freeway works in the late 1990s. Having said that, of course, as we all know, the ultimate aim for the north-south corridor is that the freight coming down the South Eastern Freeway will marry up to that north-south corridor via an improved Cross Road.

Those are some of the benefits, and, of course, I have not touched on the other benefit, which I think to all socially minded members of parliament should be at the forefront of their minds, and that is the capacity to improve mobility options for members of our community. Perhaps those people for health reasons, perhaps those people for reasons of advancing years, or perhaps for reasons that they have a disability, those people who are prevented currently from engaging within

the driving task have a new window of opportunity into the future with vehicles that can remove the responsibility from them of undertaking the driving task.

It gives them the opportunity to move around their communities with greater freedom, to conduct those tasks which they would very much like to do on their own, whether it is to visit family or friends, to go shopping or to pursue other leisure or recreational activities. These are the sorts of opportunities that can be given back to those members of the community who are currently disenfranchised from being able to engage in that driving task.

I should say that I have been somewhat encouraged but at the same time bemused particularly by some of the earlier speakers from the opposition about their focus on jobs. Can I say from the outset that it is a welcome focus because it is not something that, certainly in my relatively tender experience in this chamber, I have come to expect from the opposition—

Ms Chapman: Oh, come on, how can that possibly be correct?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —equating transport opportunities and jobs. The deputy leader interjects. 'Oh, come on. How can that possibly be correct,' the deputy leader says.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, deputy leader! Minister, just sit down. The deputy leader is reminded that she is on her second warning, and I would hate to deprive the house of her contribution on this matter. Just as every other member is entitled to be heard in silence, I will look after her as well when she comes to speak.

Ms Chapman: Listen to what he says.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I don't have to listen to what he said; I don't want you interjecting.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I beg your pardon?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are continuing to defy me when I asked you not to interject. I will have to bring the Speaker back and he will not be happy.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I thank the deputy leader for the interjection. I am happy to furnish her with an example. It was perhaps one that I gave during question time, Deputy Speaker, that of the Torrens to Torrens project, something which at the last state election the deputy leader herself, along with the leader, committed to cancelling.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order from the member for Bragg. This will not be frivolous, I hope.

Ms CHAPMAN: Repetition. The minister just admitted that he has already referred to this in the question time—a Dorothy Dixier.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I'm sure he will not do it again.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They committed to cancelling the project and the 480 jobs which came with the project.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, before you go on, I do not want to keep stopping every two seconds for you, deputy leader. We have a choice here, I suppose: we either go the whole hog and I bring the Speaker back and you leave or you try not to interject. So are you going to try not to interject?

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a point of clarification. I thought we were in the contribution in response from the minister. He is participating in the debate. He has just indicated that he is about to repeat an example from today in question time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We asked him not to do that again, but you then continued. Do you want me to go on or do you want me to continue with debate and try to get some work done?

Ms CHAPMAN: Can I bring to your attention that the minister is defying your ruling in the sense that he is continuing to repeat the example?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, that is one-all then, and I do not want another interruption. The minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. To clarify, for the benefit of the deputy leader—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Maybe just continue.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —I did not refer to that during question time, the fact that you promised to cancel that project and the 480 jobs that went with it.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I will say that—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —I have repeated what I just said 30 seconds ago, and I understand you are sensitive about that. I would be sensitive about it, too, if I were in the position of—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could we just finish the second reading?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —trying to cancel 500 jobs at this point of the economic cycle.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you are in it, too.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I would be sensitive, too, but that is okay. I am happy to move on, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That would be good.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Clearly—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —there is quite a glass jaw from those members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet. Sit down, I am on my feet. Listen, we have the opportunity to get through this bill this afternoon. It would be good, I am sure you all agree, for people to see that we are actually producing some work in this chamber. It would be good if we could wrap this up, and I am asking all members to cooperate and to listen to each other in silence. Irrespective of what is being said, we all have the desire to hear what everyone is saying in silence.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am moving it through it as rapidly as I can, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Good.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I only have a few pages of notes. I have finished the first one and I am on to the second; I only have this to go.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Super.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I realise the fair degree of latitude that members opposite had in their contributions. I am not straying from the purposes of the bill. I am merely seeking to address those same comments that they made, so I will continue in doing so. As I was saying, I was welcoming their newfound interest in jobs when it comes to the transport sector. As the member for Mitchell said, 'Where are the jobs?' and then somewhat incongruously gave the example of a South Australian company, Cohda Wireless, which is building its success on the fact that they are selling their products into the global supply chain—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not in your spot, member for Mitchell. Member for Mitchell, you are on your second warning. Open your mouth again and you are off.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He somewhat incongruously then gave the example of Cohda Wireless, a South Australian company that has been successful selling its wares into the global automotive supply chain, focused specifically on connected vehicle technology. The best example that Cohda Wireless has at this point in time, of course, is their contractual relationship with General Motors in Detroit to provide the connected vehicle communications systems that will be part and parcel of the 2017 Cadillac, which will be sold onto the American market.

Given the decline of the automotive industries in Australia, through a lack of government support by that party represented by those opposite, maybe that sort of vehicle will be present here on Australian roads in a different configuration. Maybe that platform will be replicated here and maybe Cohda Wireless will not just be selling their wares into car platforms for delivery in other car markets around the world. Maybe they will be delivering that technology for sale in a vehicle onto the Australian market.

I also realise that the deputy leader has already demonstrated heightened sensitivity when it comes to jobs in transport. This has the potential to strike a significant nerve, given the so-called leader's emergency jobs plan—which, yes, I am sure many people opposite would be shaking their heads at—which I think was to establish a replicated productivity commission in South Australia, establish a replicated infrastructure body in South Australia, to conduct a cost-benefit analysis calculation on the sealing of the Strzelecki Track and to establish a \$6 million consultancy into a water project.

The emergency jobs plan is two committees, a calculation and a consultancy. That should really hoick up our socks when it comes to jobs in the transport and infrastructure sector. What a valid contribution from the leader. Hopefully, that is one of few that we will have to put up with very soon.

Mr SPEIRS: Point of order: the minister is not responsible for the opposition.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I bet he is glad about that. Let's get back to where we were—on task.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Another point that was raised by members opposite was: what do autonomous vehicles and connected technology mean for other forms of competing transport? I think the example given was: what would this mean for public transport, what would this mean for trams? Would we still need to be laying tracks? Would we still need to be growing our public transport networks? Would we still need to be investing in this sort of thing? Of course, public transport is not something particularly popular with the opposition, and I understand they would be looking for another excuse not to invest in public transport, but even the most base—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! You are not in your place, member for Davenport, and you are on your second warning now.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: But even the most base appreciation—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are both goading me and you will both be getting it.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Even the most base appreciation of the comparative benefits of different modes of transport in terms of moving numbers of people would show that—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That's right. There is one person on that side who catches a train. Well done!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is unparliamentary to—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There's one. And you—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet. It is unparliamentary to interject. You are on your second warning, and I would not push it—and it is unparliamentary to respond. Unless we get on with the second reading speech, we will be here all day and have achieved nothing. Everyone is entitled to be heard in silence, standing order 142—and I will not hesitate to enforce it. There are several of you who may leave us for more than half an hour if you are not careful.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. As I was saying, public transport, will we still need it with autonomous vehicles? Well, of course, yes. One example that has generated a lot of attention recently is the O-Bahn. The O-Bahn on a working day moves somewhere in the order of 30,000 people. Imagine if we did not have the O-Bahn system, imagine if we did not have this mass transit route and that we were relying solely on autonomous vehicles again.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mitchell!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Are you interjecting again? On your second warning—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mitchell!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and you are interjecting again.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down! Lead speaker or not, you can leave us if you move your lips once more.

Ms Cook: Come on Corey, move them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's enough from everybody.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, it's not funny. The house's time precious. If you all want to do this, it is up to you. It is not actually me you are defying; it is the house and the Chair. It is up to you if you want to be frivolous with our time; I do not want to know about it. Back on task.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. As I was saying, public transport: imagine if we did not have a corridor like the O-Bahn which could move large number of people on a very limited amount of geographic space. This is the same equation we think about when we are talking about buses occupying road space, when we are thinking about other separated public transport corridors, like the train system, or when we are thinking about separated public transport corridors occupying what would otherwise be road space, like trams.

Most people will readily point to the sorts of equations that are put about by those people who support public transport, that one bus occupies the road space of approximately—depending on its configuration, whether it is rigid or articulated—somewhere in the order of three to six cars. When you consider that a rigid bus conveys in the order of 40-odd people, or when you consider that an articulated bus conveys in the order of 60-odd people at least, you can understand the benefits of still having a well-frequented, vibrant public transport network where you are moving large numbers of people for comparatively small amounts of road space. Even if we did have—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wright, your voice carries.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: I'm sorry.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure you are not speaking to anyone except yourself at the moment.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No; understood.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Even if we did have what is by some people's estimate to be the ultimate iteration of autonomous vehicles, where we had a large fleet of vehicles available for short-term hire to convey people from, colloquially speaking, point A to point B, we could readily imagine what it would mean for South Australian large transport corridors, like North East Road, if we did not have mass transit systems, public transport systems like the O-Bahn, and instead we had an additional 30,000 vehicles occupying or competing, I should perhaps more accurately say, for road space on that major road corridor, like North East Road.

While they will contribute to reducing, as I mentioned earlier, congestion problems, they are not the 'solve all' that some people think they may be. We will still need mass transit systems. Could you imagine in a more space-constrained, higher-population community—perhaps a Japanese one like Tokyo—how they would manage without their mass transit systems? So in responding to the opposition, I make that comment.

When I first started making that point about public transport, I think the deputy leader made the comment about Uber and taxis, or perhaps she was referring to some of the comments that some of her colleagues made about Uber. This is a particularly popular talking point for the opposition. They have made it very clear that, rather than go through the process that all other states are doing and, indeed, we are doing in South Australia, and we are having a fulsome and thorough look at our regulatory framework for personal passenger transport—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The deputy leader interjects and says that it was her idea.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. Order! Are you up to page 3 yet?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You had better get a move on, please. I am having trouble remaining focused. Hurry up.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think the comment was a bit tedious for me—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you are not responding to the interjection. If the deputy leader moves her lips, she can leave us for half an hour. I am happy to accommodate her.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think the member for Schubert, and perhaps more in passing, the member for Chaffey, made comment about taxis and Uber and whether autonomous vehicles will revolutionise these personal passenger transport services. Quite potentially they will and it would be, from a regulatory perspective, much simpler if we had those personal passenger transport services provided without a driver, because that would be one less element of the service being delivered within the community that the government would need to regulate, and that is the driver.

I should perhaps provide a bit of context to the house. Before Uber was even a gleam in the opposition's eye back in August last year, I had a very productive meeting with their Australian managing director—I think his title is—where he set out to me what his services were, perhaps anticipating the same sort of reception that he had received in other states around the country. My immediate response was, 'Well, I can't understand what the issue is with Uber BLACK. Even under what most people would regard as an out-of-date regulatory framework, all you are providing is an alternative booking office, and we are more than happy to accredit that and do so swiftly if you provide us with some small levels of paperwork.' It was done within the order of a couple of months.

'UberX,' I said, 'on the other hand, presents a greater dilemma to governments.' I explained the context of why governments regulate transport services in the way that we do, whether they are train, tram, bus or, indeed, taxi or chauffeur vehicle services. It is not just about making sure that there is a standard of vehicle and also a standard of driver, but it is also about making sure that we have certain safety and security elements built into that service so that we can provide some level of comfort as we do in other forms of transportation that, should something go awry in the provision of that service, the government and its law enforcement agency would have the ability to investigate and, if necessary, take action on either occupant of the vehicle. I think, in principle, that is well understood by most people involved in providing these services.

Nonetheless, Uber was very keen for the government to relax its regulations and allow them to operate posthaste in South Australia. Instead, what I did was to make them the same offer that the other states had been making, and that is to comprehensively review the way in which we regulate the taxi and chauffeur vehicle industries and retest what the community's expectations are of these services and, without putting too fine a point on it, what sort of safety and security elements, not just service standards, should be provided or should be regulated for in the provision of these services.

This is a process that New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania, Western Australia and, until recently, the ACT has been going through, and I invited Uber to make the case. We released the terms of reference, and we appointed an expert panel of eminent people to conduct the review. No-one could possibly cast aspersions on the qualifications or the qualities of any of those people.

What response did we get from Uber? 'You didn't mention us specifically, so we are not going to participate.' How ridiculous! We set up this review, amongst other things, to give them the opportunity to make their case to the South Australian people and to the South Australian government, and they did not take it.

What did we have in return? We had an opposition come out and say, 'Don't worry about process, don't worry about level playing fields, let's just cut them a special deal, give them 12 months, let them run free of regulation, and we will just see how it goes.' If that is the approach to transport regulation by those opposite, we should live in fear for the quality of services that would be provided should they ever accede to the Treasury benches, can I say.

I also find it stunning that they take that approach to regulation in light of what perhaps might be a personal interest of a couple of members opposite. I can remember when the member for Unley first came into this parliament. I can remember the series of interviews that he did with Leon Byner, when he was saying, 'This is outrageous. We have this new company coming into our state called IKEA. Do you realise what this is going to do to the local industry? We should be looking after this industry. We should be protecting it. Don't you realise what is at stake here? A lot of families are invested in this,' particularly his. 'This needs protection from the government.' That is one example.

Maybe another example would be if we said to people who wanted to get into food manufacturing, 'Don't worry about food safety, don't worry about regulations, don't worry about hygiene, you just have a crack for 12 months, and we will keep regulating those people who are already producing manufactured food products, who are already stocking South Australian goods on South Australian supermarket shelves.' Imagine if we had one set of very specific, highly regulated rules for them and then allowed someone else to come in and not have to abide by any of that regulation. Could you imagine the outcry from those food manufacturers? It would be loud and it would be from the rafters.

Ms Digance interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Elder!

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Schubert, who can have his second warning for not being in his place and ignoring 142. Mr Speaker is back; things could look up. He is horrified with what he has been hearing on the loudspeakers.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It's alright, I am coming to the member for Schubert, Deputy Speaker; don't worry about that.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: While we turn our focus to the comments that came from the member for Schubert and, again, his pleas to immediately introduce, without the same level of regulation, a service into South Australia, I will put on record one thing which I think is highly regrettable. I will not make reference to the person who made this comment, but it is the same kind of narrow-minded, culturally offensive comment that comes up when some people loosely comment about our taxi industry, and that is make comment about the personal hygiene of those people who participate in the taxi industry. I went along to the Taxi Council AGM last week. I was an invited guest. I noticed that members of the opposition are no longer invited to those events, but that is to be expected, given their—

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —given their views are not in support of this.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport is reminded—two warnings already.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As somebody who has experienced taxi services in South Australia for the best part of 30 years, what I was readily reminded of was that there are many people who are involved in the provision of taxi services, who are heavily invested in the taxi industry, who come from culturally diverse backgrounds, including people of Greek ethnicity, of Italian heritage and of other cultures and other nationalities from the Subcontinent.

Perhaps I am a little bit biased about this. I have married into a culturally diverse family and, when I hear members on the floor of this chamber make those sorts of casual offensive borderline racist remarks, it absolutely makes my blood boil and seethe. I would hope that the member who made those comments—and they know who they are—would think a little bit more carefully and a little bit more closely about how they casually cast aspersions over people who provide services within that industry from now on.

I might move on to the contribution that my close friend the member for Hartley made. He confirmed, much as the member for Hammond did, that it was pleasing to see that South Australia was taking a leadership role nationally in trying to advance the attention not just of this state but of states around Australia on to the fact that this technology is here. It needs to be better accommodated than it is under our currently outdated transport laws.

I notice that that comment—that we are taking a leadership role—directly contradicts the comments of other members, particularly those from Flinders, Chaffey and Mitchell, who said that we were dragging our heels on this, that we had been languishing and that other people have been taking a lead. Certainly, that is true globally; I brook no argument with that. This has certainly received an enormous amount of attention in the United States, where much of this technology has developed.

Members opposite, including most recently the member for Hammond, gave the example of Carnegie Mellon University. Their Pittsburgh campus is the crucible where this technology has been developed. You can go to the campuses of Google, Tesla, Uber and other research and technology organisations around that Mountain View precinct in California and they proudly say—and, indeed, Carnegie Mellon proudly says—that their senior researchers are poached from their Pittsburgh campus.

They are the ones who have been leading the development of this technology, and I am very pleased that the Adelaide Carnegie Mellon campus is in discussions with the government about what further efforts we can make here in South Australia. That is something we spoke about during the

Driverless Car Conference and at a couple of side functions at that conference, and I am looking forward to those talks coming to fruition.

While we are talking about what the international experience has been, what was clear to me was that very generally there have been two ways that governments have tried to regulate for these technologies to be out on the roads. There was what we can perhaps describe as the early Californian experience, which was to be incredibly specific about exactly what could and could not occur in testing this technology out on the roads.

Perhaps the best example of that is the requirement in California that, when this technology is tested, there must be an operable steering wheel, there must be an operable pedal box and there must be someone sitting in the car who is able to retake control from whatever systems are otherwise operating and navigating that car throughout the process of that test.

What does that mean? Google's fully autonomous test mule, which will take over if it is successfully developed and made commercially available to the market and which will conduct all the driving tasks on behalf of the vehicle's occupant, requires no steering wheel, requires no pedal box and requires no gear selector. It does not require any of those driver controls.

Yet, in order to test on Californian roads—and, until very recently, that is where they have done the majority of their testing—they have had to retrofit these systems into the car in the full knowledge that, if they do make that car successfully commercially available, that will not be a part of the sold product. That is a pretty unwelcome and inadvertent by-product of how California has gone about regulating this technology as it is being tested out on its roads.

Take that example and contrast it with what the United Kingdom has done. They have taken what can be generally described as the exemption approach, something that members will say appears to be very much in concert with how we are approaching this here in South Australia, giving transport agencies and those responsible for them the ability to exempt organisations from certain road laws to enable them to trial new technologies and have a flexible framework for the conduct of those trials. So when different, new developments come to fruition and are able to be trialled, let alone be trialled on public roads, there is flexibility within the legislative framework, and the regulations which may fall from that, to countenance that, rather than say, 'We're sorry, but we require a steering wheel, a pedal box, a gear selector,' and so forth.

I think it is a happy coincidence that despite those restrictions the state of California puts onto companies like Google—I think the member for Davenport referred to this earlier—there have been many hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of miles successfully tested on Californian roads. He mentioned a figure of 15 collision incidents—that was not the figure I had; I think it was 12, but they are pretty close to one another—claiming that it was not the Google vehicle responsible for initiating that collision or incident. Indeed, in the presentation they gave to the South Australian government and the other jurisdictions during the demonstration we were present for, there was some great footage shown to demonstrate, again, what the member for Davenport referred to—I think it was the member for Davenport—and that is the extensive capabilities of the sensing technology within these vehicles.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It was the member for Schubert; that is one interjection we can accept, Deputy Speaker. I am sure you will—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well I am sure it is one you are allowed to take notice of then, isn't it? Are we on to page 3?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: We are getting to page 3, Deputy Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Audible laughter has been ruled on by former speaker Bishop, and you know what happened after she noticed audible laughter, don't you?

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! You are going to go for a walk if you are not careful.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Despite having several more pages I guess I am testing the forbearance of the Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there is a page 4 it is not going to be recognised.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There were several questions that were put to me in the course of the contribution of the member for Schubert, in particular. I am happy to address those now, and if there are further unaddressed ones perhaps we can attend to those in the committee stage. The member for Schubert makes mention of the figure, that has often been quoted in the promotion of the future benefits of this industry globally, of \$90 billion; that is what the autonomous automotive sector is anticipated to be worth by 2030.

As member for Schubert said yesterday, with my now proudly infamous kangaroo incident, we all need to take our licks, but I should make it clear that I think there was a little bit of confusion by members opposite about the circumstances of that. It was not actually an inflatable kangaroo; it made, can I say, a far more satisfying thud than an inflatable kangaroo would have made—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have heard every kangaroo joke there is, so let us drop it and get back onto what we are talking about.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not need anybody's help.

Ms Digance interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! No need to do.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond's voice reverberates through the chamber so there is no mistake when he is talking. Member for Davenport, member for Schubert, you are both on second warnings so I am happy for you to leave whenever you want.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There were three trials being conducted on the Torrens Parade Ground. There was one being conducted by the Centre for Automotive Safety Research from the University of Adelaide, and that was the infamous trial. There was one by Bosch Australia, which I think was also mentioned in passing by the member for Mitchell. They were demonstrating a new technology developed here in Australia by the Australian arm of Bosch, which is an augmentation of the reversing camera systems that we have all become used to, those of us with new vehicles. That is, an automatic braking system, in concert with that rear view camera, which if it detects an object, a child, behind a car being reversed it will automatically brake and prevent a collision. That was successfully demonstrated.

We saw a demonstration of a Ford Territory with that system turned off—the member for Mitchell made reference to, even more unfortunately than an inflatable or non-inflatable kangaroo, a rubber child being bowled over by the rear bumper bar of that Ford Territory—and then we saw it working quite successfully. I think it is very pleasing what, perhaps similar to what Cohda Wireless has achieved in South Australia, Bosch Australia (headquartered in Melbourne) has been able to achieve and I look forward to the time when that system is deployed on vehicles which come onto the Australian, let alone the global markets. Then, there was the Tesla vehicle, and it was good of Tesla to be involved in the conference, make a vehicle available and give people an experience of what that is like, a truly exciting different take on the automotive experience.

Then, there was the Subaru automatic braking system. I have to say that, if you thought that did not go as planned, it could have been far worse because there was a nameless lead political journalist who was contemplating sitting in the driver's seat for that very test, and perhaps by the grace of God go they decided at the last minute that they would not. Fortunately, I decided that I would not either. I feel very sorry for that young man, who shall remain nameless, from the Centre for Automotive Safety Research, who was behind the wheel. Subaru has made all sorts of assertions about what he did or did not do properly. We know what happened and I have to say that much merriment has been made of it, including by me. I do not want people thinking that that is an indication of the limits of this technology into the future. But I digress.

The member for Schubert asked about the \$90 billion figure. Of course, we have gotten used to his extensive internet experience during question time. I am surprised he has not been able to find it, but I am told that there was a research project undertaken by Laslau, See, Saenko, Zhang and Holman called, 'Set Autopilot for Profits: Capitalizing on the \$87 Billion'—US—'Self-Driving Car Opportunity,' by a research outfit in Boston. That provides some clarity. Perhaps with the exchange rate as it is we should be saying \$100 billion, but let us call it \$90 billion. I can say that that figure incorporates car maker profits, connectivity and apps, maps, software, wireless hardware, computer hardware, wiring, optical cameras, lidar and radar. So, that is the composition of that figure.

The member for Schubert asked how many companies have been approached by the government for trials. I am not quite sure that that is, perhaps, the right inflection on it. I think the way in which we are contemplating it is: how many companies are expressing an interest in this? Perhaps the best example I can give upfront, and I want to make it clear to the parliament that I am not anticipating that Google is going to pick up their testing efforts from California or indeed from where they have now moved to a less restrictive regulatory regime in Texas, but when we went for that demonstration they held up the bill and said that this is a different approach from a jurisdiction about how to try to provide a more welcoming framework.

I am not expecting Google to come and test in South Australia but I think that is but a small window into understanding what it means to technology companies, as well as automotive companies, about having a less restrictive framework. I am advised that there has been some interest expressed pursuant to the bill being passed, so I do not think it is worth commenting that any of this interest is yet concrete, and I do not think we should be counting on people coming to South Australia in one fell swoop to begin testing.

Certainly, as I have indicated and the member for Hammond has indicated, we have research organisations like Carnegie Mellon and, of course, Cohda Wireless in South Australia, which is interested in having greater flexibility to test their technology. General Motors offered themselves to become a key sponsor of the conference, and the member for Mitchell, who attended the conference, might have seen their stand and I am sure he is familiar with the General Motors public/corporate affairs staff here in Australia. They are looking at not necessarily the type of four-door sedan vehicle that we all might be used to but other types of vehicle. Bosch we mentioned earlier in another context, and Volvo, of course. I am told Tesla has expressed an interest, perhaps more accurately, within the legislation itself. I do not want to start hares running about their moving again their testing efforts in other global jurisdictions here to South Australia.

Can I perhaps say, though, that what we are trying to do with this legislation is not recruit all of the companies that are conducting tests elsewhere around the globe and have them relocate to South Australia. If that happens it will be great, but that is not the principal aim. We acknowledge that Australia is, in the scheme of things, a relatively small automotive market. It is, however, a relatively modestly sized automotive market that has vehicles that are required to be configured in a way which comprises a minority of vehicles sold globally. What we would like to think is that, when these sorts of cars are available—which are already being sold onto our local market now with certain features, functions and capabilities deliberately disarmed because state legislation frameworks around the country do not provide for them—we are trying to say, 'If you are looking to bring these to market in Australia, you have at least one jurisdiction now that is willing and able to welcome these vehicles for testing purposes.'

We have also announced that this is a forerunner to a broader review of all our transport legislation which we look forward to bringing to the parliament next year which will provide, in a similar way, greater flexibility as to how we regulate motor vehicles, how we regulate behaviour on the road, how we regulate management of the roads, and (of interest to the member for Schubert) how we regulate passenger transport services as well. That will provide, I am hoping, one example of what we hope to see more broadly nationally, and that is all jurisdictions reviewing their legislation in similar ways to enable these cars to be deployed throughout the private vehicle fleet.

That is something which was raised in the most recent Transport and Infrastructure Council meeting where ministers—not just me but other like-minded ministers—urged national policy bodies, like the National Transport Commission, to get on with the job of providing us with some regulatory frameworks which will enable this technology to be deployed across our roads.

The member for Schubert, I think, also asked whether there would be a limit per year with regard to the impact on other road users. The number of trials will depend on the nature of the proposal and what the anticipated impact is on other road users. As I perhaps indicated in my earlier comments about those expressing interest, we are certainly not at the point where discussions or negotiations have progressed to the extent that we are in that level of detail.

I am yet to receive a formal proposal, and I think that is a recognition of the fact that the bill has not passed. But, even after the bill has passed, it is going to take some lifting of people's collective gaze and a broader acknowledgement that the capacity exists in this state before we start seeing these companies approaching the government to undertake a trial. So, there is no answer that I can give the member for Schubert on what we envisage the number of trials to be, but, of course, in contemplating that trial we would take into account what the impact on the road network, and, of course, on users of the road network, is likely to be.

There has been a concern raised with me certainly by the member for Mitchell (I think in a briefing that he received on this bill), certainly by the Motor Trade Association and certainly yesterday by the member for Schubert, and it relates to this issue about insurance and public liability insurance. I think that is a very legitimate concern, because there needs to be from the outset—and the bill certainly provides for this—an assurance that, before any trial occurs, an appropriate insurance policy is undertaken.

The member for Schubert made reference to the fact about whether it needs to be a locally held insurance policy. I have to say that we have not specified in the bill that it does need to be locally held, perhaps for a couple of reasons. One reason is a recognition of, perhaps, a construct of the insurance market that most if not all Australian insurers are backed or bankrolled by overseas financial interests.

I think to put a finer point on it what we would be interested in is the application of a policy to Australian conditions and the ability for the community of South Australia, or the government on behalf of the community of South Australia, to claim against that policy, and that certainly will be front of mind for government. I cannot give an indication at this point in time about what the expectation of the government will be in terms of holding a domestic policy, but we want an assurance that it is domestically enforceable and that we have just not a clear line of sight to that enforceability but certainly that we have full confidence that the terms of that insurance can be enforced if necessary.

There is another issue relating to insurance about quantum. What level of insurance should be held? Why doesn't the bill or why hasn't the government specified a level of insurance? I think that even the member for Schubert foreshadowed in his remarks that the reason that there had not been a quantum foreshadowed is about flexibility.

I take that one step further and say that it is not just about flexibility: it is about making sure that the insurance reflects the risk. For example, while some of us may not have been paying as close attention to our car insurance policies in the last 18 months as we might have previously, I think that most of us would be aware that common car insurance policies hold levels of public liability insurance of the order of, perhaps, \$10 million, \$20 million or \$30 million.

While I have prefaced my comments by saying that we will try to match the level of public liability insurance to the risk inherent in that, I think that if there seems to be a common conception that the level of risk from Joe Blows, like the member for Schubert and me, are needing to attract a level of public liability insurance of \$10 million, \$20 million or \$30 million insurance with a policy, then that might give you some indication.

However, without specifying in the bill or giving a commitment about that level, what the parliament and the community will have is a gazetted notice of the terms of the trial, I think, a month in advance of that trial occurring and the conditions attached to that. So, there will be an early and fulsome disclosure about all the terms of the trial, including insurance. Perhaps if it is desired by the member for Mitchell, we can explore that a little further in committee.

Mr Wingard: Yes, I will.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am advised that specifying a monetary figure could inadvertently push low-risk proponents out of the running to trial their technology as it may be too

expensive. Then on the flip side, of course, Volvo announced in October 2015 that it will accept full liability whenever a Volvo autonomous vehicle is in autonomous mode. That is not for the purpose of trialling, I understand, I think that is a more general comment. As I said, I am advised that standard vehicle insurance covers range from \$20 million (for example, AAMI or Allianz) to \$30 million (QBE Insurance for third-party personal injury and property or vehicle damage). I think that gives the parliament some idea of where we will be headed with this, but we can explore it a little further in a moment.

I come back to the point that, before authorising any trial on South Australian roads, all the risks, issues and risk management plans will be considered on a case-by-case basis by DPTI, with consultation from other relevant agencies and stakeholders in order to determine the adequate insurance cover required. We will work with those stakeholder groups, like the Motor Accident Commission, South Australia Police and so on, to make sure that we have a minimum level of insurance that will enable us to best manage the risks inherent with that trial.

Before we go into committee, the last issue raised by the member for Schubert was: what regard do we have for size or weight limits, minimum or maximum, and what is determined to be automotive for the purposes of the trials? The member for Schubert queried whether buses, tanks, motorbikes and single-user vehicles are captured under this. Certainly, most research of autonomous technology has focused on cars, although there are limited examples of autonomous heavy vehicles and buses.

The bill is drafted to provide for any type of motor vehicle as defined by the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. This includes any vehicle with an engine and could ostensibly include buses, tanks, motorbikes, single-user vehicles and even trams. Exemptions include very low-powered vehicles or devices, such as e-wheelchairs and power-assisted bicycles. I think that covers off that matter.

Thank you, Deputy Speaker. It has been a pleasure to receive the opposition's support for this bill and to have the opportunity to respond in as much detail to them as they conjectured on the bill's clauses in their contributions. I very much look forward to having further discussions in the following stage of the bill's passage.

Bill read a second time.

Mr PICTON: Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER (17:14): I make this statement about the matter of privilege raised by the member for Morphett in the house earlier today but, before addressing the matter, I wish to outline the significance of privilege as it relates to the house and its members.

Privilege is not a device by which members or any other person can seek to pursue matters that can be addressed by debate or settled by a vote of the house on a substantive motion. McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand* makes the test for whether or not a matter is a matter of privilege, defining it as a matter that can, quote:

...genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the House in the discharge of its duties.

An essential aspect of privilege is to ensure that each member can speak without fear or favour, but at the same time be able to rely on the accuracy of the statement made in the house by any member.

I refer to the matter raised by the member for Morphett, where he alleges that the Minister for Emergency Services has knowingly misled the house, as the minister's answers to questions in the house on 18 and 19 November 2015, while consistent with each other, are inconsistent with what the member for Morphett believes to be the minister's intentions, which he deduces by reference to information contained in public documents not before the house.

In response to questions from the member for Morphett about the incorporation of the SES and CFS volunteer charters into legislation or regulation, the minister on 18 November this year on page 3591 of *Hansard* is quoted as saying:

I will be engaging with the volunteer sector and all volunteers who are involved in emergency services. The commitment I gave at the beginning of the process last year was that it would be an enforceable regulation...

Further, on 19 November, at page 3721 of *Hansard*, the minister is quoted as saying:

...yes, there will be a head of powers in the act itself, and I talked about regulation. In fact, there was some discussion as to whether or not it should be a regulation around the volunteer sector. I said that a regulation would suffice, and elevate it from being a policy, which it is at the moment.

The member for Morphett refers to the Emergency Services Sector Reform Environmental Scan and SWOT analysis report, wherein at page 10 it states:

...throughout the reform engagement process the minister has committed to elevating the charters into legislation in a similar manner to the volunteer charter in the Country Fire Authority Act 1958 in Victoria.

The member uses this reference and, more specifically, reference to the word 'legislation' to allege that the minister in indicating to the house that volunteer charters will be incorporated into regulation and not the act is misleading the house.

The member for Morphett's contention is that any reasonable person would understand that when a minister talks about legislation that means incorporation into an act of parliament, not a regulation to that act. It is the perceived inconsistency between the minister's reference to the charter being incorporated into regulation and not the act that the member for Morphett alleges that the minister has misled the house.

As previous Speakers have stated, an inconsistency between words used by a member in the house with those previously used in the house or elsewhere, or words spoken that are inconsistent with the text of a document, is not itself misleading and therefore not a matter of privilege. Although it may be unfortunate that the word 'legislation' in the extrinsic document could be construed to be inconsistent with information provided to the house by the minister, as the minister clearly noted in his answer to the house on 18 November, 'First of all, regulation is legislation.'

As both answers provided by the minister are consistent with each other, there is nothing to suggest that the information provided to the house by the minister was misleading. Accordingly, I do not propose to give precedence which would enable any member to pursue the matter immediately as a matter of privilege. This decision does not prevent the member for Morphett or any other member from proceeding with a motion on the specific matter by giving notice in the normal way.

I would just add that it seems to me that the member for Morphett fundamentally misunderstands the idea of privilege, and the matter of privilege is of so little merit that if the member for Morphett raises one like this again I will name him.

Bills

MOTOR VEHICLES (TRIALS OF AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr WINGARD: I thank the minister for covering most of the questions that were raised by me. It appears in your references that the member for Schubert raised similar questions. I just want a little bit of clarity—and I do not think it will take long because you did cover it quite well—on part D and the bit about the public liability. You talked about the public liability matching the risk. At what stage will the public know the figure that was talked about that will be there for coverage for a test for an autonomous vehicle?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: In my summing comments earlier, I made reference to the details of the trial being published a month earlier and that stands; however, I misspoke. I said that

those details will be published in the *Government Gazette*. The bill does not require them to be published in the *Government Gazette*. The bill requires them to be published online according to section 134D(5) where it says '...authorised trial to be published on a website...'

The details of the trial are anticipated to include the nature of the trial, the conduct of the vehicles, and the details of the vehicles, etc. I should be absolutely clear that the legislation does not specifically require the insurance details to be published on that website; however, the government undertakes to do that within those notices published on the website.

Mr WINGARD: On the same one again: is there an ability for the government to investigate the insurance company to ensure that you are comfortable that it is adequate coverage and that we are covered?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think the short answer is yes. In my earlier comments, I think the member for Schubert made a good point, and the point he was getting at is: how can we be comfortable that the insurance policy that they may have, that they advised the government of, is, for want of a better term or terms, operable and enforceable in Australia? I would anticipate that, amongst the other details of the trial, that will be a critical element for us to make sure that the level of insurance that we require for them to be able to undertake the trial is not just at a level which satisfies us but, importantly, that the policy is both operable and, in particular, enforceable in our state.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr WINGARD: I have a question on new section 134B(2), where it talks about vehicles. I just want clarification again. I know this was asked by me and the member for Schubert during our speeches, and you have touched on this, but I am again seeking clarification. We have talked about whether or not we can have autonomous buses, trams, trains or the like, and I think you indicated we could, so I just want to know, again for the record: have you ruled any vehicles out and/or, given the fact that we are looking deep into the future and who knows what vehicles we are going to have and what they will be called, how is that covered? Can we have autonomous buses and trucks, etc.?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The advice that has been provided to me is that we can countenance any vehicle which is defined by and provided for by the Motor Vehicles Act. I will just see if this bill gives me the ability to provide an exemption from those definitions within the Motor Vehicles Act to cast the net wider.

I am advised that the class of vehicles which we would be excluding are trains because they are not provided for by the Motor Vehicles Act, so the guidance will be provided by what is in the Motor Vehicles Act. What I might do is come back, perhaps between houses, and provide you with some advice about whether I have flexibility to provide for other vehicles which may not be countenanced by the Motor Vehicles Act through some sort of exemptive capacity through this legislation.

Mr WINGARD: I am looking at 134H, which reads:

- (a) a policy of public liability insurance indemnifying the owner and any authorised driver or operator of the vehicle in an amount not less than the amount specified by the Minister in relation to the trial...

Again, that refers back to the answer I think you gave earlier that you will be publishing that on the website, as you pointed out.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am advised that the legislation does not specifically require us to publish the insurance details; however, I undertake to the house that we will be publishing those details in association with the notice that we publish on the website.

Mr WINGARD: Fantastic, thank you. I will move on to 134I—Offence to hinder authorised trial or interfere with equipment:

- (1) A person who, without reasonable excuse—
 - (a) hinders or obstructs the undertaking of an authorised trial; or

(b) interferes with any equipment or device relating to an authorised trial...

Maximum penalty: \$10 000.

Given the scope and the possibility for terrorism in this day and age—not that we want to talk about it, but it is something we must cover off—are you happy and comfortable that that figure is a big enough deterrent to cover those sorts of concerns and where this could potentially go to, given the access that someone could have if they can tap into this sort of operation?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am advised that there are other offences under other pieces of legislation which could quite possibly apply in the scenario which you allude to; in particular, cybercrime offences under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. I assume that there are other national pieces of legislation which would also be of relevance.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

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) (17:29): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Adjournment Debate

RIVERLAND SPORTSPERSON OF THE YEAR AWARDS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:29): I would like to use this time to acknowledge one of the local sporting events in my electorate of Chaffey, that is, the winners and nominees of the recent 2014-15 5RM Berri Resort Hotel SGIC Riverland Sportsperson of the Year Awards.

The Riverland Sportsperson of the Year Award was first introduced in 1961, when the winner was cricket and golf champion Kevin Harrington. After a recess between 1971 and 1975, the recent presentation was the 51st time the region's leading sportspeople have been acknowledged in this way. The Riverland Sportsperson of the Year's decision is put in the hands of a panel of esteemed judges with decades of experience in the local sporting arena.

I would like to start by acknowledging all the nominees for the 2014-15 Riverland Sportsperson of the Year, and there are many of them, and they come from all sports, as the Riverland is known as an exemplary breeding ground of elite sportspeople. At the awards, the Riverland Legends of Sport inductees to the local version of the Hall of Fame were Leeanne Grantham in basketball, Rick Darling in cricket, and Tony Modra—and we all know Tony Modra—for football. He is another Riverland champion, as are Rick Darling and Leeanne.

The Riverland Sportsperson of the Year was Peter Dunk. Peter is the Commodore of the Lake Bonney Yacht Club and was named as Yachting South Australian Senior Sailor of the Year, which is a formidable feat coming from a small lake club compared with the large ocean clubs across South Australia. During 2015, Peter won the National and the South Australian Mosquito Catamaran Sloop Championships and also finished first in the Victorian State Titles.

As a member of the Mosquito Catamaran Association of South Australia, he won the Travellers Award and came first in the Dash for Cash. At his Barmera-based Lake Bonney Yacht Club, Peter won the Club Championship, he was first in the ANZAC Day Trophy Race, second in the handicap series and second in the 69th Easter Regatta. At the Victor Harbor Yacht Club, he was third in the Rum Race Regatta and was aboard the boat that finished 12th in the Adelaide to Port Lincoln race.

Peter has been sailing from a very young age, having both parents who were serious sailors. He competed in the 2002 Worlds in Sydney, the Sydney International Regatta and the

Youth Nationals in 2003. He started sailing mosquito catamarans in 2003 and has competed in every national and state championship since 2004. What a great feat!

The Beaupaires Peter Frankcom Junior Sports Star of the Year was Chris Dicerbo from the Loxton Rifle Club, where he is a member. He had a fantastic year, winning the state championships, an international win in New Zealand, and he has represented state and country at a number of events. I am told that Chris is often seen showing up his much more experienced competitors.

The 5RM Steve McFarlane Contribution to Sport Award was won by Jon Matthews from the Waikerie Football Club and the Waikerie Gold Cricket Club. He received the 2014 Cricket Australia 50 Year Service to Cricket Award, and that is a great achievement. The 5RM John Ormsby Coach of the Year Award went to Kev Barber. Kev is a longstanding coach in the Riverland, and I remember doing a coaching clinic with him when I was coaching one of the young Renmark teams.

Kevin is the Barmera United Soccer club coach. Barmera United won the 2015 A grade soccer title, when Kevin added to his total of 10 premierships across the grades. That is just a great feat. He has had five back-to-back flag wins in under 12s, the under 16s, the B Grade and twice in the A grade. These are just wonderful achievements.

Once again, I congratulate all the award winners, finalists and nominees on their outstanding contributions to Riverland sport and I wish them all the best for the upcoming season.

TRADE, DEFENCE AND VETERANS PORTFOLIOS

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (17:33): As the year approaches an end I just want to round up some of the achievements for agencies for which I am responsible as minister and commend them for their efforts.

I want to start with the investment and trade portfolios because a significant amount has been accomplished—our biggest trade missions ever to India and China and to South-East Asia; a complete revamping of the government's entire approach to investment and trade, including significant reinvestment in investment and trade, as I will explain; \$14.3 billion of trade flows creating 65,000 jobs—and increasingly South Australian businesses and jobs depend on getting it right with selling our goods and services overseas.

There have been quite a lot of program highlights in this portfolio, mostly affecting rural producers, manufacturers and service providers, but I would say that one of the major achievements has been putting out a calendar of outbound and inbound missions for 2016 which I hope will become a template for future years going well forward. For too long now, we have been unable, for different reasons, to have regularity and consistency in our outbound and inbound mission profiles.

As a consequence, businesses have not quite known from one month or one year to the next exactly when we will be going, what we will be doing and how we will be doing it. I hope that that consistency will provide some certainty, not only to government but mainly to businesses, who really do want to get overseas and trade but who need to know well in advance so that they can budget for what is planned and what is going on.

The export partnership program has now been turned into a huge success and reinforced, and I hope to have some positive statements to make about the funding for that going forward. The relationship with Shandong is going from strength to strength. We have signed a sister-state relationship with Rajasthan and I could go on for some time about how I think that will bear fruit going forward.

In relation to those 65,000 jobs that depend on overseas activities, if we could grow that number by 10 per cent or even 5 per cent, we would help a lot of families put a meal on the table. I also point to the creation of the investment agency, and I commend Mike Hnyda as CE and also Matt Johnson as director of the trade agency. They and their teams are doing an outstanding job, creating jobs in the future for a lot of South Australian businesses.

I want to quickly move now to defence. A lot hinges on the outcome of the submarine CEP process and Future Frigates. It is very clear that we also need the offshore patrol vessels built in

South Australia so that we ease the valley of death, and I hope the commonwealth, under its new leadership, makes the right decisions in that regard.

I have no doubt that, were it not for the intervention of the state government, a decision would have been made to build those 12 submarines offshore around 18 months ago. There is no doubt about that: the media release and the relevant instructions were already drafted. Because of the intervention of the Premier and myself, the state government—with the assistance of Senator Penny Wong, if I could commend her, Senator Stephen Conroy in the federal parliament, and Senator Nick Xenophon—has run a successful campaign to turn that around.

I sincerely hope that we are on track now and that we get those submarines and frigates built not only in Australia but principally in South Australia because I think we are facing some serious competition from WA and elsewhere. This needs to be the home of naval shipbuilding and sustainment, of course. Certainly, Perth and Sydney are where the fleet is based, but this is where things need to be built.

I want to move more generally to the last year and matters going forward. I want to specifically reflect on my decision to resign from the Liberal Party to become an Independent and serve with the state Labor government in a bipartisan and cooperative way. It has been an absolute joy. I have thoroughly enjoyed working with the Premier and the cabinet team. The quality of the discussions is sound and the experience around the table is obvious.

I think in difficult times that the government is doing its best to put the state back on its feet and get it pointing in the right direction. I think the contributions by the member for Frome and myself have been quite pivotal to that because there are two independent voices around the table. In my case, it is a very conservative voice, and that is influencing decisions that are made in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

I want to talk about the way that that decision has been received by members opposite, and I just might encourage them to reflect on the past 18 months and work out where they want to go for the next 18 months. I note that a couple of motions that will be moved in February and March respectively, on health and the Repat, are clear and obvious attempts to target me. I will not get into the substance of those debates (I will leave that to the debates), but I will just say that I welcome those two motions—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —because it will give me an opportunity to talk about the performance of the Leader of the Opposition when he was shadow health minister. I was shadow health minister for some time, I think a fairly effective one, and I handed over a very thorough brief to the member for Dunstan, who made a complete and utter mess of it during his period as shadow health minister. He offered nothing of substance during his entire tenure.

One of the points I made to him was that the health system was in crisis and some tough decisions would need to be made if the Liberals were elected. Of course, the actions reflected in the forthcoming motions and during the debate about the Repat make it clear that there is no policy courage, when it comes to health, on the other side of the house.

However, I will make a broader point. If members opposite want to get into a fight with the member for Waite over the next 18 months to two years I say, 'Bring it on,' because—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey will leave the chamber.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —I will give back as good as I get.

Mr Whetstone: You are irrelevant.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I must say that I find the member for Chaffey's and others' argument that I am irrelevant quite funny; if people are irrelevant you do not need to go around telling people. No-one believes you—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! You are talking to me.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I will make the point that if, for the next 2½ years leading up to the next election, you want to have the newspapers and the media full of bad Liberal news stories, keep it up, because I will respond and it will be colourful. I have a lot to say about the member for Dunstan and I have a lot to say about the leadership group opposite. I know the full history and I know about people's performance, or lack thereof, so if you want to keep it up I will not only defend the point, I will be quite colourful and detailed in my explanations. There are a number of marginal seats opposite, and I simply say this: the worst thing that could happen to members opposite at the next election would be to lose yet another one—which, I suspect, will occur—and I believe an ongoing fight with Martin Hamilton-Smith could assist that process rather spectacularly, which you will see in the six to 12 months leading up to the election.

I encourage members opposite to look at the way the Labor Party handled the situation when the former Labor member for Mitchell chose to resign from the Labor Party. I think the tactics and the strategy that the Labor Party used to handle that issue might be instructive for members opposite. I send a very clear message to those opposite that if they want the newspaper and the media full of bad news stories about the Liberal Party by continuing attacks on me, I am happy to oblige. Believe me, not only will I put up a big show, but if people want to throw a rock I will back up the truck and lift the tipper. It really is up to them. I really welcome it, and I cannot tell you how excited I am to address the two forthcoming motions on the Repat.

The decisions the government has made are the right decisions for veterans and the right decisions for our health system, and they required considerable courage. You might recall that members opposite wanted to close Modbury; frankly, we might well be here, were they in government, closing both Modbury and the Repat for the same reasons and facing the same circumstances that the government presently faces.

All I would say to those opposite is that rather than concentrate on personal attacks, think about policy. What I would like to see is intelligent debate on policy issues. The reason I am standing over here is that I want to make a really informed contribution to the future of this state. I have an 11 year old and I want him to have a job in 10 years' time.

Frankly, there are some very important issues that need to be debated. Future submarines and frigates, as I have mentioned, is one; getting more of our businesses to sell their products and services is another; working out ways to accommodate the transformation of the automotive industry is another; and dealing with the downturn in mining, energy, oil and gas is another. Improving our education system and our health system, these are all important debates and, frankly, I would rather hear the opposition talking about that than launching personal attacks. However, if that is what they want that is what they will get.

Time expired.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

MARY MACKILLOP COLLEGE

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (17:44): As tempting as it is to rebut the member for Waite, I would like to quote Bon Jovi:

We've gotta hold on ready or not. You live for the fight when it's all that you've got.

Deputy Speaker, I wanted to quote—

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Surely it is against the standing orders to quote Bon Jovi, surely, for the good order of the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I just wish he had sung it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I just wish he had sung it because I would have known what he was saying. Member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: I wish to speak about a couple of functions I recently attended in and around my electorate. Firstly, the Mary MacKillop College had its awards ceremony last night, which followed a mass before. It was a wonderful evening. I congratulate Mrs Kath McGuigan as well as the school board, parents, teachers and volunteers who make the school such a wonderful community that it is. After an official welcome, we saw many students presented with service and leadership awards from years 8 to 12, academic awards, subject awards, special awards and a principal's address.

I want to take some time to congratulate especially the recipients of the special awards at the college. The Patrick Bourke Challenge Perpetual Trophy for Public Speaking went to Stephanie Sinclair. The Gleeson Outstanding Athlete Award went to Jade Boffo. The Leanne Hall Geography Award went to Charanjit Kaur. The Joanne McFarlane (Golding) Award for Outstanding Service to Liturgy went to Laura Santucci. The Girardi Performing Arts Award went to Melody Abram. The Mary MacKillop College Social Justice Award went to Elyse Gambell. The Sister Mary Harradine Award for Service to School Music went to Brooke Marchetti. The Max Harris Young Writer Award went to Claudia Mazzone. The Rotary Club of Magill Sunrise—and that Rotary Club values community service extremely well, they donated two prizes which were awarded last night by Mark Thompson—Service Above Self College Community and Service Above Self General Community were respectively awarded to Kylie Do and Laura Santucci.

The Mary MacKillop College Old Scholars' Award went to Nicola Sapio, and I congratulate her. The Caltex Best All Rounder Award, obviously awarded to the best all round student, was awarded to Kelsey Cremasco and I congratulate her. The Australian Defence Force Long Tan Leadership and Teamwork Awards for year 10 was awarded to Vanessa Bianco and for year 12 went to Elyse Gambell, and they were presented by Kath McGuigan. The Principal's Leadership Award was awarded to Stephanie Hoang and Carla Saponari, and I congratulate those students on receiving those awards. The recipient of the Mary MacKillop Award 'In all things Love' was announced at the ceremony and I congratulate that student for receiving that award as well, I believe it was Elyse Gambell.

Kath McGuigan, the principal, gave a fantastic speech at the end of the ceremony. She encouraged us all to be grateful for what we have and for the students to be truly grateful for Mary MacKillop and what she did for the school. I would like to reiterate that gratitude because what they have there is a fantastic community. I also thank the staff, the students, parents and friends who make the school community what it is.

I recently attended the St Joseph's School, Hectorville, blessing and official opening of the new learning spaces. I congratulate the school, the board, the committee, parents and friends, teachers and the broader community at that school for what they have done. If you go to that school you can see some fantastic refurbishment which has occurred. There is well over \$1 million in investment in that school. I know that the school community, the students, the teachers and the parents, will benefit for many decades to come because of the foresight at that school and the investment that has occurred. It has only occurred with the work of the school, the committee and the parents working together, being long term in their thinking and very strategic. I congratulate them and I wish them all the very best for their upcoming years at that school as well.

Bills

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (BUILDING UPGRADE AGREEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

EVIDENCE (JOURNALISTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:50 the house adjourned until Thursday 3 December 2015 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES**

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (13 May 2015).

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): I have been advised:

1. The 2014-15 allocated budget towards the repair and maintenance of vacant properties is \$31.1 million and this related to 5,492 houses, of which 4,142 were vacancies and 1,350 were tenant transfers.

The cost for 2013-14 was \$26.6 million with 3,815 vacancies and 1,174 transfers and the cost for 2012-13 was \$29.7 million with 3,934 vacancies and 1,352 transfers.

AMBULANCE SERVICES

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop)** (18 June 2015).

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

1. SA Ambulance Service is a user-pays service. While transport services include a per-kilometre charge it is important to note that currently ambulances regularly bypass a nearby hospital emergency department if it is not the most suitable destination for treatment. Whilst proximity is one factor considered by ambulance clinicians when determining the most suitable destination, the destination hospital is always determined by the patient's clinical needs.

For peace of mind, people can take out ambulance cover which fully covers the cost of all services provided by SA Ambulance Service.

2. I can confirm if a public patient attends a public hospital emergency department (such as Noarlunga Hospital), but that hospital is unable to provide the treatment required, the cost of ambulance transport to another public hospital (such as Flinders Medical Centre) will be covered by SA Health. This will apply regardless of whether the patient is admitted or not.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2015).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): EPAS is scheduled to be delivered on time for occupancy of the new RAH. As with any major system implementation, contingencies are in place in the unlikely event EPAS is delayed.

HEALTH REVIEW

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (8 September 2015).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): Deloitte are not reviewing the statistical analysis underpinning Transforming Health.

Deloitte have been engaged to fulfil the role of an interim chief transformation office function while SA Health appoints a substantive chief transformation officer. This is to ensure the continuity of Transforming Health Program leadership.

Deloitte are, however, reviewing the transforming health priority areas to maintain momentum of the program while the appointment of the implementation partner and independent project management office is still to be concluded. These priority areas include medical imaging, theatres, outpatients, ophthalmology and decommissioning of the Repatriation General Hospital.

Joe McDonald was likely referencing the work Deloitte are undertaking with Southern Adelaide Local Health Network to support bottom up planning at the Repatriation General Hospital.

SA Health is currently in the evaluation phase of the procurement for the implementation partner and independent project management office, with the status commercial in confidence as negotiations on contract and price are yet to occur.

HOSPITAL TRANSFERS

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (8 September 2015).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): The Repatriation General Hospital, like all SALHN hospital sites, accepts transfers as required without any time restrictions.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (23 September 2015).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): All patients undertaking low risk chemotherapy are welcome to have their treatment in the Wallaroo Hospital's chemotherapy unit, under the care of their public oncologist or haematologist.

All country chemotherapy units are linked with a specified metropolitan cancer centre for the purposes of supporting ongoing education, continuity of patient care and for pharmacy distribution processes. While Wallaroo Hospital is linked to the Lyell McEwin Hospital for these purposes, patients under the care of oncologists located at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and The Queen Elizabeth Hospital have also been treated recently in Wallaroo.

People with private health cover can use the Wallaroo Hospital chemotherapy unit or any other Country Health SA Local Health Network chemotherapy unit, for supportive services including PICC/PORT (central venous catheter) access, flushing and disconnections of chemotherapy pumps. Patients from St Andrews Hospital and Calvary Hospital have recently accessed these services in the Wallaroo Hospital chemotherapy unit.

Country Health SA Local Health Network is currently working to develop safe pathways and processes to enable private patients the opportunity to receive treatment under the supervision of their private oncologist or haematologist in country chemotherapy units.

The hours of service and staffing levels that the Wallaroo Hospital chemotherapy unit operates are based on patient demand. In the first six months of 2015, the unit averaged four treatments per week. In addition to its operating hours for scheduled chemotherapy, the unit is used regularly on an as needs basis for video-conferencing and other support activities such as PICC disconnections, and trained staff are made available to assist or undertake these services.

PORT LINCOLN HOSPITAL

In reply to **Mr TRELOAR (Flinders)** (23 September 2015).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): There is no intention of doctors not being available for the Emergency Department at Port Lincoln Hospital.

While the roster is primarily covered by general practitioners on-call, some shifts are also covered by locums when required.

Country Health SA Local Health Network is talking to local general practitioners about their capacity to cover the shifts currently covered by locums.

Country Health SA Local Health Network is not aware of any immediate threats to the service.

*Estimates Replies***STEM EDUCATION**

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (23 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): I am advised:

The last four years of data for this target, including agricultural studies, are:

Field of Education	2011	2012	2013	2014
Natural and Physical Sciences	1,612	1,900	2,048	1,953
Information Technology	469	582	558	635
Engineering and Related Technologies	1,285	1,479	1,605	1,569
Architecture and Building	635	693	680	659
Agriculture, Environmental and Related Studies	449	414	396	374
Health	5,470	5,851	6,133	6,010
Total	9,732	10,722	11,217	11,012

Note the yearly total is different to the sum of the field of education data because:

1. This data has had a disclosure control technique applied, where random small adjustments are made to cell counts to mitigate the risk of disseminating identifiable data. This allows for more detailed data to be released and does not significantly impair broad level analysis. This technique is not applied to the totals.

2. The data also counts one student in two different fields of education if they are studying double degrees. However, in the totals, the student is only counted once.

HEALTH SERVICES

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): There are no plans to transfer BIRCH Services into the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

BIRCH Services will continue at two new sites, one at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre and one at a yet to be determined location in the south.

The Felistow site has been handed to Renewal SA to manage as it was found to be in fair to poor condition.

The pool at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre will continue to be available for BIRCH and community use.

HEALTH REVIEW

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The Transforming Health Business Case contained the information, using health roundtable data, that there are on average 400 to 500 more deaths in South Australian hospitals, benchmarked against other participants in the health roundtable.

McKinsey developed the Transforming Health Business Case along with input from the Ministerial Clinical Advisory Committees during late 2014 and early 2015. I then released the 'Transforming Health Proposals Paper' for public consultation on 3 February 2015.

After Cabinet endorsement of the Transforming Health Business Case in early March, 2015, I released the 'Delivering Transforming Health – Our Next Steps' paper outlining initial decisions, a commitment to ongoing engagement, and timelines of the first changes to improve the healthcare system.

The business case overview containing the mortality figure and analysis is available and was uploaded on the website on 16 March, 2015 (see <http://transforminghealth.sa.gov.au/>).

HOSPITAL BEDS

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

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

1. Hospital maintenance care patients occupying acute hospital beds are coded according to their clinical condition and are not coded as disability patients. It is not possible to accurately say the number of patients with a disability occupying acute hospital beds.

Hospital patients with a disability generally have high care needs that fluctuate throughout their admission and this can result in a longer length of stay.

2. As above. It is not possible to accurately say the average length of stay for patients with a disability or aged care occupying acute hospital beds.

The average length of stay for maintenance care patients occupying acute hospital beds overnight in 2014- 15 was 14.9 days (as per table below).

Separation Financial Year (long)	Episode Of Care (D)	Hospital (D)	Length Of Stay—Days	Separations	ALOS
2014/15	Maintenance Care	FMC	4,607	262	17.58
2014/15	Maintenance Care	LMH	4,257	302	14.1
2014/15	Maintenance Care	Modbury	3,980	267	14.91
2014/15	Maintenance Care	Noarlunga	2,012	132	15.24
2014/15	Maintenance Care	RAH	6,544	417	15.69
2014/15	Maintenance Care	RGH	3,148	177	17.79
2014/15	Maintenance Care	TQEH	3,026	289	10.47
		Sum:	27,574	1,846	14.94

The average length of stay for mental health patients occupying acute mental health beds overnight in 2014-15 was 14.9 days with the lowest hospital average at 4.2 days (Women's and Children's Hospital).

In 2014-15, there were 28,332 country residents occupying overnight beds in metropolitan hospitals which equates to 17 per cent of the total number of episodes. This percentage remains consistent with 2013-14.

STUDENT TRANSPORT

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised of the following:

The figures quoted in Budget Paper 3 are developed by the Department of Treasury and Finance. An amount of \$13.4 million of the total of \$30 million relates to concessions provided to school students for public transport by the Department for Education and Child Development.

The remaining amount relates to other agencies outside of the Department for Education and Child Development.

Expenses by function data is derived from information submitted by government departments and agencies. This information is derived by DTF and is used to report to the ABS by sector by Treasury, and the information is subject to change.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised of the following:

All Ministerial appointments are as follows:

Title	Estimated full year employment costs 2014-15
Chief of Staff	\$188,841.71
Ministerial Adviser	\$129,468.08
Ministerial Adviser	\$129,468.08
Ministerial Adviser	\$156,313.60
Ministerial Adviser	\$129,468.08

Non Ministerial appointments are as follows:

Title	Estimated full year employment costs 2014-15
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$121,512.70
Ministerial Liaison Officer—Health and Child Development	\$110,626.46
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$107,453.01
Parliament and Cabinet Officer	\$93,542.60
Ministerial Liaison Officer, Non-Government Schools Secretariat	\$110,626.46
Project Officer	\$80,897.34
Administration & Correspondence Officer	\$82,748.42
Personal Assistant to the Minister	\$93,542.60
Business Support Officer	\$60,817.56
Personal Assistant	\$82,748.42
Research Officer	\$72,907.62
Senior Business Support Officer	\$70,830.39
Communications Officer	\$48,605.08
Office Manager	\$124,791.88
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$104,282.06
Business Support Officer	\$65,828.37
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$110,626.46

Note: The total employment cost is based on the salary rates and leave loading rates (if applicable) of the position incumbent, plus additional on-costs of 24.4 per cent of the salary for payroll tax, superannuation, WorkCover and long service leave.

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised of the following:

As at the last pay day in June 2015, there were 486 employees on paid leave from the Department for Education and Child Development.

The reasons employees were on paid leave are as follows:

- Annual Leave
- Country Incentive Team Leave
- Long Service Leave
- Overseas Exchange
- Paid Maternity Leave
- Skills and Experience Leave
- Special Leave

The number of employees on leave without pay from the department was 1,026. This represents less than 3 per cent of the total workforce. Employees on assignment/secondment to another SA Public Sector agency are not included.

Employees take leave without pay for a number of reasons such as parenting leave (accouchement leave)/child rearing without pay, sick leave without pay, special leave without pay, work exchange, travel, personal reasons etc.

ECARL

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised of the following:

The Families SA Call Centre manages phone calls 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The Child Abuse Report Line operates during business hours, whilst the Crisis Response Report Line operates after hours.

In 2014-15, the Families SA Call Centre received a total of 66,983 calls, with an average wait time of 11 minutes 57 seconds.

The Child Abuse Report Line received a total of 44,692 calls, with an average wait time of 20 minutes 16 seconds.

The Crisis Response Report Line received a total of 10,380 calls, with an average wait time of 16 minutes 12 seconds.

PUBLIC SERVICE ASSOCIATION EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised:

'Office holders in the PSA' is taken to mean 'Officers' under the Association Constitution and Rules, that is, the President, the Vice-Presidents, the Treasurer, the General Secretary and the Assistant General Secretary of the Association.

Under the Rules of the Association, officers must be elected from the membership of the association. Therefore these officials are either employed within the SA public sector and concurrently hold office within the PSA or have previously been employed by the SA public sector and some may hold a 'right of return' to public sector employment.

This is longstanding practice held over by many governments.

I am unable to disclose the nature of the substantive fallback positions due to provisions in the Information Privacy Provisions, but will provide information on which departments those positions are in.

Various office holders either are currently employed by or hold fallback positions in the following departments:

- Department of the Premier and Cabinet
- Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure
- Department for Communities and Social Inclusion

- Department for Correctional Services
- Department for Health and Ageing

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised:

When a chief executive or agency head formally declares an employee excess, the details of that employee are entered onto the 'Excess Employee Database'.

The Office for the Public Sector is responsible for the administration of the database, including the appropriate authorities to public sector agency representatives to access the database information. Public sector agencies are responsible for entering and ensuring the information is up-to-date for employees on the database.

The database records the number of public sector employees who have been formally declared excess by a chief executive or agency head.

As at 30 June 2015 there were 39 employees formally declared excess and recorded on the database.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to various members. (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change): As Acting Minister for Public Sector I have been advised of the following:

The South Australian Public Sector Workforce Information Summary Report provides information about the structure, size and composition of the SA Public Sector workforce. Information is published annually on the Office for the Public Sector website—www.publicsector.sa.gov.au. Workforce data for July 2015 will be published towards the end of the year.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

The project was delayed as the legislation required to progress the project was delayed. The supporting Regulations are currently being developed which will prescribe the information to be electronically transferred between agencies. Implementation is dependent on finalisation and making of the Regulations. From South Australia Police's perspective, there will also be a training component for police which is planned to occur during early 2016.

POLICE RECRUITMENT

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

SAPOL and TAFE SA have formalised a partnership to deliver a pre entry literacy and numeracy testing for potential Police and Protective Security Officers.

Previously, applicants were permitted to sit the entrance test once per year. The TAFE model now allows applicants to re-sit quarterly if necessary.

The TAFE concession price for this pre entry testing is \$125.50 (incl. GST).

TAFE SA currently conducts all testing in metropolitan Adelaide at two week intervals. The current testing process includes capacity for country applicants to attend Adelaide and complete all testing in a one week block.

This is in recognition of the financial impact and inconvenience to country applicants—if they undertake the block testing they are not required to pay the fee.

The TAFE component of testing for country applicants is currently facilitated by South Australia Police (SAPOL) at no cost to the applicant as part of a one week block when they attend to complete all testing. The viability of conducting testing at selected major regional TAFE centres will be assessed 12 months into the contract.

The TAFE test was introduced on 31 January 2015. As at 13 July 2015, 810 candidates have sat the test. Of those applicants, 263 passed and 547 failed.

During 2013, 731 applicants sat the aptitude testing using the previous (AIFP/SAFESELECT) methodology. Of those applicants, 599 passed and 132 failed. During 2014, 793 applicants sat the aptitude testing using the previous (AIFP/SAFESELECT) methodology. Of those applicants, 601 passed and 192 failed.

Since the commencement of the new (TAFE) process, there has been a noticeable improvement in the quality of formal applications to SAPOL; applicants' ability to progress to the next stages of the recruitment process; and successfully complete subsequent assessments.

Process efficiencies have also been achieved, with improvements in overall recruitment timeframes beginning to flow from the new system. Ongoing improvements in the timeframe from acceptance of an application to an employment decision are anticipated.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

In 2014-2015, the Department for Correctional Services delivered 4,874 hours of offence focused programs. This was above the target of 4,425 hours.

In addition, there was a total of 90 program commencements, which was above the target of 65. The program breakdown for 2014-15 was as follows:

- 2,148 program hours delivered for the Making Changes Programs with 48 program commencements;
- 142 program hours delivered for the Domestic Violence Treatment Programs, with eight program commencements; and
- 2,584 program hours for other criminogenic programs with 34 program commencements.

In 2015-16, the Department for Correctional Services is aiming to deliver 5,200 hours of offence focused program hours, with a total of 87 program commencements. The projection breakdown for 2015-16 is:

- 2,135 program hours for the Making Changes Programs;
- 300 program hours for Domestic Violence treatment programs; and
- 2,765 program hours for other criminogenic programs.

In 2015-16, the Making Changes Program and the business rules associated with this program are being reviewed. Hence, the projected program delivery hours may change.

ROAD SAFETY

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

South Australia Police (SAPOL) financial transactions are classified as either administered funds or controlled funds.

The Road Safety Program (Program 3) is within SAPOL's controlled funds with an expenditure budget for 2015-16 of \$106m. This covers expenditure that includes the Traffic Support Branch and approximately 10 per cent of the Metropolitan Operations Service and State Operation Service activities which are allocated to this program. SAPOL does not cost or budget at an activity level.

SAPOL receives funds from the Community Road Safety Fund. These are reflected as intra government transfers and form part of SAPOL's overall income budget. In 2015-16 the budget is \$39.3 million.

Police services undertaken within the Road Safety Program include:

- Maintenance and operation of mobile/red light cameras;
- Driver drug and random breath testing;
- Traffic enforcement initiatives;
- Major crash investigations;
- Heavy vehicle legislation enforcement;
- Regulation of road use;
- Vehicle collision prevention;
- Driver education;

- Highway Patrols;
- Processing of infringement notices; and
- Rural road safety enforcement saturation campaign.

ROAD SAFETY CAMERAS

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

This budget line refers to final payments to the safety camera supplier for four safety cameras installed at school pedestrian crossings during 2014-15. Funding was from the Motor Accident Commission Road Safety Fund.

The sites are:

- Antonio Catholic School, Morphett Vale;
- St Agnes Primary School, St Agnes;
- Hamilton Secondary College, Mitchell Park; and
- Norwood Morialta High School—Middle Campus, Rostrevor.

The crash analysis utilised in identifying these four sites for installation was the five year crash data from 2008 to 2012. This analysis identified these four sites as recording eight crashes in total including one fatality, three minor injury and four property damage crashes. The speed limit at these sites is 60 km/h.

There are also two sites planned for installation during 2015-16 and the locations are yet to be finalised. It is expected that final project planning, service identification and civil construction will commence later in 2015. These two sites will be highlighted on the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure's safety camera information web page once final identification is complete.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

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

Between 30 June 2014 and 30 June 2015 positions with a total employment cost of \$100,000 or more:

Minister for Disabilities

(a) Abolished:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	Director, Funds Management	\$163,795
Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	Director, Specialist Services & Clinical Governance*	Nil

(*): This position was vacant for the duration of the 2014-15 financial year therefore no cost was incurred.

(b) Created: Nil

Minister for Police

(a) Abolished: Nil

(b) Created: Nil

Minister for Correctional Services

(a) Abolished:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department for Correctional Services	Executive Director, Human Resources	\$206,927

(b) Created:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department for Correctional Services	Project Director, Emergency Services Reform Office (Temporary 12 month contract)	\$180,000

Minister for Emergency Services

- (a) Abolished: Nil
(b) Created: Nil

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised of the following:

Minister for Disabilities

All Ministerial appointments are as follows:

Position	Total Employment Cost
Chief of Staff	\$164,103.00
Ministerial Adviser	\$117,898.80
Ministerial Adviser	\$117,898.80
Ministerial Adviser	\$117,898.80

Non Ministerial appointments are as follows:

Position	Total Employment Cost
Office Manager	\$110,550.96
Personal Assistant to the Minister	\$84,000.15
Parliament and Cabinet Officer	\$94,097.25
Correspondence Officer	\$58,920.03
Correspondence Officer	\$56,589.39
Senior Officer	\$75,277.80
Senior Administration Officer	\$56,458.35
Administration Officer	\$56,589.39
Correspondence Officer	\$61,251.84
Trainee	\$33,398.50
Ministerial Liaison Officer – DCS	\$103,280.58
Ministerial Liaison Officer – SAFECOM	\$116,603.37
Ministerial Liaison Officer – DPTI	\$100,295.91
Ministerial Liaison Officer – SAPOL	\$97,313.58
Ministerial Liaison Officer – DCSI	\$103,280.58

AGED-CARE FUNDING

In reply to **Ms REDMOND (Heysen)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised:

The funding received from the Commonwealth Department of Social Services for the operation of the Aged Care Assessment Program in South Australia in 2014-15 was \$9,602,000. This was a 6.8 per cent increase on funding received in 2013-14.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Ms REDMOND (Heysen)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised of the following:

Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion

Minister for Social Housing

Minister for Multicultural Affairs

Minister for Ageing

Minister for Youth

Minister for Volunteers

The title and total employment cost (TEC), which includes salary and on-costs, of individual staff members in my office as at 30 June 2015, including Ministerial and Non-Ministerial appointments is:

TITLE	TEC
Chief of Staff	\$170,725
Ministerial Adviser	\$122,656
Ministerial Adviser	\$122,656
Project Officer – Southern Suburbs	\$120,671 (*)
Senior Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$116,268
Office Manager	\$107,187
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$100,143
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$100,143
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$97,195
Parliamentary and Cabinet Officer	\$94,014
Personal Assistant to the Minister	\$94,014
Personal Assistant to Chief of Staff	\$78,891
Senior Business Support Officer	\$77,170
Business Support Officer—Receptionist	\$66,043
Business Support Officer	\$61,379
Administration Officer	\$56,707
Administration Officer (0.4 FTE)	\$24,552'

(*)This position commenced during 2014-15. However, for comparative purposes the full year equivalent is shown.