

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Thursday, 10 December 2015**

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 14:01 and read prayers.

*Petitions***REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL**

Mr DULUK (Davenport): Presented a petition signed by 590 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to close the Repatriation General Hospital and recognise this hospital as the spiritual home and vital lifeline for veterans of South Australia and the South Australian community.

LEIGH CREEK

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart): Presented a petition signed by 54 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to provide a firm commitment to the long-term future of Leigh Creek.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: The mention of the member for Stuart reminds me that a distinguished former Speaker, the Hon. Graham McDonald Gunn, is with us, who 24 years ago pioneered the excellent renovation of the opposition offices as one of his first acts as Speaker.

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—

Charles Sturt, City of Annual Report 2014-15
Karoonda East Murray District Council Annual Report 2014-15
Mount Gambier, City of Annual Report 2014-15
Naracoorte Lucindale Council Annual Report 2014-15
Port Adelaide Enfield, City of Annual Report 2014-15
Tea Tree Gully, City of Annual Report 2014-15
Walkerville, Town of Annual Report 2014-15

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. J.R. Rau) on behalf of the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Mutual Recognition (South Australia)—Controlled Substances—Temporary
Exemption—MDMB-CHMICA
Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (South Australia)—Temporary Exemption—
MDMB-CHMICA

By the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Controlled Substances—Controlled Drugs, Precursors and Plants

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

South Australian Forestry Corporation Charter

Ministerial Statement

PINERY BUSHFIRES

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:05): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: As with all major fires threatening our schools and preschools, the Department for Education and Child Development has undertaken a preliminary review of events as they unfolded during the Pinery fire on 25 November 2015. A full review and debrief will be undertaken in term 1, 2016.

This post-incident review looked at actions taken by schools and preschools during the fire, as well as the effectiveness of existing policies and procedures to identify any immediate improvements that can be made. First, I am pleased to report that there were no injuries to our students or staff, and damage was limited to minor aesthetic repairs and smoke-related cleaning of school areas. However, many of our staff and students were directly affected by damage to their homes and properties and through the loss of crops and livestock.

Support staff have been made available to affected schools and preschools to provide counselling and other support as required. I am advised that early indications from the review show that DECD policies and procedures regarding bushfire management and response were followed. The department is taking a further detailed look at the response by Wasleys Primary School, with the intention of identifying systems gaps and further areas for improvement.

The department and its staff take their duty of care requirements very seriously, and every effort will be made to learn from any errors made during the Pinery fire emergency. This will include consideration of the specific training needs of DECD staff in emergency management. A number of initial immediate areas for development have been identified that will assist the department and sites to respond to any future live emergency incidents.

I would like to highlight that none of the schools and preschools operating on the day of the fire were categorised as being a high bushfire risk, so they do not traditionally have bushfire-specific processes in place and utilise their emergency procedures. Areas for development include introducing additional communication methods; for example, electronic SMS warnings for when a large number of sites need to be contacted. The department is also considering satellite telephone services for our highest risk sites to counter public communication infrastructure issues that occurred during the Pinery fire.

The department will also consider enforced closures of schools in affected areas after a bushfire has started in the local area or a major emergency has occurred, based on advice from the local education director, school principal or preschool director. This has traditionally been decided centrally. However, the absence of reliable communications with site leaders and uncertainty around safety and accessibility of the area made this difficult during the Pinery fire.

The department has robust bushfire response processes for its high-risk schools, but the Pinery bushfire has illustrated the potential for any regional school or preschool to be at risk. The annual end of fire-danger season review will reconsider system responses for all our schools to ensure that any areas of improvement are implemented for future seasons.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT POLICY

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:08): I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: On 26 June 2014, the former minister for education and child development announced that school bus services in regional areas would be reviewed. This resulted in a review of the school transport policy undertaken by the Department for Education and Child Development. The review explored where we can improve our existing bus services, by considering what is working, and examined the possibility of reconfiguring existing resources to deliver a more efficient and equitable transport service to as many children and students in rural areas as possible within existing resources.

An extensive consultation process was undertaken with key stakeholder groups and representatives, all of whom have provided valuable contributions to the review. The department's review team has since considered results from the survey, which captured over 600 participants, and has taken into account the various stakeholder views from the structured consultation process. The team has also made a series of interstate comparisons with South Australia's school transport policy and, importantly, examined the current policy's parameters. I am satisfied with the thoroughness of this review and the due consideration that has been given to ensure that any opportunities for improvement have been identified.

The review indicates that our existing system is working well and that the current school transport policy continues to meet our aim of providing a fair and efficient free school transport service. The department has examined the potential to make improvements to services within the scope of existing resources. It determined that the changes to the current system can only be achieved with significant additional funding or the introduction of a charge for services. Any extension of existing school bus routes is cost prohibitive, so the current arrangement will remain with eligible non-government students continuing to receive free transport or transport assistance to their nearest government school.

Non-government school students will continue to be dropped off at their school where a DECD provided bus goes directly past incurring no additional travel. The policy on travel assistance provided to a limited number of special interest schools requires further review in consultation with the affected schools and students. I acknowledge the report has been delayed as a result of my desire to examine if DECD is the appropriate organisation to manage these services.

Opportunities may exist for an integration of services to benefit rural communities and achieve efficiencies for government and local government by combining resources and assets. Accordingly, my department will work together with the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure to determine what mechanisms could be used to facilitate the regional community use of buses including the DECD fleet. Key to this proposal will be active involvement of local government. The school transport policy review is available on the department's website.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:11): I bring up the 538th report of the committee, entitled Inlet Regulating Structures on Margaret Dowling Creek and Eckert Creek.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Acting Premier. What is the government's response to South Australia's underemployment ratio reported in today's labour force statistics for the first time?

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) (14:12): There is actually some quite encouraging news in these figures. The figures indicate that there has been a very positive change in the labour market situation here in South Australia, a reduction of 0.3 of 1 per cent in the figure, and that obviously means that this figure compared to that of the last reporting period is better than the last one.

Let's be very clear about this. I think the opposition are very keen to sort of make a lot about figures when they are not going in the right direction and make light of them when they are. I think what we should be doing is to be as informative as we can for the people of South Australia, which is to say, 'We are engaged in a period of change in the South Australian economy, which is involving some economic—'

Mr Williams interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, protect me from the member for Kavel as well if you can, Mr Speaker, because he is making things difficult; and the member for Morialta as well, sir.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr GARDNER: It was a very specific question in relation to the underemployment rate. The minister has touched briefly on unemployment, has not yet got to underemployment, and is not answering the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: Yes, he is circling the substance of the question.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am, Mr Speaker, because the important thing to note is that the government has always said that we have got a difficult period ahead of us; a difficult period in which we will all have to work very hard together, that is, government and industry, and private employers, and we would hope the opposition, to make sure that we see as much employment opportunity as possible created in South Australia.

That is part of the reason that we are driving forward with major economic reforms. That's part of the reason that the government was so keen—and, I acknowledge, with the support of the Leader of the Opposition; I acknowledge that—to get through the new return-to-work scheme, which if it is not butchered by other amendments which are floating about the place will deliver real business savings year on end so that they can employ more people and have greater opportunities.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister is referring to a bill before the parliament.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I'm not, Mr Speaker; I was referring to the return to work bill, but I have been reminded that there's an opportunity right now for the other place to pass a piece of legislation—

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier did refer to 'butchering' the return to work bill, which to my mind refers to a bill currently before another place.

Mr Gardner: In this house, sir.

The SPEAKER: Oh, it's before this house, is it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I see; yes.

The SPEAKER: So I call the Deputy Premier to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I'm sorry, I misunderstood the objection. I thought that the member for Bragg was talking about the butchering presently going on to the planning legislation, which was—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: But, anyway, can I—

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will not provoke the opposition—

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Very well; I'm sorry, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: —and of course that means that I upheld the member for Bragg's point of order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Very well; I understand that. The overall trend at the moment is something that we obviously have to keep our eye on. As somebody once famously said: a swallow does not a summer make. The fact that we have one encouraging set of numbers in this particular reporting period is very good, but the government is not saying just because there has been a modest improvement at this point in time, better than any other state, I believe, that we are resting on our laurels. We think we need to keep working on this, and we are looking to see an overall improvement. There's never been any doubt about this, Mr Speaker, we have got a fair degree of hard work ahead of us.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

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

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Supplementary, sir: can the government advise the house what the total number of South Australians who are currently underemployed is?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Point of order: this is information that's freely available. The member for Schubert is always happy to call a point of order if something has been released. It's on the internet, they can google it.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Supplementary, sir: is the Deputy Premier aware of how many people are underemployed in South Australia?

Mr Pengilly: Ring Bernie.

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is warned. 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) (14:17): Look, I'm not here as the interpreter of the statistical—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I can do no better or worse than to refer the honourable member and others to the statistics which have been published. I'm not here to provide a commentary on individual elements of them. All I can say is what I said before. We would like to see a higher participation rate, and we are actually seeing in these figures a higher participation rate. We would like to see people who are working longer hours; but, of course, whether people are working longer or shorter hours depends on whether or not the businesses for which they work are being given a lot of work to do or not as much work as they would like.

We're not running away from the fact that there are businesses in South Australia, particularly those that have had some association with the automotive industry and are looking at that period of difficulty that lies ahead with the transition to Holden's phasing their production here in South Australia out of existence. Of course, there are areas in the economy where there is underemployment. But equally and interestingly enough, today two of my ministerial colleagues and I, the Minister for Industry and Trade and the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, had a meeting with a series of employers who are people who are in the cast metals and metals fabricating engineering sort of space in the small to medium-sized firms. They are saying there are some difficulties they are facing, due to the mining industry downturn, amongst other things.

They are also acknowledging, interestingly enough, that there are some opportunities. It was very interesting to have a chat to them about the potential for them to take advantage of some of the programs that the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and Mr Nightingale are working on in

terms of increasing local participation in industry employment opportunities. There are efforts going on all over the place to make sure we get more people in jobs and more people working longer hours.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Acting Premier. What is the government's plan to address underemployment for the 95,000 South Australians who have as little as one hour's employment per week?

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) (14:20): It is a good point, and I was starting to warm up to it in my answer to the last question. There is certainly a situation where we would like to see people who are working either less shift work than they used to work, less overtime than they used to work or less regular hours than they used to work, getting more work, obviously.

Mr Marshall: We are going backwards: 11,000 more last month than the month before.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That is a function of many factors, including how many people are actually in the jobs market. If you actually have a certain number of hours to be worked and you have x number of people to work those hours, you divide x into those number of hours and you get a number. If you make x , $2x$ or $x+6,000$, which is what we have done, and you do not change the number of hours to be worked, then obviously mathematically you have the same number of hours spread across more people, which means that some people are working less hours.

We are not suggesting that there is not room for improvement in the economy. That has never been the government's position. The government has said, and I think the Premier has said, repeatedly we have a lot of work to do, and when I say 'we' I mean the government, I mean employers, I mean the opposition. We would love the opposition to get behind—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —planning reform, for example, so that we can actually cut red tape and enable people to invest in construction in South Australia. We would love that to happen. We are sitting here now in fact this afternoon waiting for that to happen so that we can break for Christmas with that all squared away. We are very keen indeed on working cooperatively with industry, and indeed the opposition, to try to get improvements in the job environment here, but we have never, ever suggested that we do not have some work to do. We do, and we accept that. The jobs plans that have been put out by the government, the plans for the north, all of the work—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The one thing about these questions is, when we have a good result in the labour market, we get questions like this. When we have another blip in the other direction, I think it was—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: he is imputing improper motive on the questioner, now challenging what we should be asking about.

The SPEAKER: I don't think it is imputing improper motive.

Ms Chapman: They're telling us what we should be asking.

The SPEAKER: It is not a point of order I am inclined to uphold. In that gap, I call to order the leader, the deputy leader, the members for Mitchell, Morialta, Stuart, Hartley, Davenport and Kavel, and I am appalled to see that the disorder was so intense that the member for Flinders gets called to order. I warn the member for Morialta and the deputy leader and I warn for the second and final time the member for Morialta. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am reminded, actually, of an adage which is attributed to Gore Vidal, who apparently said in one of his novels that, every time a friend of his succeeds, a little piece of him dies. That really is the way in which these basically good figures are being treated by the opposition. There are constructive things they can do. We have—

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will not talk about the opposition. They have not been in government for years. They cannot possibly be germane to the question of underemployment. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thank you, Mr Speaker, for that guidance and, were it not for the fact that their members in the upper house are frustrating the passage of important legislation, I would totally agree with that point.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Given that the minister first knew of the problems with the cable on the Seaford line back in June 2014, why has it taken him nearly 19 months to do something about it?

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) (14:25): Certainly, there has been a problem—in fact, a developing problem—with the catenary wire on the Seaford line since the first separation of the catenary wire occurred in the middle of last year. I think we last ventilated this issue in here resulting from some questions from the member for Mitchell, who has also displayed a keen interest in this. As I explained at the time, it was thought, after the first occurrence in the middle of last year, that it was an isolated incident. There was an inspection done at the time and there seemed to be a parting of the cable which seemed to be (as I was advised at the time and I think I advised the house) a result of how the cable was installed, or related to the join of the cable.

Even more concerningly, we have had a repeat of the problem, which occurred in May of this year, obviously, to the deep frustration of the government, putting it very mildly, let alone to commuters, as well as the lead contractor, a company called Laing O'Rourke. There was concern about why this had happened again and further investigations occurred.

The advice I had at that time (and I think, looking back, what I advised the house in early June this year) was it was thought that the problem could be resolved with some targeted rectification—some targeted replacement of some parts of the wire related to those areas which had failed. In the meantime, there had been works on an ongoing basis, particularly after the last service and before the commencement of the first service the next day, to make sure that the line was serviceable and safe for everyone in the corridor. There had been strengthening and bonding, and similar sorts of efforts, to make sure that anything that might have been a concern and might have impacted on the operation of that cable was attended to so the train line could operate, and operate safely.

Since that second incident in May of this year, there have been much further efforts by both the lead contractor, who is responsible to the government for the supply and installation of this wire; and, in the course of those investigations in the months following that second incident (the months we have just had preceding), I am now advised that the problem is far deeper and more extensive.

The problem is not about the installation of the wire or, indeed, just joins in the wire, which is what I was advised previously and what I advised the chamber. The issue is with the manufacture of the wire itself. The advice that I have now is that the supplier of the wire, a company called Olex Australia, supplied that wire from their manufacturing facility in Victoria for this project. They have supplied the project with a faulty batch of wire.

Despite all of the investigations and analysis by both the lead contractor, Laing O'Rourke, and also the department, it is now deemed necessary that all of that wire that has been supplied by Olex Australia needs to be replaced. That is very extensive. We are talking about some 35 kilometres of wire. It is far more extensive than what we thought when either of those two instances occurred that I described earlier.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, the leader.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Can the minister confirm that there have only been two failures of that cable: May last year and June this year?

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) (14:29): Certainly I am aware of two breaks or partings of that cable which has interrupted services and which has caused all of this work and all of this analysis to take place. I am not aware that there have been further similar events to that but, of course, in the Leader of the Opposition's question he talks about failure of the wire. What I am now advised and what I am now advising the house is that there seems to have been a failure in the manufacturing of this wire which has affected all of those lengths that have been supplied to the government, to the extent where both the lead contractor and the government have reached the view that all of those wires, all of that batch that was supplied for the Seaford electrification project, needs to be replaced from that manufacturer, Olex Australia.

That is why now we are faced with the situation where we are having to interrupt rail services in a way in which we didn't envisage when we were traversing this area back in early June. Certainly, I made it clear that the government would not be having to pay for any rectification works that occurred. I also said at the time it was our expectation, based on advice, that we would be able to conduct whatever rectification works were required between those two times—between that last service, which is approximately midnight, and the first service the next morning, which is approximately 5 or 6am.

Given that the problem is far more extensive—it is not just about replacing sections of wire; it is about replacing whole lengths of this wire to the extent where we are replacing, I am advised, approximately 40 per cent of the wire which was supplied—the catenary wire—for this project. We are talking about replacing 35 kilometres of wire. This is not something which can be replaced—

Mr Goldsworthy: Thirty-five kilometres.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —outside of operational hours. This is something where the workers need full and unfettered access to the rail corridor on an ongoing basis. That is why, yes, albeit it is at that time of year when it is a lower patronage period—we don't have schoolchildren using the service and we have a lower proportion of workers and students commuting to and from the city—nonetheless, it is an incredible inconvenience to all of those people who rely on this service during that time of year that they will not be able to access that service.

At the very least, we are also requiring that lead contractor, rather than just replacing the wire that has been deemed necessary to replace, we are also requiring them, at their cost and at no cost to the government, to replace the train services with substitute bus services, tailored as best as possible to try to provide certainly not the same level of service, but a level of service where there are limited-stop express bus services, for example, as well as funding the communication campaign necessary to make sure we can get the message out to people who are going to be affected by this interruption in service.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, the leader.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Is there any potential safety hazard for commuters or those adjacent to the lines if there is a further break?

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) (14:33): I thank the leader for his question and I think it is an eminently reasonable concern. Certainly, for all of the people who are involved in operating our rail corridors, the first and foremost consideration they have is exactly what the opposition leader refers to, and that is safety—safety during the operating of that rail corridor and safety of the corridor as a whole, whether it is seeing a train service run up and down there or not.

I guess there are two particular elements that I can focus on: one is the safety of the operation of the line as it is today and safety as the corridor will be as it is being worked upon for these rectification works. I am advised that all steps are taken and have been taken to ensure that the corridor is safe. Is there a safety issue if one of these wires falls down? Conceivably, it would be a similar situation to a powerline falling down on a road corridor.

Is there risk? Yes, there is risk, and that risk, from the government's perspective, is unacceptable to the extent that it needs to be mitigated. That is why, rather than rectifying certain sections of the wire which were, at an earlier stage, thought to be the problem, the contractor and the government have jointly reached a decision that the full extent of all the cable that was supplied by this manufacturer from Victoria, Olex Australia, all the wire it supplied to this project, is to be completely replaced to minimise that risk that the leader alludes to in his question, the risk to safety from this recurring.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): A supplementary question: will the provider of the cable be meeting the costs of providing the substitute transport that the minister outlined to the house today?

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) (14:35): I outlined to the house earlier that the rectification works, the substitute transport services, the communications required to get the message out about what is going on, why, and the availability of the substitute transport services, will not be the responsibility of government. Government will not be meeting those costs. That is the first point.

As to who does meet those costs, that is a matter for the major contractor with whom the government has contracted to provide these works. Should they seek to recover those costs from the supplier, that is a matter for them.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): A supplementary, sir: the minister outlined to the house that the cable was provided by Olex out of Victoria. Can he confirm that that cable was indeed manufactured in Victoria?

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) (14:36): That is certainly the advice that has been given to me, that it was indeed manufactured in Victoria.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): A further supplementary, sir: has the minister considered removing the electric trains from this line pending the resolution of the cable issue?

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) (14:36): There are two points to make there. To hark back to something I said just a few moments ago about ensuring that the operations of the trains on the Seaford line are currently safe, I am assured that they are. I am assured, both from the lead contractor's perspective and also the department's perspective, that they have taken all steps to minimise the risk to safety.

The leader asked a specific question, I think, about removing train services from the Seaford line while this problem was being fixed. All services are being removed from the entire line for a period of time while these rectification works are occurring, which is specifically what the Leader of the Opposition raised in his question. Then, of course, for a three-week period—off the top of my head I think it is from 4 to 25 January—for approximately one half of the line, which is where the rectification works will be concentrated at that period in time, trains will be removed from service while those rectification works are underway.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister advise the house how many commuters will be affected by the decision to shut down the Seaford and Belair lines?

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) (14:38): I do not have that figure with me. If we were attempting to answer that question we would try to estimate what level of patronage there is at that time of the year, in January, bearing in mind that there are virtually no school students using the trains at that time, there are far fewer university students using the trains at that time, and there are fewer workers using that train corridor at that time. I would have to come back to the member for Mitchell with some estimate, if possible.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:39): A supplementary, sir: given the remediation work that is being done, can the minister guarantee that the work will be done in the time frame that he has outlined today?

The SPEAKER: That is hardly a supplementary question; it does not arise from the minister's answer. Be that as it may, let us just make it a new question.

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) (14:39): It is a good question from the member for Mitchell. We obviously want to make sure that we are minimising the period that the service is not available, and that of course leads to the consideration: do they have sufficient time to be able to conduct the works? I have asked the department that question. They assure me that they have developed a schedule which will enable them to conduct the works and have them complete by the end of 25 January.

They have scheduled the works to ensure that we can run a train service for New Year's Eve because it is incredibly busy in the city with all of the community activities as well as the cricket and so on that is on. They assure me that, within that work schedule that they have developed, they have a significant contingency so that if there are unanticipated amounts of inclement or otherwise preventative weather, for example, they have enough capacity within that work program that we have publicly announced to still be able to deliver the rectification works in the time frame that we have outlined.

O-BAHN TUNNEL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house whether it will be necessary to delay the O-Bahn City Access Project to enable Australian steel to be used in the construction and, if so, what is the estimated delay? The project design specifications, as published, include the use of sheet piles and, at present, these are not fabricated in Australia and would need to be imported from China or Europe.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:41): Thank you to the member for Kavel whose interjections are always welcome. We have made it absolutely clear that we will continue to source steel from Australian and, of course, South Australian suppliers. We will seek to have that steel fabricated in South Australia where possible. The deputy leader is correct. There are elements of the O-Bahn project, as there have been elements with other infrastructure projects, where certain either materials or fabrication techniques simply are not provided by participants within the South Australian economy and we will have to look elsewhere for them.

O-BAHN TUNNEL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): A supplementary: has the minister referred this project, which includes 14,000 tonnes of steel, to the government's new steel task force chaired by Mr Bruce Carter?

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) (14:42): I would have to check to see what the task force has been contemplating. I am not a member of it, so it is a bit hard for me to comment directly on that. But we certainly knew with the construction technique that we were pursuing on the O-Bahn project we had several key targets. One was making sure we had a fit-for-purpose piece of infrastructure, we were maximising the number of local jobs and, where possible, local content, as well as making sure it could be constructed in a time frame which was as swift as possible, but in particular scheduled in a way which would minimise the impact on several different areas within the project site.

For example, in the road space, making sure that we could get out of the road space as quickly as possible so that we are not impacting traffic on Hackney Road and Dequetteville Terrace, in particular, and also at the intersection of Botanic Road and Hackney Road, as well as trying to schedule the projects as far as possible outside of the festival season and perhaps what we would also refer to as Mad March, given that The Garden of Unearthly Delights uses Rundle Park quite extensively. Its name eludes me but there is also another one over the other side in Rymill Park.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Gluttony.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Gluttony. There we go. I don't get out enough. The deputy leader I think raised delays in her questioning. I certainly have not been presented with any advice that we anticipate any delays because of the way in which we are designing the project or procuring the materials.

O-BAHN TUNNEL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): A further supplementary: if there was an opportunity for Australian steel to be used in this project, will the minister consider delaying the project to enable that to be accommodated?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:44): I think I mentioned earlier that the understanding we have within government and the department—and I am not quite sure how the deputy leader has arrived at her understanding—is that the sheet piling, which is required for the O-Bahn project, is not fabricated or manufactured, or whatever the other applicable term might be, in South Australia.

Ms Chapman: Australia.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What I said was that it is not done here in South Australia. Given that the government's efforts have been focused on maximising local participation, certainly by businesses but also particularly by workers, I am not quite sure whether it would be in the public's interests for us to delay a project in order to deliver an economic benefit to an adjacent state to the detriment of people who use our road network and our public transport system.

O-BAHN TUNNEL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): A further supplementary: given the importance of the task force and securing locally procured product, as indicated by the minister, is he aware that so far the task force only has the chairman and it has not met?

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) (14:45): There are two things: not being the minister responsible for it, nor sitting on it—no.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

O-BAHN TUNNEL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): I have a further question for the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the government referred the O-Bahn project, and in particular the design to include sheet steel as an alternative to other conventional products, to the Office of the Industry Advocate and, if so, has Mr Nightingale approved that process?

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) (14:46): My understanding is that with all of the infrastructure projects which the government is funding we have a close working relationship with Mr Nightingale and the office that he leads. As for the particular details about that level of involvement with the O-Bahn project, I am happy to come back to the deputy leader.

ILLICIT DRUGS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Police. Does the minister agree with the member for Fisher that:

...an overbearing police presence and zero-tolerance policies are forcing partygoers to take unnecessary risks, such as overloading on drugs...

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for his question. The issue of drugs, whether it is drugs at an event or drugs in the community, does require a whole range of strategies to address. No single strategy can actually eliminate it. You may recall recently that the Prime Minister announced \$600 million to deal with the issue of ice, and that is actually focused on harm minimisation.

Having said that, even though that is an important focus, we still take a lot of compliance activity within the police to make sure that we address the issue. I do not think anything the member for Fisher has said contradicts the principle I have just—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: As I said at the outset, any issue dealing with drugs requires a range of strategies and some will require compliance, like police activity. Police will continue to have a presence. Secondly, there will be other programs as well to support it. What I have said is that I do not believe that we have an over presence by police. I think the police presence was appropriate.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Schubert and I warn the member for Hartley and the member for Morialta.

ILLICIT DRUGS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:48): Supplementary: given that since 1998's Tough on Drugs strategy there has been a bipartisan approach that has included rehabilitation, education and policing measures to take place, does the government still believe that policing music festivals, including with drug sniffer dogs, is appropriate or is the government taking the member for Fisher's prescribed policy?

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): The member for Fisher, in what I thought was a very well put together article, expressed her views about how complex and how concerning—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This is a serious topic. I would like people to understand that the member for Fisher was trying to actually have a conversation with the people of South Australia through the opportunity presented to her by the newspaper of writing an article in which she was saying, not that we should be soft on drugs—that is not what she said—and not that we should have

people going around testing pills at venues to see whether the pills were safe so that the kids could be given pills. In fact, if I remember—because I read that article with a bit of interest, actually—I thought to myself, she is very clear that she is not advocating a soft on pills or soft on drugs attitude.

If people were to read the member for Fisher's contribution and read it carefully and consider what she is saying, what she's actually saying is, 'This is a very complex problem.' I think, quite surprisingly, what she is saying and what the member for Morialta asked in his question are very much in the same space: it is a multifaceted problem. It does involve health issues; it does involve education issues; it does involve policing issues.

Mr Marshall: Do you have to wind back the police?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Nobody is suggesting winding back the police.

Mr Marshall: Except in the article.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'm sorry—I read the article and I did not understand the member for Fisher to be saying that we should not be policing these things and we should be turning a blind eye to people supplying drugs to young people.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'm saying read the article as a whole, and I took the article as a whole as being supportive of the notion that the government is not an apologist for people who peddle drugs to young people. The government is not out there saying, 'We're abandoning all sense of policing these venues and we're just going to have people out there testing your pills to make sure they're okay.' The member for Fisher said nothing of the sort.

ILLICIT DRUGS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:51): Supplementary: given that the member for Fisher's comments quite separately from her article in *The Advertiser* and on radio yesterday specifically referred to an overbearing police presence and the zero tolerance policies being directly linked to people preloading—

The SPEAKER: Could we come to a question?

Mr GARDNER: Does the minister agree with the member for Fisher that the police presence is 'overbearing'?

Mr Pengilly: That's what she said.

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

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) (14:51): That is an interesting question because, if one is to answer that question in the way I assume one is intended to answer the question—which I don't intend to do—one would actually be caught up in the proposition that, because we want to stop people preloading, we don't police the events.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I know the member for Fisher. I read the member for Fisher's article. I am absolutely confident that she was not telling everybody, 'Don't have police there because then people won't preload.' She certainly didn't say that, and that is not the government's position. I can say that the government's position is very clear.

The government's position is that we don't encourage people to take these experimental drugs at all, full stop. In fact, not only is it bad to take drugs because they are illegal and you are breaking the law but the people who make these things are backyard amateur chemists who don't actually care what the consequences are to the people who buy these things.

These drugs have not even been tested on rats, let alone on people. These drugs have not even been tested on rats, and the individuals who are prepared to make this stuff without any regard to what is in it and then take it to venues and sell it to young people—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —are beneath contempt. The fact that young people die because these people are selling this rubbish to them is appalling—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The minister is debating the question which was very straightforward: does he agree that the current police policy—

The SPEAKER: That is an entirely bogus point of order, wasting the house's time, interrupting the opposition's strategy. The Deputy Premier was asked whether he agreed with the member for Fisher and he is entirely within scope, so I warn the member for Stuart. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The former member for Stuart wouldn't have behaved like that. As I was saying, so the government—just so it is really clear—the government does not encourage people to take this rubbish at all—No. 1. No. 2: the government does encourage anybody who knows about people who are manufacturing or selling these things, to pick up the phone, ring Crime Stoppers, and get the police to go out and shut these people down.

Mr Whetstone: What about the imports?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That is a legitimate question and I will come to that in a moment if I am given more time. The government also—

Mr Marshall: Bring back Jay!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He'll be back, don't worry. He'll be back. He's like Arnie; he'll be back.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel will stop gesturing wildly.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He intimidates me, sir. As I was saying—

Ms Vlahos interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —we do not have the view as a government that we should relax policing of these events at all. That is not going to happen—

Mr Marshall: Tell the member for Fisher.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and the member for Fisher does not want it to happen because the member for Fisher is just as concerned as the rest of us about young people being able to enjoy these events in safety. That is what she is concerned about. So there is no difference of opinion and I have tried to articulate as best as I can what the government position is. But, I did hear somebody, possibly somebody from the Riverland, asking a question about—

The SPEAKER: Alas, the Deputy Premier's time has expired. The deputy leader.

COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM PROGRAM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Police. What action has the South Australian government taken in its role delivering the countering violent extremism program designed to counter the threat of radicalisation of young South Australians?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for her question.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease his interminable commentary and I warn him for the second and final time.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: To the extent that that question relates to my portfolio—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Well, not entirely, it doesn't. It covers other portfolios as well but to the extent that it is covered by my portfolio, I am advised by the commissioner that the commissioner meets regularly with the Islamic Society and other groups to ensure that they have a full understanding of what is happening on the ground but also to build good relationships between the government and the community to ensure that intelligence can be gathered and brought to the attention of the police and other agencies, and it is done so. The advice I get is that relationships are very strong, they are very good and, as a result of that, they are confident that they can address matters as they come up.

COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM PROGRAM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): Apart from meetings between the commissioner and the Islamic Society, why has there been no program pursuing this project in South Australia, unlike every other state in Australia?

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader has asked her question; the minister.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:58): I thank the deputy leader for her question. The commonwealth government has recently partnered with the state government and we are providing—

Ms Chapman: It was 2014. That is not recent. That is why I am asking why it hasn't been done.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Recent funding has been provided by the commonwealth government and the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion will have a responsible person in regard to our campaign in engaging against encountering violent extremism. This is not the first time, obviously, we have engaged with the federal government, and I can tell you that the Minister for Multicultural Affairs has been here, I think, at least twice to engage in conversations through the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission with our Muslim community to talk about the concerns and to talk about how we can work together. One of the key things that we will be doing is pulling in different agencies as to how we can identify and prevent extremist issues here in South Australia.

COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM PROGRAM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): Supplementary for the Minister for Social Inclusion: given the answer of the minister and the meetings that she has had, how much money has been allocated in her portfolio for the Living Safe Together program which is operating in every other state?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:59): I'll have to take that on notice. What I can tell you is that we have \$135,000 per annum for two years in this new program.

COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM PROGRAM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): Further supplementary to the Minister for Social Inclusion: minister, given the conversations that you've been having, is there any evidence of radicalisation of students in South Australia's education system, given that you're undertaking responsibility for this program, and what steps has the South Australian government taken to deal with that?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:00): Obviously, my engagement has been focused on those multicultural groups, and we continue to work with those groups to understand the motivation. From my other explanations and briefings, South Australia is considered a lower risk state in this area. As we know, we've recently tripled the budget in multicultural affairs, and we've used some of that money to engage widely across the Muslim community.

There are 60 different ethnic groups that form the Muslim community here in South Australia. Many have been here for generations and some are new arrivals. So, part of our valuing cultural diversity, which we consider we have a very bipartisanship view on, we continue to do that. While we will have these different elements in conjunction with the commonwealth, I think it's an overall aspect of welcoming people here in South Australia; and I don't think that it is as significant an issue as it is in the Eastern States.

COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM PROGRAM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Supplementary to the Minister for Education: given the Minister for Social Inclusion's answer, which doesn't include any identification of students in the education system in South Australia, can you tell the parliament if there's any evidence of that and what action your department is taking about it?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:01): There is no evidence that has come to my attention that we have an active and live problem with radicalisation of young people—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —in our schools.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for persistent interjection.

Mr Goldsworthy: We're asking sensible questions.

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Mr Speaker, while that is the case, and while other ministers are taking a lead across Australia in the collective response to this question, it has been an issue that has been discussed previously and will be discussed again at the education ministerial council meetings. There was an effort by the federal government in the education area around the middle of the year to produce a document that purportedly would deal with this issue. It included exhortations to be concerned about children listening to rock music and who might take up an interest in environmental matters, from my recollection, and it did not appear to me to be particularly useful or to be hitting the mark.

However, we have as a ministerial council continued to take an interest in this matter and, as I say, it remains something that will be coming back to us in terms of producing material and support for teachers and other educators in our education system that might more helpfully either identify problems or indeed tackle them before they happen. My view is that, while I am absolutely interested and committed to that discussion continuing and to useful material being produced, what's most important is that we have an education system that teaches our children the value of diversity, the very great gifts that we had in the Enlightenment about allowing others to have other points of view, about celebrating diversity within a common shared sense of values. I believe we do that well in the education system, and from that perspective I think we've done that well for a long time.

More recently, there have been moves to introduce curriculum that is aimed at respectful relationships. As we know, the challenge of domestic violence, of family violence and of violent extremism are all part of the continuum of how we treat each other. The fact that we are increasingly having really good efforts in that curriculum and in the support that's offered through the schooling system gives me cause to think that we are acting responsibly and rationally. However, as I say, it remains part of our Education Council ministers' agenda, and we will see where we can take some more specific resources that might be useful.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT FUND

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Minister, can you update the house on how the government is encouraging the development of open spaces within our community?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for her question. Yes, I can provide some information on this very important question. The Open Spaces and Places for People grant programs operate under the Planning and Development Fund.

Mr Marshall: You said you were going to do up the Parklands—four separate programs, remember? You announced that in 2013.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That is true.

Mr Marshall: How's that going?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Very, very well. The Leader of the Opposition will be absolutely delighted with the outcome, and I am happy to share it with him in due course. The grant provides financial assistance to local government for the purchase, planning and enhancement of public open spaces. Councils throughout the state are invited to apply for a grant funding eligible projects under the process. Applications are now open until 29 January—29 January, everybody—and the funding programs are well subscribed by councils. Approximately 60 funding applications are received each year.

Since July 2002, the government has provided approximately \$125 million in P&D grants to over 675 local government open space and public realm projects. Recently, the member for Elder opened the Oaklands Recreation Plaza on my behalf. This project has been undertaken by the City of Marion as part of the wider transformation of the former Oaklands Park driver development centre. P&D funds totalling \$900,000 were provided towards the development of a landscaped plaza which has been designed to provide recreational facilities for a range of uses. The project complements the adjacent Sturt River Linear Park, which also has ongoing support from the P&D fund. Another significant project which the government supported is the St Kilda Playground.

Ms Vlahos: Magnificent.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's right. In 2014, there was a grant of over \$1 million provided to the City of Salisbury for the total redevelopment of the playground. I was there with the member for Taylor, I recall, looking at that. It was a bit of a warm day that day, I recall.

Ms Vlahos interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The first stages of the project have now been completed, with the council currently finalising the remaining play elements. Open spaces such as plazas, parks and playgrounds are critical components of community infrastructure in areas of both low and high density. The government welcomes further projects such as these in the next round of grant applications.

ECONOMIC PLAN

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries and also the Minister for Tourism. Can you update the house on the progress made against the economic priorities in your portfolio?

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) (15:08): I thank the member for Kurna for the question. Two very important top five economic priorities fall under my responsibility. One, of course, is premium food and wine from our clean environment exported to the world, and the other one is to make South Australia a destination

of choice for travellers. I am happy to report that, in the all-important area of jobs, we have seen in the tourism sector an increase of 1,000 jobs across South Australia in the past 12 months, so we have taken it from 31,000 up to 32,000 people employed in that area.

In the area of agribusiness, which is worth more than \$17.6 billion to the state, we have increased jobs by 1,200, which is terrific news for South Australia as we transition our economy. What we need to remember is that one in five working South Australians are actually employed in the agribusiness sectors, so that goes right across agriculture, food, fisheries and forests. We are out there all the time working hard with industry and individuals to make sure we can deliver as many jobs as we possibly can.

It was terrific last Friday to firstly go to Murray Bridge, where I was with the member for Hammond, who has done a terrific job following the closure of the UDP dairy processing factories at both Murray Bridge and Jervois. He and I have been in constant contact over the past 18 months or two years on that factor. It was terrific to go there last week and meet with some of the staff as that plant was reopened by the Beston group, which is doing terrific work in exporting South Australian premium produce, whether it is seafood, dairy products or, indeed, meat and health foods, into many markets throughout China and South-East Asia. I congratulate everyone who is involved in the Beston group, particularly those staff who have been re-employed. There are 35 people who have come back to work and their Christmas is looking a whole lot better than the earlier part of the year.

I met a worker who had worked for the Murray Bridge factory there for 45 years. He had been out of work for a few months and, to see him back on the tools making cheese, which is what he has done his entire life, was just terrific. He was very pleased with the Beston group's injection of funds and investment in a very important part of the state. The interesting thing was that he, when he finished his shift, was going to hand over to his daughter, who also works there.

In the tourism sector we have had a number of big wins this year. We have seen record numbers of international and national visitors coming into South Australia, and also record revenues from a very important sector. I had a meeting this morning with Qatar Airways and they are going to begin direct flights into South Australia from 2 May next year. It will be the only destination in Australia that will have the A350 plane coming in so, as well as having lots of people coming from around the world into South Australia, I am sure we are going to have a lot of plane spotters coming here from other states.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: the minister is not directly relating his comments to the economic targets, as suggested, so under 98 he should be sat down.

The SPEAKER: A quick answer is a good answer, minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. It is obvious that those opposite do not like good news, and this is very good news. There are two economic priorities for South Australia—tourism and agriculture, food, fisheries and forests—and I get up every day and work out what we can do to make this place better—how can we create more jobs, how can we bring more money into South Australia—and this is exactly what we are doing. Those opposite just want to talk South Australia down. They will go to the Christmas break continuing to do that. I look forward to seeing everyone again next year as we continue to build agriculture and tourism.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir. The minister is now reflecting on the opposition, and it is inappropriate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

Bills

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (BUILDING UPGRADE AGREEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 December 2015.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:13): I rise to speak on the Local Government (Building Upgrade Agreements) Amendment Bill 2015. This bill was introduced

by the Hon. Ian Hunter as Minister for Environment in another place and has come to us as a result of successfully passing that house. Essentially, it is a bill which provides for the introduction of a building upgrade finance mechanism in South Australia.

In short, it makes provision for improving the environmental performance of buildings, primarily in commercial areas. To facilitate that, the upgrading of the existing buildings requires, if they are to introduce renewable energy, energy efficiency, sustainable water projects and the like, the owner to spend money. The benefit that has been identified is for both building owners and occupiers because, as occupiers or tenants, it provides the means to manage their utility costs, or at least reduce them.

The model of a building upgrade agreement varies in Australia. In New South Wales, they have a model which has operated for some time. In Victoria, they have a model which provides for a voluntary agreement to be entered into between the landlord and tenant or tenants. That has been so successful that it has recently expanded from the Melbourne metropolitan area to the whole of Victoria under the Victorian Labor government. Indeed, they have a Sustainable Melbourne Fund which, as I understand it, operates under the stewardship of the Melbourne City Council. As I said, it has been a model which has been implemented, assessed as favourable and expanded in the state of Victoria.

So when the government introduced this bill in another place in February this year, obviously the opposition were and remain committed to supporting initiatives that would enable a win-win situation, including making buildings more tenantable and cost efficient, assisting with sustainability, and providing for both our energy costs and environmental impacts to be appreciated and shared. We have been and remain committed to supporting projects that do just this.

When we consulted on the bill, Business SA made it very clear that the interests of small business tenants, under the model proposed in the bill, would not necessarily be protected. Essentially, introducing this model and imposing it on tenants without their consent could result in it not being a win-win, as championed by the government, but a win for the landlord, who would have the benefit of the improvement to the property, the likely consequential increase in value of the property and perhaps even the effect of increasing the rent recoverable, on review, from the tenant. The tenant may have some marginal decrease in a utility cost as a result, but they may carry a huge financial burden in either financing costing and/or rental. We looked at this very carefully and Business SA alerted us to the vulnerability of small business operators in tenancy situations.

To ensure there is no undisclosed conflict of interest, I advise the house that I am an owner, with an entity, of a commercial property in metropolitan Adelaide which has a tenant. Hence, I am a landlord. A bill in the model that has been proposed is more than likely to be of great benefit to people like me.

However, we are here as members of parliament to ensure that when we introduce initiatives, as good as they might sound at the outset, we are doing so for the benefit not just of any vested interest or any small secular group. The test for us is, 'It sounds like a good idea in the first place, but does it stack up and assure us that it gives a win-win to landlords and tenants?' and, in theory at least, a flow on economic benefit to other South Australians who rely on there being a viable enterprise occupying these premises, wherever they take advantage of this type of financing upgrade.

Having looked at the matter, and having seen that there was not necessarily a benefit for tenants, mid this year we set about preparing amendments to the bill in another place to effectively replicate the Victorian model. What is interesting is that when the government instituted this proposal, it actually referred to Melbourne as being a jurisdiction that has taken up this type of financing option. However, I do not think it was clear, full and frank in relation to the legislative model it was actually adopting.

Be that as it may, we were. We did the homework and we identified that there was a potential problem. For the record—because I have read the most appalling press release issued by the Hon. Ian Hunter, Minister for the Environment, suggesting that the opposition was sitting on its hands on this issue—the opposition, via the Hon. Michelle Lensink, tabled amendments to this bill to invite the government and others to support a model which would in fact replicate the Victorian model.

They have been sitting on the table in another place since July this year. It is the government that has control of government business, and it has failed to do anything about this for months and months.

About three weeks ago I was asked to have a look at this bill (the Hon. Michelle Lensink is on maternity leave, as members know). For the benefit of members, she has delivered a beautiful baby boy, Mitchell Oliver, whom I have visited; not all babies are beautiful, but I can tell members that he is a beautiful baby. However, I got this call to have a look at the bill and was asked if we would agree to meet with representatives from Mr Hunter's office to discuss the progress of the bill. I said I was more than happy to, that I had temporary responsibility for it, and within 48 hours we had a meeting with the representatives of the government, in particular Department of Environment representatives. They were ably supported by Ms Julia Grant and other members of the Climate Change Unit (as I think it is now called) from the Department of Environment.

I pointed it out at the time, and I still maintain, that I am bitterly disappointed that whole unit has been downgraded into the Department of Environment after holding status under former premier Rann in the Premier's Office, given its importance. It is incredible to think that as we are here debating this bill, which helps to support energy initiatives and things which, in the long-term, will hopefully help address man's influence on climate change, we have the Premier on the national stage dealing with what was described as subnational government leaders.

I place on the record that I totally object to that; South Australia is not a subnational government. South Australia is a state government and any department people, whether federal or state, who want to refer to the South Australian government or parliament as some kind of subnational group ought to be severely reprimanded. It is totally unacceptable.

Anyway, I digress from that and come back to say that while we have the Premier of the state and the minister racing around the world to say how fabulous we are on climate change, we are back here with a unit of hardworking people in this area who have been demoted and flicked off to the Department of Environment, notwithstanding the high status that it had under the previous premier.

Let's get back to specifically what happened. So we were there, we had a meeting, and I said, 'I have had a look at the bill, I have had a look at the representation that was made to us of various stakeholders. I am happy to discuss that further, if there has been any change.' 'Well, look, there is a change. We are happy to keep the New South Wales model in our bill, but we want to add a no worse off set of clauses for tenants.' Accordingly, I said, 'Fine. Have you discussed this with Business SA because on the face of it they appear to be the main group who are concerned about the benefits, or lack thereof, and vulnerability of further costs being placed on small business proprietors as tenants.' They said, 'No, we have not. You can.' I said, 'It is your bill, but if you want I will convene a meeting with them, have a talk to them and see whether they might be interested.' 'What about the others? Yes, there is a whole list of other people we say on behalf of the government who are supportive of this. You can ring them, talk to them and whatever.' I said, 'That is fine. I am happy to do that.' So, I did.

It was clear at that point. The very next business day I had a meeting with Business SA. Their view was very clear. It is not the way to go and in fact we need to maintain the position of the opposition as outlined, namely to replicate the voluntary Victorian model. That was fine. I rang all these other people that the government said were supportive of their position. It was pretty clear to me pretty early on in that consultation that they were not actually talking about one model or another. They were supportive of a building upgrade finance model. They did not get into the detail of it. In fact, when I spoke to the Property Council, they said, 'Why don't you have a talk to X at the Melbourne City Council who is involved with the Sustainable Melbourne Fund and they can give you some advice about how it works?' So, that was fine, and I did that. Of course it is a good fund, as it appears from the inquiries I made, and so good that it fits within a model which has now been replicated across Victoria which is consistent with the model that we proposed.

Far from the government actually moving this bill along, far from it being positioned as set out by the Minister for Environment suggesting that we are sitting on our hands, for the record, we have done everything possible to advance the progress of this bill and we are still here and happy to support it today, notwithstanding that in the other place the government was successful in pressing

ahead with their amended model, which is what I would call a sort of tacked on New South Wales model. I think it improved it. I do not think it is as good as Victoria's. I think there is a level of vulnerability there; however, from our side of the house, we are supportive of the project getting going in the sense of having it available.

However, there are two things I want to say about that. One is I note that it appears the government intention is to operate a sustainable Adelaide fund which would be run under the direction of the Adelaide City Council, so unsurprisingly the Lord Mayor the Hon. Martin Haese is supportive of that occurring—well, why wouldn't you? Of course you would want to be in charge of a whole lot of money that could be available. Nevertheless, it is one which is going to be introduced—and this is the second point I make—in a market which is far different from Melbourne or Sydney.

Those who might want to take up the opportunity to improve their property in concert with the tenants, which will be able to occur under this bill and, indeed, even if they do not all agree they will be able to progress this, are doing so in a market which is vastly different to the Melbourne and Sydney markets. Members only have to walk outside this door and walk down King William Street to see row after row of empty buildings and 'for lease' signs.

The situation is not good out there and, again, it is hardly surprising in that environment that stakeholders, as they are often called, on behalf of the property industry are saying, 'Let's just get something like this through so that we have a chance to be able to get some financing, upgrade our building and get some tenants.' It is not a question of having a better arrangement for landlords and tenants under a financing model, here it is the issue of whether you can get a tenant at all.

I am not as confident that it will be as easily able to be replicated here, but what the government has done is introduce in its amended form—which has gone through the other place—a model which allows for, if I can paraphrase, a way of clawing back the costs or lack of benefit that a tenant has not achieved. In other words, they have been signed up to this arrangement and they have a commitment to pay, but the new model or the amended model will enable, after a certain period of time of expected revenue return or reduced cost benefit in the upgrade if it has not been achieved, the capacity to be able to claw it back.

I think that is a clumsy way to deal with it and I think it is going to be a model which is going to be difficult for tenants to navigate without significant cost and time or paying some professional person to do those calculations. I think trying to get a small business to have the time, money or energy to apply for some refund arrangement is going to have little take-up. I might be wrong. I hope I am.

I hope that whenever these financing agreements are entered into and they are progressed that they are successful and that we have some chance of helping both the property owners and the tenants out there who are trying to get a reasonable tenancy for their business with reduced, or at least maintained, costs of utility prices, usually in energy and water.

With that, I will say to minister Hunter when he gets back that we have fixed this matter through the passage of the parliament here today, no thanks to him. Next time he wants to set out some accusatory claim that the opposition is sitting on its hands to try to justify his failure to do anything for five months then he should have a look at the file and get a briefing.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:33): I always love listening to the member for Bragg rewrite history in her own terms. At its heart, this bill is about correcting a market failure and, in doing so, creating a vibrant and modern CBD and state. I do have some history in this area and I think I may well have been at the Premier's Climate Change Council when that recommendation was made to go to government to establish this fund.

This bill seeks to upgrade our existing buildings and do so in a sustainable way that delivers environmental benefits, comfort for occupants but, more importantly, cost savings. It will most certainly add to the construction demand in this state and create jobs.

The modelling that has been undertaken, as I understand, has shown that thousands and thousands of jobs could be created through this initiative, and almost \$60 million worth of capital investment could be unleashed just in the CBD over an eight-year period.

At the moment, it is the case that such upgrades are difficult because of barriers and those barriers include, amongst other things, financing of the projects and a split incentive between tenants and landlords where the former receives benefits through utility costs and better accommodation and the latter incurs the costs of the upgrade. That is why this bill is specifically designed to overcome these particular barriers.

It will allow building owners to access financing on more attractive terms than traditional forms; for example, over a longer term and at a fixed rate. The bill also allows costs of the upgrade to be shared on a reasonable basis with the tenants. Upgrades under this mechanism have seen tenants in other jurisdictions reduce their overall costs, even after accounting for the charge levied for the cost of the upgrade.

On the subject of other jurisdictions, the deputy leader spoke about her views on how we have arrived where we are, but it is clearly my understanding that we have looked at what occurs in other parts of Australia. We have actually pulled pieces out of each of those jurisdictions to make sure we have something that we believe has properly built upon what already exists in other parts of Australia. To that extent, this bill is a win-win for tenants, landlords and the state.

The member for Bragg also talked about North Terrace and I think there are a lot of reasons why, for an extended period of time, buildings there have stood vacant. That begs the question as to whether or not we build on this and look at issues in the area of heritage and some impediments that might arise in that area. That is a different subject and I will leave that for the government to deal with as it sees fit.

With respect to the passage of this bill in the other place, I might remind the deputy leader that this was welcomed by the Lord Mayor as well as the South Australian Property Council and the Local Government Association. The member for Bragg also said, 'I might be wrong,' and the truth is that it would not be the first time. She said she hopes she is wrong and I know she will be wrong in this regard. It was the head of the Property Council who said:

The Building Upgrade Finance mechanism makes economic sense, not only for building owners and occupiers as a means of managing their utility costs, but for the businesses that can provide the clean technologies and solutions that lift building performance.

Financing such upgrades through Building Upgrade Finance may offer a number of benefits compared to other forms of traditional finance—the potential is limitless and could be applied to offices, shopping centres, hotels, healthcare facilities, university buildings, factories and warehouses.

I am quoting there someone who is well known to the Liberal Party—Daniel Gannon, who heads the South Australian Property Council.

In concluding my remarks, this bill is an example of the government's job creation efforts and job creating efforts. We do not see jobs and the environment as opposites. This government understands that you can protect the environment and create jobs at the same time. In fact, we will see many thousands of jobs in the future come from ensuring that we treat our environment as the asset it is. We will achieve this, and there is no doubt about that.

For example, have a look at what we have achieved in the area of waste and resource recovery. Our efforts to reduce waste and improve recovery rates have been decisive—as decisive as in any jurisdiction in Australia. It has seen the emergence of a \$1 billion industry employing almost 5,000 South Australians in the effort to ensure that we properly recover resources to be used again.

This bill is a sensible regulation that corrects a market failure. It will help create jobs, attract investment, improve our city and, potentially, reduce greenhouse gases by 32 per cent. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:38): It is said that there are no bad people, only bad incentives. Time will tell whether this bill provides a good incentive or a bad incentive. Much has been said about the current government's credentials when it comes to sustainability and improvement of energy and water use, as well as environmental performance. My message to the government is: focus on what you have so far and focus on the problems you have created thus far.

What comes to mind is the plethora of problems that exist in a part of the world in my electorate which the former minister for water would be aware of—Lochiel Park. Lochiel Park was

promised to be one of the best environmentally friendly and sustainable zones in South Australia, but, unfortunately, the people of Lochiel Park, after years and years, do not have the recycled water that they were promised. Many people bought land solely on the premise that they would get these sustainability features and still, under this government's watch, same government, these measures have not been delivered.

So it is a bit rich for this government to come in and want more when it cannot get these things right, time and time again after seven or eight years. There are people in my electorate who have absolutely no belief in this government when it comes to their environmental credentials. My message would be: get what is existing right before you go onto these sorts of things.

As has been put, the Local Government (Building Upgrade Agreements) Amendment Bill 2015 is part of the government's previous election commitment to drive investment in this sort of area, especially in sustainable commercial buildings through, amongst other things, the retrofitting of improved energy, water and also the environmental performance of existing commercial buildings.

I note that a number of stakeholders have been engaged in speaking about this bill, and the member for Bragg alluded to some of the concerns that exist at the moment on this bill, especially from Business SA and the Property Council of Australia (SA). Obviously Business SA has supported the bill to some extent, but they have also highlighted some flaws, and I am of the belief that they have suggested that the clause in the bill which allows for the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995 to be overwritten be removed.

I understand that the Property Council of Australia (SA), whilst they have highlighted issues, support the bill in principle. We have suggested certain amendments in another place, and I would encourage the government to consider these because, as the member for Bragg has said, this bill can certainly be improved.

Whilst I can appreciate that the government is trying to create positive social change and environmental change through investment and through incentives, I am not sure whether this is the silver bullet and whether this is the right way to do it. It seems inefficient, there seems to be many weaknesses which have been highlighted and time will tell exactly how this bill will pan out. I encourage the government to look at these flaws—which many on this side of the chamber as well as in the other place have highlighted—before the bill progresses.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:42): I rise to support the Local Government (Building Upgrade Agreements) Amendment Bill, but I should point out to the house that my husband and I, by virtue of a rental house and property are landlords, so I put that on the record so that people are aware of it.

I would like to make some brief remarks. Others have already noted in this debate that the bill has the potential to unlock thousands of jobs for our state and attract tens of millions in capital investment, so that cannot be all bad. This will be achieved by overcoming market failures through the creation of this new mechanism. Under the building upgrade finance mechanism, a commercial loan is tied to a property rather than a property owner (that sounds like good news to me) and loan repayments are collected via a local government charge which is levied against the land and passed onto a financier by a local government.

If there is a transfer of ownership of the property, the charge can remain with the property if the purchaser so agrees. BUF helps building owners to access loans to undertake capital upgrades. Also under many commercial leases, tenants pay local government charges. Therefore, by entitling a building owner to recover a tenant's contribution to a building upgrade charge, the mechanism helps to address the split incentive between landlords and tenants in leased buildings, where the building owner incurs the cost of the upgrade but the tenant receives the benefits through reduced utility bills and improved accommodation.

The mechanism therefore helps to unlock investment in building retrofits and realise the associated economic and environmental benefits. The mechanism is beneficial to tenants, as the projects can improve indoor amenity, result in improvements in staff productivity, contribute towards corporate social responsibility goals; for example, energy efficiency, carbon and water targets. The mechanism can also unlock previously unrealised savings to tenants; for example, in circumstances

where the reduction in utility costs is greater than the contribution to the building upgrade charge, or when the building upgrade charge has been fully repaid, the tenant can benefit from the net reductions in the operating costs. I am told that this is the experience with similar schemes in New South Wales and Victoria, and I am also informed that no tenants' outgoings have exceeded their cost savings.

The government has recognised the importance of tenants' rights, and I understand the minister in the other place has provided assurances around this. I must say in another life as a campaigner for the tenants association in South Australia, I certainly support this initiative and this proposal. These assurances include that the regulations made as a result of the successful passage of the bill are proposed to be drafted to require building owners to report regularly on the actual cost savings to tenants using the approved methodology. This will be developed by the state government unless otherwise agreed. The subsequent regulations, I am told, are also anticipated to provide for make-good provisions in the event that the tenant's contribution has exceeded their cost savings.

My understanding is that the bill has come about as a result of substantial consultation and review over quite some time. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:45): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Local Government (Building Upgrade Agreements) Amendment Bill on this the last day of sitting for 2015—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: We're sitting next week.

Mr TRELOAR: Don't go there, John—on what should be, what is intended to be, the last day of sitting for 2015. Firstly, I would like to mention the work of my colleagues in the other place for their time and effort in dealing with the government and stakeholders in this bill. I would like to commend the work of the Hon. Michelle Lensink, who is the shadow minister for sustainability, environment and conservation, and her staff. They do a great deal of work on behalf of the opposition when it comes to dealing with legislation such as this, seeking briefings and stakeholder feedback. So I put on the record my thanks for that.

Members would be aware that the Hon. Michelle Lensink is currently on maternity leave, and I congratulate her on the record for the birth of Mitchell Oliver. I hear that both mother and son are doing particularly well, so congratulations to them. I would also like to thank the Hon. John Dawkins for handling the legislation in the other place on behalf of the Hon. Ms Lensink.

The Local Government (Building Upgrade Agreements) Amendment Bill 2015 is part of the government's election commitment to drive investment into sustainable commercial buildings through retrofitting improved energy, water and environmental performance of existing commercial buildings. It seems, through extensive consultation, that all stakeholders support the concepts behind the bill in principle at least. Stakeholders have voiced concerns in relation to the no disadvantage test for tenants and the location of the administrative unit. Consultation particularly engaged Business SA and the Property Council of South Australia.

The minister indicated in his summing up speech in the other place that the LGA is still being considered as the location of the administrative unit, so we will see how that unfolds. Proposals for this scheme were promoted first by the Premier's Climate Change Council, which endorsed advice to the former environment minister way back in April 2012. The draft bill was released in January 2014 for a 10-week consultation process. The current bill was tabled in February 2015.

As the lead speaker for the opposition, the member for Bragg has indicated this legislation was very much shaped around other similar models that have been operating in Victoria and New South Wales both. In both those jurisdictions, a bipartisan approach was taken, and every attempt has been made to do that here also, although I do remind this house that amendments that the opposition put in the other place were defeated, albeit narrowly, and we still believe that the bill as it is now is not as good as it could be. However, we will be supporting it in its current form.

During the debate in the other place, the Liberal Party indicated that we had some concerns with the bill, particularly in relation to the imbalance between the power of tenants (which in most cases are small businesses) and landlords, and we put amendments to that effect. Those concerns relate to the potential negative effects on small business and the government's apparent unwillingness to address the reasonable concerns of this important sector.

As members would be aware, there were some sensible amendments proposed by the opposition, which I will not go over in great detail but which were dealt with in the other place. Suffice to say, they were geared towards creating a more equitable system whereby landlords would be required to gain tenant consent to the payment of financial contributions towards environmental building upgrades—a very reasonable proposition I would have thought—whereas the government's approach will force tenants to make financial contributions to building upgrades, even if they genuinely believe the upgrade will not deliver any cost savings. Ultimately, that particular amendment was not agreed to, but I wanted to put on the record in this place that that particular amendment would have been a reasonable and sensible proposition as part of the approach to building upgrades.

On my reading of the debate in the other place, it would appear that the government has not necessarily had adequate negotiation with key stakeholders in relation to this bill, particularly the small business sector. Most of the tenants, as we have said already, are small businesses. Obviously, small businesses are a significant employer in this state, so any additional costs and financial pressures placed on small businesses as a result of the government's proposal will be a regrettable outcome for the business sector.

Since the bill was introduced way back in February this year, the opposition has expressed a willingness to work with the government to improve the bill based on stakeholder input. For example, Business SA has sought to discuss alternative ways of striking a balance between the interests of tenants and landlords. They have sought those discussions with the government and the opposition both. Indeed, there was a suggestion from Business SA where, if 75 per cent of existing tenants provide approval, that would enable a landlord to recover costs from tenants. The government has been unwilling to countenance that suggestion, and it illustrates that they have simply ignored reasonable suggestions and proposals from the business sector, other stakeholders and also the opposition, which is disappointing.

Unfortunately, it seems to be a recurring theme when it comes to this government: come up with a proposal, feign consultation, ignore industry experts' advice and suggestions, and then push ahead with an imperfect proposal. That is no way to govern; in fact, it shows a level of arrogance and results in poor outcomes. I would echo the remarks of the Hon. John Dawkins in the other place, where he stated that the Liberal Party remains committed to our position that any building upgrade agreement should not override tenants' existing lease agreements and should not override the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995.

Having said that, we are at a point now where the bill has passed through the upper house. It is about to pass through the lower house with support from the opposition, even though we acknowledge that the bill is imperfect. If ultimately it comes to pass and it can be made to work properly, then it will result in a good outcome.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:54): I would like to thank all the staff involved in the preparation of this bill and I would like to thank all members for their contributions.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:54): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FIREARMS BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed not to insist on its amendments Nos 1, 2 and 7 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed and agreed not to insist on its amendment No. 9 but agreed to the alternative amendment made by the House of Assembly.

*Adjournment Debate***VALEDICTORIES**

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:55): How nice it is to be here in the second week of December 2015, in the House of Assembly, thinking about the festive season, and also reflecting on the speed at which matters progressed here and there. Can I say to members of the House of Assembly how delighted I am with the expeditious way in which they have over the course of the year dealt with matters, even though occasionally the member for Bragg has, I think it is fair to say, said more than was absolutely necessary to make her point, occasionally exceeding her quota by some hundreds of per cent. Nevertheless, aside from her, this place is not populated by the prolix.

For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, I am just making the point that, leaving aside the member for Bragg, this year the contributions in this place have been brief and to the point, which is a merciful deliverance from the alternative, which I think the Leader of the Opposition and I have both had the privilege of observing in some detail in the last couple of days, and it is to be commended.

Can I say that, on behalf of the government, I have spent a great deal of time in this place during the course of this year and I want to thank all members of the opposition for, as I said, the generally constructive way in which they have engaged in things, and I think the people of South Australia observing this particular chamber of the parliament would be very impressed and would think to themselves, 'Those people appear to be on about actually doing something for the state: those people appear to be more interested in talking about things of important significance for the state's development than talking about raffles at fairs, whether horses are recognised, and various other things.' I do not want to be too particular lest somebody understand exactly what I am talking about, and that would never do. Can I say that I appreciate all the members of this place, even from the objective observer's point of view, having been by and large constructive and offering useful suggestions as to how we might do our jobs well.

I do make the point again, however, that, if there is one member who could improve slightly, it is the member for Bragg who should try to work next year on what I would call the 25 per cent rule, and that is say 25 per cent about everything compared with 2015 and try to make it at least 25 per cent more relevant, and you are going to be absolutely hitting high notes. You will be the Placido Domingo of the state parliament if you can achieve that. I offer that to the member for Bragg for nothing just as a thought. Anyway, can I say thank you to all the members of parliament. Obviously—

Mr Gardner: This from someone who's taken five minutes to get to the thankyou.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. Can I say thank you to all of the government members who have been so helpful during the course of the year, and my ministerial colleagues. Can I say to the Leader of the Opposition (and I say this with sincerity) that there are matters in which his constructive engagement with the government has been very helpful for the people of South Australia. Unfortunately, in respect of one very important matter presently, even those talents do not appear to be—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am not doing that. I am just saying: in respect of an unnamed matter, even his talents to bring hands across the water do not appear to reach certain people who appear to be determined to do their own thing. Anyway, let us not tarnish today with sad stories. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his cooperative assistance in relation to many significant matters, not least of which has been the return to work bill and other things, although that was last year.

I thank all the parliamentary staff—people who work in this place and have spent a lot of time making sure that the place functions. I thank Hansard for the work that you do. Hansard, when not recording my words, often has to record a lot of dross. It is to be commended that, even in those moments when sometimes it is difficult to follow, sometimes the punctuation is not very good and

sometimes the grammar is not very good, they still manage to get it all down and these gems are preserved for future generations to be able to wend their way through the pages, flicking through the pages of the contributions here. I say to Hansard: thank you; your job is a thankless one, a difficult one, but future generations will thank you, because they will be able to see what happened here in its full glory.

I thank parliamentary counsel and, again, Richard Dennis. They really have done an enormous amount of work in supporting the parliament. Given my particular responsibilities, because I seem to have a lot of legislation, they have certainly been of great assistance to me and I would like to offer my personal thanks to them.

I also say thanks to my personal staff, past and present. Some of them leave me and they move to other places from which they make my life difficult, but the good thing is that they are completely consistent, because they used to make my life difficult when they were with me. Others who are now working for me are doing an excellent job—and I would commend them to those who might be paying attention to this. I would like to thank all my staff, past and present, particularly Kim Eldridge, who moved on to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions this year after having done a great job as my chief of staff, and Kate Baldock. Although we refer to her affectionately now as 'the quitter', she is leaving at the end of this year to follow her husband, who has an exciting career opportunity in Singapore. I say to Kate: thank you very much for the great work you have done in supporting our office; you will be greatly missed. To all of my other staff: thank you very much for all of your hard work.

To my ministerial colleagues, thank you for all of your good humour and tolerance. To everybody who has been named and anybody I should have named but have not—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your mum.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: My mother—yes, definitely, my mother. Can I say to all people who I have named and those who I should have named but have not, I wish you all a very safe and happy Christmas. I hope you are able to spend time with the people who mean most to you and that you have an enjoyable and rewarding festive season. I hope we all come back here happy and well to be very productive in the new year, and that a new spirit of productivity descends on people, other than people in this room, because we already have that spirit of productivity. If we could only go from red, which means stop, to green, which means go, that would be a great thing.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:03): It has been a great honour to serve as the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition throughout 2015. It has been a very interesting year. I love this time of the year when we get to Christmas. It is the season of goodwill, and my speech today will be filled with goodwill, unlike the Acting Premier, who seems to have his speech filled with advice for other members of this parliament. I could fill many Hansard hours with advice for the government, but I will not do this. I will focus my efforts on the season of goodwill which is in front of us. My favourite time of the season is the time when I take my children off to church. I put one on each side and I sing the carols as loudly as possible. I embarrass them as much as possible at every opportunity in this season, and I look forward to doing that in a couple of weeks' time.

I would like to reflect on this year and I would like to begin by thanking my parliamentary colleagues on this side of the house and, in particular, the deputy leader, who has pretty much been the subject of the Acting Premier's speech this afternoon. The member for Bragg is an outstanding deputy and works extremely hard. I would also like to specifically single out the whip for the Liberal Party, the member for Morialta. He is an extraordinarily talented person; he is a great whip and a great shadow minister, and he really has been great counsel to me in my time as the leader.

To all my parliamentary colleagues, thank you very much. This has been a year where we have worked extraordinarily hard, and I am very grateful for the efforts that people have put in in what is typically a fairly difficult time in the electoral cycle, when we are not quite at the halfway mark. I would also like to acknowledge my colleagues in the other place, in particular the Hon. David Ridgway, the leader, and the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the deputy leader—and, of course, the proud mother of baby Mitchell. I had the great delight of meeting him at my house on Sunday,

and I extend my very best wishes to Michelle and Scott on the safe and happy arrival of their son Mitchell.

To those opposite, I also extend my best wishes for this part of the season. As the Deputy Premier has made clear, we have tried to work in the best interests of the people of South Australia throughout the year. There have been some highlights and there have been some less than satisfactory moments but, as the Deputy Premier pointed out in his speech, there is always an opportunity for improvement. I am sure we can do that, and I do thank him for his attitude towards working with the opposition in the best interests of the people of South Australia. I would also like to extend the Liberal Party's best wishes and seasonal greetings to the Independent members and members of other parties in the Legislative Council.

I would like to turn my attention slightly here to the staff who support me and our entire team with distinction, in particular my chief of staff, James Stevens, who supports me here in parliament, and his entire team. They work 24/7. The resources of opposition are tiny, they are absolutely tiny. In the federal parliament they sort of have this equation of 5:1 where, if the government puts on five ministerial staff the opposition automatically gets one. A lot of people think that is completely unfair; 5:1, that is outrageous. If that were the case I would have 60 staff in Adelaide, because we know that the number supporting government ministers is around 300. I would have 60 staff, but I do not have even a quarter of that number. So it is with much gratitude that I express my best wishes to all the people in the leader's office for Christmas.

I would also like to acknowledge the people who work in the Dunstan electorate office, whom I sadly neglect on a pretty regular basis. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the sterling effort of Ashton Hurn who has run that office and who leaves me tomorrow. She has an outstanding career in front of her. Whether she chooses to serve in the parliament or not I am not sure, but she has an incredible political brain, an incredible work ethic and an incredible sense of personal integrity. I really look forward to watching her career unfold.

To all of the opposition, electoral and parliamentary staff, thank you very much. Thank you very much to our president, Steve Murray, who works so diligently on a volunteer basis for our party, and to our newly appointed state director, Sascha Meldrum. We are delighted with her appointment; she has already hit the ground running and been such an incredible support to our parliamentary team, and leads a very hardworking and able team at the Liberal headquarters.

Most of all today I would like to acknowledge and thank the people who work here in Parliament House. It is a great honour and privilege to have this as our work environment. When I come into this chamber, which opened in 1889, it fills me with a great sense of awe. As I said, it is an outstanding privilege to serve here but it does not just happen without a huge amount of work, and today I would like to acknowledge all the people who make our lives as politicians so much easier.

In particular, I would like to acknowledge the Clerk of our house, Rick Crump; the Deputy Clerk, David Pegram; and to all of the House of Assembly chamber attendants. Thank you very much. To Jan Davis, the Legislative Council Clerk; Chris Schwartz, the Legislative Council Deputy Clerk and Black Rod; and to all the Legislative Council chamber attendants. I would also like to single out and thank David Woolman, the building services manager, and his assistant, Liz Lynch, who do an outstanding job maintaining and building on the fabric which is this great building. They could do a little bit more on my floor but nevertheless that is a project maybe for next year.

To all the committee staff, to all the table staff and also to the amazing library staff, led by Dr John Weste. I would also like to acknowledge Anna Graves who was this year appointed director of the research services group and thank her and her group for their support of all of us who are politicians in this building. Also I would like to particularly acknowledge the contribution that Sally Dawson has made to the library services group. She retires as the director of this group next week after being with us in this building for 28 years.

Not only is Sally Dawson retiring this year but, as the Acting Premier has reminded us, Richard Dennis will be retiring. He goes back even further than Sally Dawson. He started here in 1982. He can remember when David Tonkin was the premier of South Australia. I, myself, was in year 10 at school. In fact, I was in year 7 at school when Mr Tonkin became the premier of

South Australia. Richard Dennis can remember him extraordinarily well. Richard, of course, is our Parliamentary Counsel. He is a particularly hardworking, diligent, thoughtful and charming person. He has served this house with distinction and in 2010 I was very privileged to be present at Government House when he was presented with his Public Service Medal for his outstanding contribution to parliamentary services. We wish him all the very best for the future.

I would also like to acknowledge Dr Jenni Newton-Farrelly, a fellow old scholar of Immanuel College plus ultra, our incredibly talented electoral specialist who has recently clocked up 30 years of service to the people of South Australia in this building.

To Creon Grantham, the catering staff and the Blue Room staff, and in particular to Basil who makes the best coffee. They are all very good, of course, but Basil has it exactly right. To Philip Spencer and to the entire Hansard team, I do not know how you do what you do, but thank you very much for everything you do to make us sound lucid.

To the Procedures Office, the cleaning staff, the switchboard team, maintenance team and our dedicated security personnel, to Kent Nelson and the finance team, and last but not least to Lorraine Tonglee and all of the team at PNSG who do such a great job at keeping me online.

I would like now to make a few comments which are on the sad side for us on this side of the house about Nick Ruygrok. I would like to take this opportunity to reflect upon this very tragic event that has rocked the entire South Australian Liberal Party over the last 24 hours. Yesterday morning, news filtered through that Nick was tragically killed while riding his bike in Sydney. Nick began his career here in South Australia as a trainee under the parliamentary trainees program with the member for Adelaide, Rachel Sanderson.

Nick served in the role for a year with such distinction that he was promoted to adviser once his traineeship had ended. I know that Nick worked with utter dedication during the 2014 election on the Adelaide campaign, and he was a great resource for the member for Adelaide, and indeed for the entire Liberal Party team, during his two years working here. Nick had recently moved to Sydney to pursue his career with the New South Wales Attorney-General. He had just bought a house and he had just become engaged to his high school sweetheart, Verity. It is with deep sadness that I pass along my condolences to Nick's family, his fiancée, and all his friends and colleagues. Vale Nick Ruygrok.

I would also like to thank my children for their incredible support to me this year. Charlie has finished year 12 this year and he is off to live in England next year, so it is up to Georgie to look after me for the remainder of the year. They are great kids and I particularly value their support and that of my sisters, Jenny Richardson and Kerrin Barreau, who have had to do a huge amount of work. The work of opposition never ceases. I am sure the government would say the same thing, but the work of opposition, with very finite resources, can only be done with a huge amount of support from those around us and so, to my family, I say thank you very much.

I am looking forward to 2016. There are a lot of challenges which face South Australia, very significant challenges—unemployment, low growth and a range of stalled programs around export growth in this state, just to name a few. But I am very optimistic about our future. I think South Australia is a great state. I feel that our early history in this state is a fantastic foundation of religious freedom, equality, enterprise and democracy, and that is a great foundation for us to build a future for the great state of South Australia.

I, on behalf of the Liberal Party, commit myself in 2016 to work as diligently as I possibly can to advance the cause of South Australia because I believe in South Australia and I believe in its future. It is now my final duty of the year to wish everybody all the very best for a wonderful Christmas season, and I look forward to seeing them back in this place in 2016.

RUYGROK, MR N.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (16:16): Today we mourn the loss of a great man taken too soon. Nick Ruygrok, aged 25, tragically died yesterday at 6.30am in Sydney after being hit by a car whilst riding with the Dulwich Hill Bicycle Club. Nick worked in my office from 2012 to 2014 as a trainee and then as an electorate officer after graduating from Adelaide Uni with a Bachelor of Laws.

He handed out how-to-vote cards for me at the 2010 election and was an integral part of my 2014 campaign.

Nick was school vice captain at Pulteney for the class of 2007 where he was also the captain of rowing, received the bronze, silver and gold for the Duke of Edinburgh Award, was the president of the Venture Club, and was a recipient of the Pulteney Bond Scholarship. He also played football and cricket at the school and was a huge Port Power fan. Nick was also heavily involved with the Henley Beach Surf Life Saving Club.

Nick was wise beyond his years and was a dedicated, hardworking and loyal staff member and friend. Nick moved to Sydney to follow his long-term love, Verity, with whom he recently celebrated seven years together. In Sydney, Nick worked for the member for Coogee, Bruce Notley-Smith, and most recently for Gabrielle Upton, the New South Wales Attorney-General, as an adviser and parliamentary liaison officer. Nick and Verity got engaged earlier this year with a party being held only weeks ago at Verity's parents' home in Prospect. Nick and Verity had recently bought their first home together and only just last week sent me a card with photos of their new flooring and their new home that they were redecorating.

All deaths are sad, but they are far worse with someone so young and with so much potential. Nick was at the beginning of what should have been a long and fulfilling life. Anyone who knew Nick has been devastated by his death. On behalf of myself and the Adelaide electorate staff, past and present, who worked with Nick, including Gemma, Jarrad, Jimmy and Sam, and all of the state Liberal members, our condolences, thoughts and prayers are with Nick's mother, Jackie; his sister, Maddy; his fiancé, Verity; and Verity's parents, Andrew and Tracy, whom Nick was very close to.

Our thoughts are also with Jarrad Schwark, who met Nick whilst working in my electorate office, who was riding with Nick as part of the group at the time of his death. Vale, Nick. We will never forget you.

At 16:19 the house adjourned until Tuesday 9 February 2016 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***VETERANS' ENTITLEMENTS ACT**

125 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12 August 2014). (First Session) In reference to 2014-15 Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 107, Program 4: Veterans' Affairs—

What advocacy has been undertaken to the federal government on behalf of those who served in the civilian surgical and medical teams in South Vietnam to seek recognition under the *Veteran's Entitlement Act 1986*?

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

There has been significant advocacy on behalf of those who served in the civilian surgical and medical teams in South Vietnam to seek recognition under the *Veteran's Entitlement Act 1986*. My response is limited to written advocacy by my predecessors to commonwealth government ministers.

On 9 September 2009, my predecessor, the Hon. Michael Atkinson MP, wrote to the then Commonwealth Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Alan Griffin MP, on behalf of South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO) Australian Civilian Surgical and Medical Teams (Vietnam) at the request of the Veterans' Advisory Council.

On 15 October 2009 the Commonwealth Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Alan Griffin MP, responded and stated that: 'Should any change be made to the applicable law regarding benefits for SEATO team members, I will ensure that it is widely publicised.'

On 27 March 2013 my predecessor, the Hon. Jack Snelling MP, wrote to the then Commonwealth Minister for Defence, Stephen Smith MP, on behalf of SEATO Australian Civilian Surgical and Medical Teams (Vietnam) at the request of the Veterans' Advisory Council.

On 15 April 2013, the Hon. Warren Snowdon MP replied to Minister Snelling's correspondence of 27 March 2013 stating that: '... the government has no plans to alter the current eligibility requirements for civilians.'

On 12 February 2014 Minister Snelling again wrote to Senator the Hon. Michael Ronaldson to provide further advocacy.

On 19 March 2014, Senator Ronaldson replied stating that: '... the government has no plans to alter the current eligibility requirements in relation to civilian coverage under repatriation legislation.'

ABORIGINAL HOUSING

167 Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (24 September 2015). In relation to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 117, I note that three additional employment related accommodation properties for people moving from remote Aboriginal communities have been acquired—

1. How much has been spent on this acquisition, where are they located and who can access them?
2. How many employment related properties exist in Housing SA?
3. How many of these are in remote Aboriginal communities?
4. Can the property be reverted back for standard Housing SA use?

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. Three Employment Related Accommodation (ERA) properties were cited in relation to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 117. After budget papers were prepared, settlement on an additional property occurred, also falling within the 2014-15 period. The four properties are located in Clovelly Park (two), Seacombe Gardens (one), and in Ceduna (one). Expenditure on these four properties was \$1.74 million.

A further six dwellings in Largs North (two), Northfield (two), Angle Park (one) and Ceduna (one), along with five land parcels in Whyalla, were included in the 2014-15 acquisition schedule. They were purchased late in the financial year and settled early in the 2015-16 period. Three of the properties and the five land parcels have since reached settlement with an expenditure of \$1.32 million for the dwellings and \$337,000 for the land.

To be eligible for the ERA program, applicants must be of Aboriginal descent, from a remote community in South Australia (or cross borders), be engaged in, or ready to take up, further education, training and employment opportunities, and have an independent income.

2. Including the newly acquired properties, Housing SA has 36 ERA houses spread across Adelaide (17), Ceduna (four), Port Augusta (seven), Roxby Downs (three) and Umuwa (five). The program also has a 24-bed short-stay facility that accompanies the APY Lands Trade Training Centre, also located in Umuwa.

The five land parcels recently purchased in Whyalla will deliver five dwellings for ERA, with construction due to be completed by June 2016.

3. ERA properties are not located in remote Aboriginal communities. They are purchased to accommodate Aboriginal people who have relocated from a remote setting to engage in education, training and employment activities.

4. Properties are purchased using funding through the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing and are exclusively intended for supporting the outcomes of the ERA program. They are not intended to be reverted back to mainstream social housing.

Most of the properties are managed by non-government providers under head-lease arrangements; however, the program is flexible enough that if a property was deemed difficult to let, or was no longer suitable for the program, it could be sold or transferred back to social housing stock provided it was replaced with a suitable asset for ERA purposes.

YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (12 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:

Mr Blunden's case was not an open Youth Justice case at the time of his death in 2011. The Department for Correctional Services (DCS) did not seek information from Youth Justice, in relation to Mr Blunden.

A Memorandum of Administrative Arrangement (MOAA) about the sharing of information about young people with a youth justice history who are entering the adult corrections system, was implemented on 28 April 2014. This improves information-sharing that falls outside of direct institutional transfer. The Coroner's report highlighted this good work between the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (Youth Justice) and DCS.

APY LANDS

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (30 June 2015).

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

Nil. There have not yet been economic oil or gas discoveries made to date on APY lands.

Estimates Replies

SOUTH EAST ASIA ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

In reply to **Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet led the process to develop the South Australia-South East Asia Engagement Strategy.

I am advised that stakeholder input was gathered through the receipt of written submissions as well as industry workshops that were conducted in metropolitan Adelaide and in the regions of Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, the Riverland and Mount Gambier.

Fifteen written submissions were received by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Austrade offices located in the South East Asia region were consulted and provided input into the draft strategy.

The Canberra-based 'Heads of Mission' were consulted and provided input during the diplomatic forum held in Adelaide last year.

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet engaged PricewaterhouseCoopers (PWC) to run the consultation sessions on its behalf. There were initially 11 sessions in Adelaide (grouped by industry sectors) exploring businesses' current engagement and priorities for South East Asia. Subsequently, PWC held a further nine sessions in Adelaide at which a draft of the strategy was presented to stakeholder groups, as well as four regional sessions (Berri, Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln and Port Pirie).

PWC advises that between 160 and 180 people attended the consultation sessions at PWC's offices in Adelaide and around 70 people attended the regional sessions facilitated by local Regional Development Australia offices. Numbers are not exact as various people participated without registering or using the sign-in sheets provided, or made direct contact with the project team outside of the consultation sessions.

MANUFACTURING WORKS

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I am advised:

An independent evaluation of the government's manufacturing works strategy conducted by global consulting firm, Frost & Sullivan, found 290 new jobs had been created to April 2015 and 847 new jobs will be created over the life of the strategy.

The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide is currently being updated.

BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION VOUCHER PROGRAM

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation):

I am advised of the following:

Year	Number of Vouchers	Amount (\$)
2013-14	3	150,000
2014-15	34	1,251,304

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation):

I am advised that the Economic Development Board maintains a focus on advanced manufacturing across a number of the projects it leads, in particular through its Value Add and Industry Growth Subcommittee.

Projects include:

- Developing a manual to map value chains across industries using a consistent methodology which will enable policy makers and industry to compare sectors and distil information about the critical stages of production;
- A review of potential 'Future Industries' where South Australia currently has, or could develop, comparative or competitive advantages;
- Food Park Project (in collaboration with PIRSA) – the Food Park concept looks to address the benefits from co-locating food manufacturers in terms of sharing infrastructure, attracting service providers and joint approaches to issues such as trade waste, water and energy;
- Functional and Luxury Food Project (in collaboration with PIRSA) – identifying opportunities for SA food manufacturers to expand in to Asia; and
- A study outlining the national and global market potential for the seaweed industry in South Australia.

TONSLEY PARK REDEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation):

1. In 2014-15, nine companies commenced operations at Tonsley, and 13 businesses took up residence in the Co-HAB co-working space at Tonsley.

2. A total of 15 companies are currently operating at Tonsley, plus 13 Co-Hab occupants.

3. Two.

4. No.

5. Six.