

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 8 March 2016

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

The SPEAKER: I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Bills

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 9 February 2016.)

Clause 1.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 5, line 5 [clause 3(a)]—After 'that' insert 'rental'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is not supported. This and the subsequent number of opposition amendments are seeking to reduce the application of the legislation from its current ambit, the form that it has taken for some time, covering all residential properties, to cover only rental properties. The Housing Improvement Bill and the Housing Improvement (Standards) Regulations 2007 are concerned with safety and suitability.

We believe that all people living in South Australia have the right to live in houses that provide basic standards and amenities. Maintaining minimum standards for existing housing is relevant for all residential dwellings in South Australia, ensuring safe and suitable housing for all. This bill is proposing health and safety protections for all members of the community from risks that may be present in poorly maintained residential buildings.

Issues such as structural failure of fences or gates on the perimeter of properties can and have caused death and injury to members of the public. Issues such as structurally unsafe pergolas may put at risk the safety of visitors, young children or service providers at a property. The role of the regulator is to ensure that our accommodation is safe and suitable. The bill now provides the ability to, first, liaise and negotiate with owners without issuing formal orders. Where there is no meaningful response from landlords, the issue of orders or enforcement of those orders is for the benefit of the community.

The bill recognises that properties routinely change between owner-occupied and rental accommodation; it is therefore necessary that the legislation captures all residential dwellings. The inclusion of clause 3(c)—Objects of Act—links the importance of raising community awareness, with ensuring that housing meets prescribed minimum housing standards. Raising community awareness is an important tool in encouraging self compliance.

Whilst there is a body of legislation that regulates a house under construction, without the current act or this proposed legislation there is no ability to regulate houses that are modified or deteriorate after construction. Where these modifications or deterioration affects the health and safety of residents and others in our community, the ability to regulate these houses to minimum

standards of safety and suitability is vital. It is therefore necessary that the legislation captures all residential dwellings; therefore the amendment is not supported.

Mr KNOLL: The reason the opposition is putting forward this amendment is quite clear. It is very much in the government's media on this bill (or whether it is the second reading speech on this bill) that it very much pertains to protecting tenants from being exploited by landlords in a situation where they are being asked to pay unreasonable rents on substandard housing, and certainly it is there for the protection of tenants. Limiting this bill to premises that are tenanted out seems like a fantastic first step in reducing the scope of what can otherwise be quite strong regulation.

The opposition believes that there is a level of duplication in what is being proposed here, and that certainly there are, through the local government, a number of avenues by which people can seek to have redress in these circumstances. Also the Liberal Party believes that there is an inherent right to freedom to be able to live the way people want, free from interference.

The minister has put on the record that there have been instances where people have been hurt from substandard housing, and certainly we accept that, except to say that there already are avenues by which local government can provide redress in this area. This is a level of duplication that we think is unnecessary, and therefore we are putting forward these amendments so we can maintain the spirit of this bill, which is around protecting tenants, whilst at the same time freeing up the legislation from owner-occupiers, giving them the ability to be able to live and, if there are issues with their housing, there is still redress through local government to deal with these issues.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I thank the member for Schubert for his contribution. Let me address your concern about duplication with other acts. While other legislation or contractual arrangements may stipulate that premises are required to be kept in good repair, it is the Housing Improvements (Standards) Regulations 2007 which established the standards and provides instructive detail.

The object of the Development Act 1993 is to provide for efficient planning and development in the state and therefore focuses on new constructions and renovations where building work is required. There is very limited application to the maintenance of existing houses—for example, the requirement for smoke alarms and swimming pool fences.

With regard to the Residential Tenancies Act 1995, the Residential Tenancies Act and the Housing Improvement Bill seek to legislate for two entirely different purposes. The objective of the Residential Tenancies Act is to enforce aspects of the relationship between the landlord and tenant, and housing improvement interest remains regardless of ownership or tenancy arrangements, voiding the intention of the act being circumvented.

The Residential Tenancies Act, however, does not cover all types of arrangements where a person is granted a right of occupancy for valuable consideration. For example, an agreement under which one or two persons board or lodge with another, or residential premises attached to or situated on land let by the landlord to the tenant for business purposes, or residential premises attached to colleges or educational institutions.

As in the current act, the bill will regulate minimum standards for all premises used as a place of residence. For those residential premises where the agreement is not covered under the Residential Tenancies Act, division 4 of the bill provides landlord obligations consistent with the Residential Tenancies Act for the duration of the housing improvement interest.

You talked about local government as well. Local government has the ability to enforce legislation relating to environmental health and planning and development. The Housing Improvement Bill will continue to complement this legislation and the Housing Regulator will continue to work. The local government, in relation to specific properties, may present risks that straddle various pieces of legislation. Duplication has not and will not be an issue between housing regulation and local government.

I just go to the point again, and I have raised this previously in our conversation, that while you point out that individuals should have the freedom to live as they choose, we all recognise that these freedoms must be weighed against the impacts on others. It is not a legitimate argument to

say an individual has a right to choose to live in an unsuitable or unsafe way when this has the potential to impact on the health and safety of others in the community.

Where an order is placed on a property that was rented, the order remains on the property should it become owner-occupied. These minimum standards apply to all residential premises in South Australia. This order remains on a property regardless of occupancy. We know that a property can change from being rented to owner-occupied without being repaired, and that is why we are not supporting the amendment.

Mr PEDERICK: I just want to ask the minister, and she noted the regulations from 2007, how far back an act has been in place that regulates housing improvement in regard to owner-occupiers.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Since 1940.

Mr PEDERICK: This legislation has been in place since 1940, and I understand it has not been enacted on owner-occupiers in that time, yet you have indicated in your previous contribution that there have been deaths and injury as a result of owner-occupier homes not being up to standard.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I understand that is not correct, although it is rare, and in fact there was something in the 1980s, as I am told. There was some action taken against an owner-occupier.

Mr PEDERICK: Can the minister give us any more detail on what that action may have been from the 1980s in relation to owner-occupier?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I do not have that answer here. I am happy to take it on notice and come back to you.

Mr SPEIRS: I would like to ask a couple of questions but, just by way of introduction, my view is very similar to that described by the member for Schubert—that, while we want to keep the spirit of this legislation intact in regard to private landlords ensuring that their properties are in a reasonable condition, the extension of the bureaucracy and the long and heavy arm of bureaucracy into private residential dwellings is of concern to us. There is no doubt in my mind that this is duplication and that it is simply unnecessary additional law being brought into being when there are other forms of legislation which could be used to deal with some of these issues.

I would like to ask a question in relation to section 56 of the South Australian Public Health Act. Under this section, under which you have a duty to 'take all reasonable steps to prevent or minimise any harm to public health caused by, or likely to be caused by' your actions. Has the existence of the public health act (which is often used by local councils to deal with properties which are in a poor condition, particularly private properties) been canvassed when developing the Housing Improvement Act and the possible duplication between the public health act and the clauses in that act which can already be used by local government to deal with issues of public safety caused by substandard private housing?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I thank the member for Bright. I am advised the bill that we are proposing—the modernisation—we understand that this has been available to the owner-occupier since 1940. My understanding is that we go further than the public health act that you are talking about, and the focus is on structural damage and looking at that structural issue, which is not covered by the public health legislation that you talk about.

Mr SPEIRS: With regard to this clause and the desire for the state government to look at policing private housing, has the state government consulted with local government as to their actions in this area under the Housing Improvement Act?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am advised that this proposed modernisation to the legislation has been around for some time and we have consulted with local government two or three times. In fact, if I recall accurately, I met the key stakeholders just before we introduced this bill again.

Mr SPEIRS: Did those key stakeholders you met with before the legislation was introduced raise any concerns about duplication? It has certainly been my experience in recent weeks, having spoken to local government both within my electorate and externally, that they are concerned about

duplication and the state government's interference in an area that they believe they have significant control of already and are dealing with effectively.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It is my understanding that the issue of duplication has not been raised. In fact, they were more than satisfied for us, under the Housing Improvement Bill, to take responsibility for the structural integrity of properties.

Ms SANDERSON: Just to reiterate the Liberal belief and philosophy that people have the right to live in their own home and freely do that, whilst I agree that people who are renting should be protected from substandard housing, overcharging or houses that possibly could cause them a danger, I think that people living in their own home have a responsibility and a right to live in their own home.

I indicated in my first speech on this bill that, whilst renovating a house, I would have been in contravention of many of these regulations, and I certainly would not have appreciated a government staff member coming to my home without notice being able to use reasonable force to enter my home if they felt that there was a safety issue in breach of the regulations of this act. I think it is going way too far, and they are not the powers that this government should have.

I note that since 1940 (so, that is 76 years of this act being able to be used against owner-occupiers) the minister can indicate only one prior use in the 1980s, which strengthens the case that it is not relevant and not required. Clearly, if there have been other dangerous chimneys or fences there have been other ways for those things to be remedied, for example, under the Fencing Act.

There are civil remedies that can be used, such as the Health Act, the Development Act, the Public Health Act, and councils generally would get involved at this level. So, I really do not see why we need another level of bureaucracy, another level of red tape and another level of this government interfering with the rights of people living in their own home who are home owners.

I would like to ask the minister whether she could confirm because I am told that this act has mostly been used against the Housing Trust, and most of the houses that are found to be substandard are actually owned by the government. Can the minister indicate how many private homes are tenanted under this act and how many are Housing Trust, or at least a percentage—if it is 50:50, 60:40 or what the rate is?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: None of the houses that are under any of the orders at the moment are Housing Trust. Can we just focus on what this is about. I know that the member is talking about the individual and the owner-occupier but this is about safety—it is safe for the resident, it is safe for visitors, it is safe for tenants and it is safe for service providers.

I know that the member for Adelaide has shared with us her interesting restoration story and the renovations that she went through, but I think it is important to continue to have that ability to have that conversation with people, draw it to their attention and then pursue it through if it is not up to safety standards and if it is not structurally safe.

I remember in Prospect not long ago a wall that fell down on a child. Now, this is the kind of thing where, if it is raised with us, we need to go in and prosecute that person, or talk to them about fixing it up. Rather than duplicating, which has been raised, I think we support local government in its ability to make the area safe.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 17
Noes 24
Majority 7

AYES

Bell, T.S.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Knoll, S.K.
Redmond, I.M.
Tanzia, V.A.

Chapman, V.A.
Goldsworthy, R.M.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R. (teller)
Treloar, P.A.

Duluk, S.
Griffiths, S.P.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

AYES

Williams, M.R.

Wingard, C.

NOES

Atkinson, M.J.

Brock, G.G.

Cook, N.

Hildyard, K.

Key, S.W.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Rankine, J.M.

Vlahos, L.A.

Bettison, Z.L.

Caica, P.

Digance, A.F.C. (teller)

Hughes, E.J.

Koutsantonis, A.

Piccolo, A.

Rau, J.R.

Weatherill, J.W.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Close, S.E.

Gee, J.P.

Kenyon, T.R.

Mullighan, S.C.

Picton, C.J.

Snelling, J.J.

Wortley, D.

Amendment thus negated.

The CHAIR: Member for Adelaide, do you wish to proceed with your second amendment?

Ms SANDERSON: I am told it is consequential.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 7, line 38 [clause 5(1)]—After 'premises' insert:

that are, or are to be, occupied under a residential tenancy agreement

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is not supported. To re-emphasise what we have already covered, the fundamental principle of this legislation is to protect all members of the community from health and safety risks that are present in residential dwellings.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 6.

Mr KNOLL: From previous answers, I am now given to understand that Housing SA properties are considered part of this clause, and the minister gave an answer that, currently, there are not any Housing SA properties that are subject to this order. Have there been properties in the past that have been subject to this order and, if there is any quantification that can be given, that would be exciting?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am advised there have been no orders but they are required to meet minimum standards.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 10 passed.

Clause 11.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 10, line 27 [clause 11(1)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:

- (a) enter or inspect any residential premises at any reasonable time no earlier than 14 days after giving the landlord of the premises notice of the intended inspection; and

Although the owner-occupier amendments, which relate to about 20 of the amendments I have put forward, have failed and therefore we do not need to go through them, this amendment, however, still could exclude owner-occupiers. This clause relates to giving notice to inspect a home. It is fair enough that no notice is given if it is the tenant who has rung up and said there is an issue, because the tenant is expecting them to come.

However, if it is an owner-occupier and somebody else has given notice of an issue (whether it is their fence, chimney, or whatever), I think it is unreasonable to turn up—and I am told it would only be within working hours—without giving prior notice and expect an owner-occupier to be home, because they are most likely to be at work during those times. It is only fair, I think, to give notice before you come to inspect somebody's home so they can be home and allow you to come in.

It worries me more that they have the powers to use reasonable force. If the owner-occupier is not home because you have not given them notice that you are coming and you have the ability to use reasonable force to break into their home if you think there is something of danger (which is indeterminable and could be based on hearsay because someone has reported it), I think I would like this amendment to still go ahead.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is not supported. As articulated by the member for Adelaide, the amendment seeks to require the regulator to provide the landlord with at least 14 days' notice of an inspection. A property inspection occurs with the consent of the tenant as the occupier. The bill proposes that the regulator can engage with the landlord early in the process and the regulator will communicate with the landlord prior to issuing an order.

The bill as presented minimises the risk that tenants are evicted or treated unfairly by a landlord if they make a complaint about the condition of the premises. Many complaints (about 50 per cent) do not proceed to action under the act due to insufficient cause for the regulator to be involved. To advise the owner prior to each inspection may cause the owner unnecessary concern and, in the case of a tenanted property, exposes the tenant to retaliatory eviction.

The new bill allows for earlier dialogue between the regulator and the owner. Generally, the regulator will engage with the owner regarding the condition of the property when satisfied that the tenant is protected from potential eviction. Under the Housing Improvement Act 1940, the engagement only occurs with the owner after a formal notice of intention to declare a property substandard has been served. Currently under the act, if an owner wishes to evict the tenant following the notice of intention, there is a requirement for an owner to apply to SACAT to confirm the notice. This provides independent review to ensure the eviction reasons are genuine and not related to the tenant complaint about the condition of the property.

Under the Housing Improvement Bill, engagement with the owner will be able to occur after the property has first been inspected. This is because the tenant protection will be brought forward such that the requirement for the owner to apply to SACAT to confirm a notice of eviction is based on genuine reasons and commences when the property has first been inspected. As a result of this early protection under the bill, the owner can be contacted by the regulator following the first inspection. This enables dialogue between the owner and the regulator, rather than progressing immediately to any formal action, as is currently the case. The need for formal action is anticipated to be reduced as a result of this.

Historically, approximately 30 per cent of owners have undertaken repairs when the notice of intention is received. There is expected to be a similar level of response to initial dialogue under the bill. It is possible that the bill will in fact result in a higher proportion of owners undertaking repairs as there is the ability to negotiate. The power of officers and penalties are real incentives where there is a serious health and safety risk to the community. We do not support the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 7 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 11, line 28 [clause 11(6), penalty provision]—Delete '\$10,000' and substitute '\$5,000'

I also have questions that do not relate to the amendment but where explanations are required. Clause 11(1)(b)(viii) provides:

...remove any article that may constitute evidence of the commission of an offence against this Act...

Can the minister give examples of what types of articles would be removed from a home that would constitute evidence?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am advised that an example is that you would take an asbestos sample.

Ms SANDERSON: Further to that, clause 11(6)(b) provides:

...having been asked a question under this section, does not answer the question to the best of his or her knowledge, information and belief...

Can the minister explain how you would determine whether someone has answered a question to the best of their knowledge?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am advised that we would have to prepare a brief for prosecution if we did not feel that they were being honest.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 12.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 8 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 12, line 6 [clause 12(1)]—Delete 'The' and substitute 'Subject to subsection (1a), the'

Mr KNOLL: We are at housing assessment orders. I would like to ask—and I am happy for the time frame to be variable, based on whatever information you have—how many housing assessment orders have been issued let's say over the last year, if you have got that information, or, if you have a time series backwards, that would be wonderful.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We do not have housing assessment orders at this stage. Perhaps I can run through some stats for you. Complaints wise, we get about 300 a year. From 1 July 2015 to 4 March 2016, we had 206 complaints. Many complaints—as I mentioned previously, in the area of 50 per cent—do not proceed to action under the act due to insufficient cause for the regulator to be involved. Where complaints do proceed, approximately 30 per cent of property defects are resolved by the owner prior to an order being placed on the property.

As of 4 March 2016, 1,493 properties were declared substandard—approximately 1.2 per cent of the private rental sector. As at 4 March 2016, 1,409 properties have rent control. Approximately 40 per cent of properties under rent control are in regional areas. As at 4 March 2016, 112 properties were declared uninhabitable.

Mr KNOLL: That saved quite a few questions. I find it incredible that, with 40,000 houses that the government owns through Housing SA, there have been no housing assessment orders. Is it the case that, if there are issues in relation to a Housing SA property, the reason there are not any that have had assessment orders put on there is because those issues are resolved prior to a more formal process being undertaken? What number of complaints relate to Housing SA properties? When you say 50 per cent are not investigated, would some of those relate to Housing SA properties or, when you say a third are fixed prior to any formal assessment order, are any of those Housing SA?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As I am advised, the housing improvement branch has received only one complaint in relation to a Housing SA tenancy. Housing SA spends more than \$100 million a year in maintenance. Obviously, we have annual visits, when we go out to see people, but there is an expectation that the tenant also contacts the maintenance centre if there is an issue. Perhaps on that basis we would endeavour for all Housing SA to have that maintenance, structural safety and security. If that is something that a Housing SA tenant does not believe is there, then we have a responsibility to act on it.

Mr KNOLL: Obviously, within your purview, minister, there are authorised officers that can inspect and go into people's houses. What staffing is there currently? I am thinking about some housing inspection officer who goes into people's houses, and I assume there is a small group of these people. I am just wondering how many staff there are.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: If I recall accurately, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggested that this may be a way for Housing SA staff numbers to be boosted. At the moment, we do not see any increase with this new bill. There are three investigation officers, one manager, one project manager, three admin support staff and the housing regulator. Three investigation officers are OPS5 positions, and we have suitably qualified authorised officers. The regulator will ensure officers have an appropriate balance of qualifications and experience to appropriately be able to perform their role and functions as an authorised officer.

Ms SANDERSON: How does the minister anticipate working all the country areas? Currently, I believe the local government has staff. There are councils throughout South Australia that, when there is an issue, their staff go out and inspect properties; however, now this will be coming back under state government. With the limited staff you have to cover such a huge expanse, how do you plan to get to all of the regional housing?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As I am advised, from our knowledge, local government does not do a lot in this area at this stage, although they have some powers. We have the ability to engage experts in the local area, and I understand that is what we have done in the past.

Ms SANDERSON: Can the minister confirm that this will not be another job put onto local government that they do not have the power to do, yet they will be given the job of going out and inspecting and thus there is further cost shifting to local government?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: My understanding is that we have the ability to engage contractors to deliver this responsibility if need be. I do not think this is cost shifting to local government; I reject that.

Ms SANDERSON: Can the minister confirm whether any of the 1,409 properties that you mentioned that were under rent control are Housing Trust properties?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: None of them are.

Ms CHAPMAN: Of the eight investigative officers—I think they are going to be authorised officers under the bill—

Mr Knoll: Three.

Ms CHAPMAN: Three investigative officers—

Mr Knoll: Three admin.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, and there is a total, I think, of eight.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: If I may provide the information: on our usual basis it is seven but we have engaged a project manager through this Housing Improvement Bill process.

Ms CHAPMAN: So the project manager will cease: is that the position?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I presume her skills and experience will be used elsewhere in the department.

Ms CHAPMAN: Apart from the person who is now working with you as a project manager, what else do these seven do other than respond to complaints and/or conduct inspections of the 1,400 or so that are under rent control?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: You have articulated that clearly; that is what they do. As you may recall, we said that with about 50 per cent of those calls made there is some action taken. There is a lot of conversation, as I am informed, prior to action being taken often. People will call up—they might be a tenant, they might be a neighbour—and those conversations obviously involve the work and understanding as to whether there is an issue that we should go out and inspect.

Ms CHAPMAN: So seven people plus the project officer who respond to the 300 complaints, half of which do not need to go on because they are counselled through it or the like, are responsible for something like 150 complaints a year.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms Chapman: As a job—I might have this job.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We couldn't possibly lose you from the house, deputy leader. We talked about over 1,400 that are under rent control, and I understand that they often review and survey those rent controls to make sure that they are maintained. Obviously, it is proactive when people call up and talk about the action taken, but there is also a maintenance and a review of what is currently under that control.

Ms CHAPMAN: And those personnel actually do the inspections, or are there other persons with qualifications in structural engineering or the like who do that work?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Three of the investigation officers who are the qualified authorised officers do the inspections.

The CHAIR: We are looking at amendment No. 8 on schedule 1 in the name of the member for Adelaide which is clause 12, page 12, line 6, deleting the word 'the', so I am putting this amendment.

Amendment negatived.

The CHAIR: I am advised that means that you may wish to not proceed with your amendment No. 9. Is that correct?

Ms SANDERSON: That is right; I think it would be consequential.

The CHAIR: It does not make sense, so it is not proceeding. In that case, we will move to your amendment No. 10.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 10 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 12, line 30 [clause 12(4), penalty provision]—Delete '\$20,000' and substitute '\$10,000'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is accepted.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to acknowledge in the gallery today the presence of members of a Chinese delegation. We welcome them to our parliament and thank them for their visit to Adelaide and hope they enjoy their time with us here this morning.

Bills

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT BILL

Committee Stage

Debate resumed.

Clause 13.

The CHAIR: We are now looking at amendment No. 11 which is to clause 13, page 12, line 32.

Ms SANDERSON: I think this would be consequential.

The CHAIR: We have not finished with clause 13 yet. We are dealing with amendments Nos 11 and 12 at the moment to ensure that the member for Adelaide is happy to not proceed with them.

Ms SANDERSON: Only because we lost the first two amendments, so it would indicate that we could not win it.

The CHAIR: In that case, you may wish to proceed with it.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Might I compliment Madam Deputy Speaker on the exquisite period costume.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think I am almost blushing.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I can almost see you next to a grille.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You could later, if you wanted to come into the Centre Hall.

CONSTITUTION (APPROPRIATION AND SUPPLY) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 10 February 2016.)

Clause 1.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can I compliment the Chair of Committees on her fine period costume.

The CHAIR: Again?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It was the Deputy Speaker to whom I was speaking previously; it is a different person.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The CHAIR: The Constitution (Appropriation and Supply) Amendment Bill. We did all of that; if someone would like us to repeat all of that, we can.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think it is great, and I thank the honourable member for their question. It is an excellent piece of legislation and an excellent move. I thank the member for Bragg for her support, and I look forward to its swift passage through both houses in the next few minutes.

The CHAIR: We are actually in committee, considering clause 1, the idea being that we are going to hear from the deputy leader that there is no opposition. Is that the idea?

Ms CHAPMAN: I beg your pardon?

The CHAIR: We are in committee, but there is no opposition to it? I am just trying to establish what is going on.

Ms CHAPMAN: Correct. I do not think this will take very long, but I do want to raise a matter with the Attorney, as he has opened up the constitution bill for the spurious purpose which is contained in the bill, and which, as the Attorney knows, we wholesomely reject. Could the Attorney explain to the house, apart from the referendum process—which of course is necessary to allow this bill to be presented to the Governor—what is the actual voting arrangement for passage through each of the houses (that is, the majority required, etc.)?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I understand it, the subject matter of these proposals has an impact on the relationship between the powers of the houses. Accordingly, the special matter and form provisions of the constitution are engaged, and that means that instead of the normal two-step process—whereby a bill receives assent in this chamber and then receives assent in the other chamber, and then is conveyed to His Excellency for his signature—a third step is required before the bill is presented to His Excellency, namely, the presentation of the bill, having duly passed both houses, to the people in a referendum. That step is required as an additional step before the matter can be presented to His Excellency.

Ms Chapman: The voting majority is the same?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Put it this way: but for the fact that the subject matter of this particular legislation affects the relationship between the houses, this would be an ordinary amendment to the Constitution Act, which, but for those provisions, is just like any act of this parliament and does not require any special manner and form. For instance, if (as I think has happened in the past) the provisions dealing with the number of ministers is varied from time to time, that does not require anything other than a simple majority in both chambers. My understanding is that it is only the special manner and form provisions which are in any way different.

Ms CHAPMAN: There is nothing in the constitution, if it is amended, requiring a two-thirds majority?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No.

Ms CHAPMAN: While the bill is open, I appreciate why 'His Majesty' is referred to in section 2 and 'Her Majesty' in section 5, to deal with historical events and the recording of them (and of course the gender of the king or queen at the time is obvious), for the rest of the act, particularly section 8, which still refers to 'His Majesty', I am just wondering why we are not tidying that up at the same time. Over the page in 10A it is 'Her Majesty', which is probably as a result of the fact that at the time we made those amendments Elizabeth II was on the throne.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am happy to have a look at that. If it were to be the case that these things would be passing, it might be a useful matter to look, at I guess. However, I gather, from what has been said already, that none of this is going to receive any support, so it is a bit academic, really.

Ms CHAPMAN: In respect of the subject matter of the bill, let me be absolutely clear that we are rejecting it; I am just highlighting the fact that there seems to be some inconsistency as to the descriptor of the monarch, probably depending on the time at which our constitution was amended to accommodate some reform. It might be both appropriate and respectful that we do it, especially as it is International Women's Day and given that Her Majesty is currently on the throne, so that we get it right. I would appreciate some consideration of that.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am happy to have a look at that. I would like to think, though, having launched ourselves into the noble pursuit of constitutional reform, it would be somewhat disappointing if all we managed to do was correct some of the definite and indefinite articles in the bill. However, I will certainly look at the matter.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will just conclude on that matter by saying that the constitution is a very significant document. I do not understand why—not just in your administration but even in previous administrations—it has not been attended to because it is not as though we have not dealt with constitutional matters, even in the time I have been in the parliament, and it has not been correct, so I just raise it. I thank the Attorney for indicating that he is prepared to have a look at it and I look forward to his progressing that in the future.

Mr KNOLL: What you are seeking to change in this bill takes power away from the Legislative Council to the extent there is a disagreement between the government and the upper house. Has there been any instance where the Legislative Council has enforced their disagreement; that is, is there an instance where, in the history of South Australia, this clause has been used to block the agenda of the government from a supply and appropriation standpoint?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As always, the member for Schubert asks a very good question. I am advised that it is possibly a little bit before the member for Schubert's time and maybe even before mine, but in 1911 there was an issue where the Legislative Council attempted to deprive the duly elected government of supply and that resulted in the provisions that are presently in there which talk about money bills which came in in 1913.

Mr Knoll: So we fixed that problem.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: What I am saying is that we could be even more thorough in fixing that because you never know when they might get cheeky enough to have another crack.

Mr KNOLL: Attorney, in your second reading speech you talked about—and I am going to quote the phrase:

...since at least 1981, the annual Appropriation Bill provides for appropriations both for previously authorised purposes, and for purposes not previously authorised...

I understand that those two clauses are taken separately—that is, for purposes that have been previously authorised, it is unconstitutional for those things to be blocked—and, if that is the case (and it is what I think I am reading), surely the idea that the Legislative Council can shut down the government is moot because the government could move to split those two bills, as in, there is nothing forcing the government to put those two different types of measures in the same appropriation supply bill. Surely, if there was an issue, you could split those two bills and ensure that previously authorised purposes cannot be stopped.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is an interesting point. Apparently, around the country there are slightly different treatments of those matters and I would probably have to—

Mr Knoll: How about South Australia?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Previous to 1981, I think they might have been done. Prior to 1981, they were done separately, so the consolidated form that we presently use is a post-1981 feature.

Mr Knoll: So there is nothing to stopping things from being split.

The CHAIR: If this is another question, use the microphone so Hansard can hear it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I believe not. I believe there is nothing to stop it being split, but let me check on that.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 6), schedule and title passed.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The house divided on the third reading:

Ayes 24
Noes 19
Majority 5

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Caica, P.
Digance, A.F.C.
Hildyard, K.
Key, S.W.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Rankine, J.M.
Vlahos, L.A.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Close, S.E.
Gee, J.P.
Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.
Piccolo, A.
Rau, J.R.
Weatherill, J.W.

Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Snelling, J.J.
Wortley, D.

NOES

Bell, T.S.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Knoll, S.K.
Pengilly, M.R.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.

Chapman, V.A. (teller)
Goldsworthy, R.M.
McFetridge, D.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Duluk, S.
Griffiths, S.P.
Pederick, A.S.
Redmond, I.M.
Tarzia, V.A.
Williams, M.R.

PAIRS

Bettison, Z.L.

Marshall, S.S.

Third reading thus carried.

CONSTITUTION (DEADLOCKS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February 2016.)

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you very much. I thank everyone for their contribution.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister has spoken and closed the debate and he will be moving that the bill be read a second time. I have something to read so I would like you all to listen. Constitution (Deadlocks) Amendment Bill, absolute majority, second and third readings for the bill to amend the Constitution Act. When the second reading debate is concluded, as this is a bill to amend the Constitution Act to provide for an alteration to the constitution of the Legislative Council and/or the House of Assembly, its second reading is required to be carried by an absolute majority. In accordance with standing order No. 242, ring the bells:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The house divided on the second reading.

Ayes 24

Noes 19

Majority 5

AYES

Bedford, F.E.

Caica, P.

Digance, A.F.C.

Hildyard, K.

Key, S.W.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Rankine, J.M.

Vlahos, L.A.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Close, S.E.

Gee, J.P.

Hughes, E.J.

Koutsantonis, A.

Piccolo, A.

Rau, J.R.

Weatherill, J.W.

Brock, G.G.

Cook, N.

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.

Kenyon, T.R. (teller)

Mullighan, S.C.

Picton, C.J.

Snelling, J.J.

Wortley, D.

NOES

Bell, T.S.

Gardner, J.A.W.

Knoll, S.K.

Pengilly, M.R.

Sanderson, R.

Treloar, P.A.

Wingard, C.

Chapman, V.A. (teller)

Goldsworthy, R.M.

McFetridge, D.

Pisoni, D.G.

Speirs, D.

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Duluk, S.

Griffiths, S.P.

Pederick, A.S.

Redmond, I.M.

Tarzia, V.A.

Williams, M.R.

PAIRS

Bettison, Z.L.

Marshall, S.S.

Second reading thus carried.

The SPEAKER: The second reading of the bill, having been passed by an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house, it may now be further proceeded with. We enjoyed that so much we will do it again in a moment.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

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

Amendment No 1 [AG-1]—

Page 4, lines 27 to 31 [clause 4, inserted section 41(4)(i)]—Delete paragraph (i) and substitute:

- (i) the following provisions apply to the entitlement of members to vote on a question arising before a meeting of the joint sitting:
- (i) in the case of a question that requires the affirmation of an absolute majority of the total number of members of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly—each member present at the meeting, including the person presiding, will be entitled to 1 vote on the question; and
- (ii) in the case of any other question—each member present at the meeting, except the person presiding, will be entitled to 1 vote on the question and, in the event of an equality of votes, the person presiding will have a casting vote.

Amendment No 2 [AG-1]—

Page 5, line 34 [clause 4, inserted section 41(8)(b)]—Delete 'or proposed'

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clause (5), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

The SPEAKER: As this is a bill to amend the Constitution Act, and provides for an alteration of the Constitution of the other place and the house, its third reading is required to be carried by an absolute majority. In accordance with standing order 242, ring the bells.

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

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Sitting suspended from 12:33 to 14:00.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE PRECINCT LAND DEDICATION BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students from Concordia College (where a former member for Playford used to administer corporal punishment), guests of the member for Unley, and I also welcome students from Nangwarry Primary School who are guests of the member for MacKillop.

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—Report on the Adelaide Oval redevelopment pursuant to section 9 of the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Act 2011 for the designated period 1 July 2015 to 31 December 2015 Report February 2016
Leases made under the following Acts
Adelaide Park Lands—Park Lands Lease Agreement—Bureau of Meteorology

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Rules made under the following Acts—
Magistrates Court—Criminal—Amendment No. 56

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Return to Work—Dissolution of Workers Compensation Tribunal—Transitional Arrangements

By the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Rules made under the following Acts—
Mining—Warden's Court

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

AustralAsia Railway Corporation—Annual Report 2014-15

By the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Hon. L.A. Vlahos)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Controlled Substances—Poisons

*Ministerial Statement***SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT BLUEPRINT**

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:08): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Today is a special day for all of us who are committed to achieving gender equality. Summed up in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, everyone has

the right to work and the right to just and favourable conditions of work. Planet 50:50 by 2013: Step It Up For Gender Equality is the inspiring theme for this International Women's Day.

Governments across the world have pledged to take purposeful action toward gender parity, and today the government of South Australia joins them. We affirm that South Australian women are entitled to full enjoyment of their inalienable right to work and to receive equal pay for that work. In order to ensure a better future for South Australian women, we must address the barriers that affect their economic wellbeing. That is why the state government's new blueprint for women's economic empowerment, Investing in Women's Futures, includes a number of initiatives that will:

- reduce the gender pay gap;
- encourage flexible work arrangements;
- improve women's financial literacy; and
- encourage women to undertake study and/or employment in STEM.

When men and women do not have equal access to resources, there are direct economic and social consequences for our community. One of these consequences is the prevalence of domestic violence. In Australia one in three women has experienced physical violence, and we know that a lack of independent income increases women's vulnerability. Increasing women's access to paid work with favourable conditions will increase their access to greater financial security and enhance their confidence and social support networks.

The new economic blueprint builds upon the state government's policy, Achieving Women's Equality. I am proud that our government remains committed to increasing and sustaining the economic status, social inclusion, safety and wellbeing of women—a path that our suffragists blazed more than a century ago. Our investment reflects the value that we place on women. Apart from being an issue of equity, the empowerment of South Australian women is one of the most effective ways to achieve higher economic growth.

If we are to have a vibrant state, we must expand the pool of potential employees, particularly in light of a tight labour market characterised by intensive interstate competition. The largest, most untapped labour pool available is women; therefore, increasing women's economic participation is not simply the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. The government stands ready to use the new economic blueprint to look at everything we can do to empower South Australian women.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:12): I bring up the 542nd report of the committee on Victor Harbor Wastewater Network Upgrade.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:13): I bring up the 23rd report of the committee on Site Visit to Hillgrove Resource Group Copper Mine and Kanmantoo Quarry.

Report received and ordered to be published.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:14): I bring up the Interim Report of the committee on Review of the Report of the Legislative Review Committee into the Partial Defence of Provocation.

Report received.

*Question Time***TRANSFORMING HEALTH**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's claim on television yesterday that equal numbers of clinicians support Transforming Health as oppose it, can he name the four professional health bodies which, he says, counter the opposition from the Royal College of Surgeons, the Royal College of Physicians, the AMA, and SASMOA?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:15): Can I say, I probably did ourselves an injustice. I think there is an overwhelming majority of clinicians that support our proposition and, sure, there will be voices—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —there will be voices that are raised in opposition. But change always comes at some political cost, and that's why we are determined to be a reforming government, because we want higher quality—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We want higher quality—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, for one, the clinical ambassadors have looked at the data and have realised that they want to save lives and improve the quality of the service that is provided to the people of South Australia. The people who have looked—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There are people who have looked at the data and are now embarrassed about the fact that there is a disparity in the quality of service that exists between different hospitals. The people who have looked at the data realised that the people of the northern suburbs are expected to travel an inordinate distance to receive equitable, accessible, high-quality health care—something that people on your side of the town, those that are on the other side of the town, the leafy suburbs, have come to expect.

We stand for a healthcare system that meets the needs of every citizen, not just those fortunate enough to live in the leafy suburbs. I know that those opposite are more than happy to run an inequitable, inaccessible healthcare system. We want a healthcare system that is actually accessible and equitable to all South Australians.

Public health is one of the great Labor projects: we created Medicare, we created the public healthcare system, and we simply are not going to stand by and allow those who want this to turn into a residualised system where the wealthy can get health care because their Bankcard is more important than their Medicare card. This is the system which is coming to us in this country—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is the system which is coming to us in this country unless we are prepared to invest in our public healthcare system. This is one of the reasons that it will be very high on my list of priorities to raise with the Prime Minister when I meet with him later today that we want him to reverse his cuts—\$5.5 billion cuts in health and education—landing heavily on our healthcare system in this state.

We are basically in South Australia having to do enormous reform just to keep pace with the rapid growth and the demands in our system. What places an unbearable burden on our system is the cuts that have been placed on us by this new federal Liberal government, and we are going to resist them with every element that we can bring to bear. We are joined in our struggle by the Premier of New South Wales, Mike Baird—

Mr Gardner: I thought you said Transforming Health wasn't about cuts.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well it's not; it's about—

Mr Marshall: You said it was.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, it's not. Let me take you through—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Let me take you—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. Let me take you through the logic of Transforming Health. Transforming Health is about quality of care which gives you affordable care. It still requires change—change which is threatening to those people that don't want to cooperate with change. Of course, there are people who are happy with the way they're working at the moment, but our obligation is to confront people with the data and the reality of the situation, which is that we need to change this system if it's to become affordable and a high quality healthcare system.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, I call to order the members for Chaffey, Morialta, Schubert, Finnis, Hartley, Morphett, MacKillop, Kavel, Davenport, Goyder, Adelaide, Newland, the leader, and the Premier for consistent argumentation throughout the answer. I warn for the first time the members for Morialta and Schubert, the leader, the member for Hartley and the member for Morphett, and I warn for the second and final time the members for Morialta, Schubert, Morphett—who is right that the government has been in office for 14 years—and the leader.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Statement of fact, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned.

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): It seems like a tough regime today, sir. Supplementary to the Premier: given that the Premier has just explained to the house that, in fact, there is an overwhelming majority of clinicians in favour of this, can he perhaps give a list to this house of the overwhelming majority of professional associations which are supporting Transforming Health?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:20): At all stages of this process, it has been driven by clinicians, from the very first. Of course, there are going to be a minority of clinicians who, for whatever reason, do not want change. It might be that they are comfortable. It might be because their rights of private practice work to their advantage working at a particular location and they do not want to change locations. There may be any number of reasons why individual clinicians may not like change.

I would be very, very surprised, if we had any change, particularly on the scale which we are undertaking, and there was unanimity of opinion on the changes. Of course, there are going to be different opinions and, of course, we will always listen to clinicians when they have real concerns about quality and safety issues with regard to what we are putting in place.

We have gone through a very long process. We have been talking about these changes for the last couple of years. There is nothing new in the reforms that we are putting up. They have been talked about for two years. In fact, really, their genesis comes from the Generational Health Review that was done by Dr John Menadue when this government first came to office. There is nothing particularly—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Well, there happens to be a new hospital being built down the road. There happens to be hundreds of millions of dollars that have been spent on upgrading every single metropolitan hospital and hundreds of millions of dollars spent on upgrading our country hospitals. There is one thing the opposition cannot accuse us of and that is sitting idle when it comes to health reform, because both my predecessors, starting with Lea Stevens, worked very hard to improve our health system in the face of opposition from the Liberal Party every step of the way—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Every time this government has taken concrete steps to improve our health system, the opposition has opposed it.

The SPEAKER: The opposition's position on health is irrelevant to the answer. Would the minister provide the house with information?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I'm sorry, sir, I was being sorely provoked by the opposition, and I apologise to the house. But nonetheless, we have been engaged in a long reform process. This is only the latest development. We cannot sit idle, and the overwhelming majority of clinicians who work in our health system cannot sit idle, given what we know and given that, when you compare data in the South Australian health system and benchmark it with peer hospitals interstate and the Australian Health Roundtable data, there are 500 more people dying in South Australian hospitals than should be the case.

In that knowledge, I cannot, in conscience as health minister, allow that to continue without doing everything I can possibly do to improve it. These changes will see definite improvements to patient care, and I am yet to see anything from anyone, including the opposition, suggesting an alternative.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): How does the minister explain the fact that 19 out of 23 emergency department doctors at Lyell McEwin Hospital have signed a letter opposing the Transforming Health changes put forward by the government?

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:23): All I have seen is an unsigned letter purporting to come from emergency department doctors but, obviously, we are committed to working through these issues. As I have said, of course there are always going to be differences of opinion but I am confident that, with these changes, any concerns that clinicians have about the process we are going through will be overcome.

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given the claims of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network management that \$320 million is being spent on the Lyell McEwin Hospital, can the minister outline when and where this money is being spent?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:24): If the Leader of the Opposition wants to venture north of Gepps Cross one day, I would be more than happy for him to be given a tour to see where the \$300 million has been spent.

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): For clarity, a member of his own team said that the Lyell McEwin will undergo a \$320 million upgrade. When we have looked on the Transforming Health site, there are capital works of just \$600,000 for Transforming Health.

The SPEAKER: I think that's the question. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:25): Roughly \$300 million has been spent at the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Mr Marshall: That's not what they're saying.

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Can the minister just confirm that in fact his department was wrong yesterday when they were out in the media saying that there will be a \$320 million transformation? What is the value of the capital works proposed for the Lyell McEwin Hospital?

The SPEAKER: The leader will not ask a question which invites a minister to confirm the accuracy of a media report. The member for Giles.

PORT AUGUSTA CABINET

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on the most recent country cabinet, in particular, the transport and infrastructure issues raised by local communities?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:25): Can I thank the member for Giles for his question—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and obviously his keen interest in this area. As the house is aware, the most recent country cabinet was held in Port Augusta and Leigh Creek, providing a valuable opportunity for ministers to speak directly to residents about the issues affecting their communities. In my portfolios of transport and infrastructure, I had the opportunity to speak to local residents and representatives about issues such as the state of local roads and services and opportunities for development into the future. As I am sure other ministers experienced, each location we visited provided various issues but also displayed strong local communities full of ideas on how their region could also be improved.

Working closely with the Minister for Regional Development, the member for Frome, we began the trip by sitting down for a discussion with Mayor John Rohde of Port Pirie, Mayor Sam Johnson of Port Augusta and the chief executive officer of the Upper Spencer Gulf Common Purpose Group, Anita Crisp. Key issues raised by these local government representatives included possible improvements to the main highways in and out of regional centres and further work on our key heavy vehicle routes in the Upper Spencer Gulf. I will continue to work with these local governments to build on the progress the state government has made, particularly in the agricultural transport sector with the completion of the government's 90-day project.

I was proud to stand up with the South Australian Livestock and Rural Transporters Association president David Smith in Port Augusta, together with ministers Bignell and Brock, to announce the \$36 million in benefits that have flowed through thanks to the government's reforms resulting from this report. Members would recall that I have recently discussed some of those initiatives in this chamber.

In Quorn, I had the chance to meet with the operators of the Pichi Richi heritage rail line, a hardworking volunteer group committed to the tourists and locals that visit this wonderful part of South Australia's railway heritage. I was able to discuss with them improvements in rail safety and what further work can be done to protect commuters and also local pedestrians while still providing this heritage tourist attraction for visitors.

In Parachilna, I was able to meet with Jane and Ross Fargher, owners of the Prairie Hotel, about the possibility of allowing light aircraft access to DPTI land that could be used as a landing strip. They advised of the substantial benefits they would expect for tourism and the local economy if they could achieve this, and I have asked my department to investigate the options to allow this to proceed.

In Leigh Creek, tourism and business leaders gathered to provide key ministers with their ideas on how a future community would look in this outback centre. Tourist coach services, freight transport and the Outback Loop were all raised as further areas for investigation and development. I would like to thank those community leaders and representatives for giving me and the other ministers their time.

In Leigh Creek, pastoralists stressed to me and the Premier the importance and benefits of upgrading and sealing—a project which I am glad the opposition has come finally to join with the government and advocate for, and that is the sealing of the Strzelecki Track, not only for locals but also for the national tourism and freight industries. As the house would be aware—

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, move a motion. As the house would be aware, the state government has submitted a list of projects to Infrastructure Australia previously, including the upgrading and sealing of the Strzelecki Track. I am pleased to see that the upgrade and the sealing of this track were included in Infrastructure Australia's most recent priority list as a priority initiative for funding.

The importance of this section of road to local residents and businesses was stressed to me, especially on meeting Kym Fort and Ben Fullagar, director and manager of the Innamincka Hotel. Both Kym and Ben outlined the benefits that an upgraded Strzelecki Track would have not only for businesses but also for local tourism. They offered their help and assistance, and they were particularly thankful for the initiative between the state and commonwealth governments to seal roads a kilometre in and out of Innamincka, reducing the dust burden on that community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is called to order and the member for Chaffey is very close to leaving for interrupting that answer from the minister, which uncharacteristically contained 100 per cent in order information. Leader.

LYELL MCEWIN HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Health. Is the minister aware that the Lyell McEwin emergency department was on bypass for five hours in a single day last week?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:30): I'm always very careful about the accuracy of information being provided by the opposition in this place. Obviously, operational things happen in hospitals every day of the week. I'm not necessarily informed of every single thing that happens in our hospital system. I'm more than happy to have a look.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Stuart. Leader—supplementary.

LYELL MCEWIN HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): How often is the Lyell McEwin emergency department on bypass?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:30): I'm more than happy to find out from my department and come back to the house.

LYELL MCEWIN HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Is the minister aware of the public statement made by the Australian Medical Association last week which states:

The Lyell McEwin was on bypass for 5 hours the day we visited and we are told that this is not at all unusual. Is it unusual for this hospital's emergency department to be on bypass? Yes or no?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31): If it was I'd have to check with the department and come back to the house.

LYELL MCEWIN HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary, sir: what is the procedure when the Lyell McEwin emergency department is on bypass?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31): The first thing I should say is the ambulance service uses a method called 'load levelling'. When an emergency department is busy in one hospital and another emergency department is not so busy, then the ambulances will sometimes bypass hospitals to take patients to an appropriate hospital. That is not unusual; in fact, I remember, the night a couple of years ago when I did a night shift with the ambulance service, it happened a couple of times. We had a patient in the back of the ambulance and we were referred to another hospital.

So, if that is what the oppositions mean by bypass, it is quite a frequent occurrence and a normal operational thing that happens in our hospitals, because we try to allocate activity on an equal basis between hospitals. If one hospital has very few patients and another hospital is very, very busy, then obviously for the good operational running of our hospitals we will divert the ambulance from the busy hospital to the less busy hospital if it's safe for the patient.

Obviously, patient safety always takes first priority, and if the patient is critically ill and needs immediate attention, then of course they'll go straight to the nearest hospital, but it's not unusual for an ambulance to not necessarily go to the closest hospital but to go to a less busy hospital. If that's what the AMA is referring to, my answer would be that it is a regular occurrence; it would happen on a regular basis.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, leader.

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Will emergency patients be able to be diverted to Modbury, given that the high dependency unit will be closed and emergency surgery terminated at that hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:33): I imagine they would if Modbury Hospital is able to deal with a particular presentation. Obviously, for serious, life-threatening type presentations, no; but for the vast majority of presentations, which Modbury Hospital continues to be able to deal with—and I think it would be in the realm of 90 to 95 per cent of the sorts of presentation which are currently presented at Modbury Hospital—they will continue to be able to be seen. And, yes, of course, if Lyell McEwin was busy there would be no reason whatsoever that an ambulance wouldn't be able to go on to the Modbury Hospital.

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Supplementary: if the patient is requiring emergency surgery—and we've confirmed that emergency surgery is closing at Modbury—which hospital will the patient be diverted to?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:34): If they have a life-threatening emergency, then they would go to the Lyell McEwin. As I said, if the Leader of the Opposition was listening—

Mr Marshall: They're on bypass. Do they just drive around until somebody can take them? Where are they going to go?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Leader of the Opposition needs to learn the art of listening to answers. What I said in the previous answer when I was explaining load levelling—what happens is that ambulances will not unusually be moved to a hospital where it is less busy. If they have a life-threatening illness, that will not happen; they would take them to the closest, most appropriate hospital. For example, a person who is critically injured or having a stroke would never be diverted; they would always be seen at the closest hospital. When we divert patients, it is always lower acuity patients where it is sensible to take them to an emergency department that is less busy. That is not unusual. That is the way our health system operates.

FLINDERS RANGES TOURISM

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can you provide an update to the house on tourism opportunities in the Flinders Ranges and outback?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:35): I thank the member for Light for the question. Tourism in the Flinders and outback contributes \$280 million to the local economy and directly employs 1,400 people. It is a vitally important industry and one that we are happy to support as a state government. In fact, at the moment, people who are tuning in and watching television would have seen the advertisement that we are running with the young boy in the back of the four-wheel drive being driven up to the Flinders Ranges, marvelling at the big blue sky, looking at those 560-million-year-old fossils that you can't see anywhere else in the world.

I guess it really brings home what many of us know already from our childhood experiences. It was almost a rite of passage to go to the Flinders Ranges on a school camp or with your parents for a holiday. It is a terrific place, and one where there is a tremendous spirit as well among those tourism operators. Also, the pastoralists out there realise that they play a really important role in tourism and the visitor economy.

In Leigh Creek, we met with a lot of pastoralists and tourism operators from around the area. It was terrific to have a forum there just to discuss a few of the ideas that we have. There are some concerns from people in the immediate vicinity of Leigh Creek with mining moving out of the town. We must remember that it was a company town run for the purposes, largely, of looking after the company's employees and not necessarily out there in the tourism industry.

With a wonderful asset, which has a supermarket, a great service station, a fantastic reservoir, swimming pool and sporting facilities, it would be a pity to waste all that. It would also be a great pity to waste the wonderful airstrip there that can accommodate jets and larger planes that could bring people into the Flinders Ranges and outback area, and then have people disperse to other parts of the Flinders Ranges and outback.

One of the ideas that we put to people at the meeting was the fact that we might change the name of the Leigh Creek Airport to call it the Flinders Ranges or the outback airport so that we actually marry up the name of the airport with the area that we spend a lot of money promoting around Australia and internationally.

Trevor Wright, of course, is probably one of the best known tourism operators in South Australia. I was very fortunate to have a wonderful flight over Lake Eyre with Trevor. I spoke to him about the possibilities and he says that it is a really growing market, particularly with the lower price of fuel. They are seeing more people fly in or drive in and then want to go on a flying trip with him. He has 15 planes. He likes the idea and he says that we should really promote it through the trade magazines in the aviation industry, so that is something that we will work on.

I think what we need to do with Trevor, too, is make him a champion of South Australian tourism. I know down in Tasmania Robert Pennicott has won 12 or 14 national tourism awards. I asked Trevor whether he ever enters them and he says, no, he's too busy running his business. I think we need to change that and work with operators like Trevor, and really help them to get onto the national stage. They are doing work that is of an international calibre and I think they should be recognised more than they have been in the past. We should be using him as one of our chief spruikers.

I also caught up with Laura Ragless at Beltana and had a look at their wonderful operation. Ross and Jane Fargher have been doing a tremendous job with the Prairie Hotel at Parachilna. Terence Coulthard has been very involved in Aboriginal tourism. The Pichi Richi volunteers do a tremendous job, and it was great to get out and have a look at their operation. When we were in Quorn, the member and the Minister for Regional Development turned the first sod on a wonderful new four-star accommodation that is being built by the Brown family. I want to thank Wendy, Rob and Sally for the tremendous work they do through Emily's Bistro: the best sausage rolls in Australia.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm the number and time frame for the general medical bed reduction across the two northern hospitals, the Lyell McEwin and Modbury?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:40): The first thing I would say to that is that the number of hospital beds will, in fact, increase as we move activity from central Adelaide to the northern suburbs. We know that almost half of the patients who come from the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network are unable to be treated in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network; they have to move to other areas of Adelaide. So, as we move activity from, principally, the Royal Adelaide Hospital and The Queen Elizabeth Hospital to the Lyell McEwin Hospital and the Modbury Hospital, across those two hospitals, after these changes are made there will be more beds.

Of course, as you change activity loads, particularly at the Modbury Hospital, and the type of patients and acuity of patients, that doesn't have an effect on the number of beds we need. I think we need to get out of the rhetoric of bed numbers and start talking about activity, because the patient doesn't really care how many beds there are in a hospital; what a patient cares about is, firstly, there being a bed when they need one. If we can achieve that with fewer beds then that is something we should achieve. The second thing we need to be talking about is the amount of activity. The result of these changes is that the Modbury Hospital will be seeing some thousands more additional patients every single year than they are currently seeing.

So, we will be able to do more, in fact, with less. There will be more patients going through the Modbury Hospital, and that means more patients from northern Adelaide will be able to be seen and treated in the northern suburbs, the way they are if you live in southern Adelaide or central Adelaide—more patients who live in northern Adelaide will be able to be seen and treated in northern Adelaide. I would have thought even the opposition would have to admit that has to be a good thing.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Can the minister perhaps explain to the house how many general medical beds there are across the two northern hospitals at the moment?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:42): I haven't got those exact numbers on me, of course, but, as I said, there will be more beds across those two hospitals as a result of these changes, as we move activity from central Adelaide to northern Adelaide, which is the next suite of reforms that have to happen. We have to move activity away from central to northern because there are many patients who live in the northern suburbs of Adelaide, like me, like the member for Florey, like the member for Ramsay, who have to travel into another part of metropolitan Adelaide to have their procedure or to be seen by a doctor or to stay in hospital. It is an inequity that there is such a significant disparity for patients who live in the northern suburbs as opposed to patients who live in other parts of Adelaide. These changes will address that inequity, and instead of almost—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —half of patients having to travel, we hope that with these changes in the northern suburbs it will be more like 80 per cent of patients who need treatment who live in northern Adelaide will be seen and looked after in northern Adelaide. I think that has to be a good thing for residents in the northern suburbs.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary: can the minister at least confirm, or clarify to the house, that there will be an increase in the number of general medical beds across the two northern hospitals?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:44): That's certainly my understanding. Let me make it clear: that is after

the changes with the transfer of activity from central Adelaide to northern Adelaide. Yes, my advice is that there will be more beds across those two hospitals after these changes because we have to move activity from central Adelaide to northern Adelaide and so beds will be moved as part of that.

But, as I say, we do need to change the political rhetoric; just talking about inputs in health will get us nowhere. I say that my side of politics is as guilty of this as the other side of politics. For too long the rhetoric in health has been about how many beds you have, how many doctors you have, and how many nurses you have, as if these things were in and of themselves a good thing. We really need to change the rhetoric and change the political debate. What people are interested in is there being a bed available for them when they need it and the amount of activity. If we can push through and have more activity happening in our hospitals than happens currently, that's an improvement. If we can do that with fewer beds we will.

The fact is that health care is changing and health care is very different from what it was 50 years ago. We don't need as many inpatient beds and, in fact, I think the biggest reduction in inpatient beds, from memory, happened the last time the Liberal Party were in office. That is not a criticism, because health care needs are changing. The predominance of day surgery has just increased exponentially. We want more people who are in palliative care to be able to receive that palliative care at home. It is a complete problem that we have too many dying patients who are dying in intensive care rather than dying in comforting surroundings at home or in their nursing home with family around them.

So, I make no apology for wanting to shift the way we talk about, and the way we conduct our health debate away from, inputs as if those inputs were in and of themselves a good thing, and to talk far more about how many patients are going through our system and how many people we are seeing, how many people are waiting in our emergency departments and how many people are waiting for elective surgery. And, on both those things, I am the first to admit, we don't do very well, despite the fact that we spend more than any other state, despite the fact that we have more hospital beds, more nurses, more doctors than any other state, yet we don't do very well and we should be doing much better in seeing people waiting for elective surgery and people waiting in emergency departments.

The answer is not to just throw more money at the problem as if that would automatically fix it. The answer is to improve and restructure our system to make it work far better than it currently does. These are the reforms that this government is determined to see through.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): Supplementary, sir: will the minister commit to coming back to the parliament this week to give us a clear picture of the number of general medical beds and surgical beds that exist currently at both Modbury and the Lyell McEwin Hospital, what it is going to be after Transforming Health and what the time frame for that transition is going to be?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:47): The problem with talking about bed numbers is not just, as I have already said—but, of course, our bed numbers—

Mr Marshall: You just said there is going to be an increase. The doctors are saying it is going to be reduced.

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —are always fluid; the number of beds that we have in the system changes day to day. We have as many beds as we need for the number of presentations that we have and the number of patients we can move through those beds and be seen. The Leader of the Opposition might not like it, but these are the facts and if, God forbid, the people of South Australia ever have to have a Liberal Party government, they will find this truth in government as well.

So, it is simply not the case: bed numbers are not a static thing frozen in time. We open and we close beds as we need them. We don't have a huge number of beds just sitting there idle. If we

don't have the presentations, then we close the beds; if we have a large number of beds, we open them. But, as I said, as we move activity from central Adelaide to northern Adelaide then the resources, including the beds, will follow that activity and, yes, overall, there will be more beds across those two hospitals than there are currently, because we are moving activity from central Adelaide to northern Adelaide.

Mr Marshall: When?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Leader of the Opposition interjects 'When?' Well, when we're ready.

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright.

LEIGH CREEK

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:49): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Minister, following last week's country cabinet, can you provide advice about the cultural opportunities in the Leigh Creek area?

The SPEAKER: The cultural attaché.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:49): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. As Minister for Health, it is always great to travel to our regions to hear firsthand from doctors, nurses and allied health employers in our country health system. As part of last week's country cabinet, I visited the Quorn and Leigh Creek hospitals where I met with staff, volunteers and members of the Health Advisory Council to discuss various issues affecting health care in their local communities.

One of the most heartening things I found during my time in Leigh Creek was the level of optimism shown by the local community, which is banding together and looking to increase alternative industries in the area. Last Tuesday I joined other members of the cabinet in visiting the historic Ediacara Fossil Site in my role as Minister for the Arts. The fossils in this site are the oldest known, complex animal fossils on the earth and range somewhere between 635 million and 542 million years old.

It was great to have Professor Jim Gehling from the South Australian Museum and Professor Mary Droser from the University of California give us a tour and provide us with an insight into the incredible importance of this site—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: And, yes, the Treasurer does point out that she flew out from the United States specifically to take the cabinet through.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Leader of the Opposition is very angry today, Mr Speaker. I don't know why he's angry. He's an angry young man.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I know why.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: You know why?

The SPEAKER: I call the Minister for Health to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Mr Speaker, while the scientific community has been involved with the area—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It's a great article.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for making a display.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: While the scientific community has been involved with the area since that great South Australian Reg Sprigg discovered the fossils in the 1940s, the tourism potential

of the site is something that is yet to be realised. I look forward to helping where I can to encourage interesting growth in this exciting area. In Leigh Creek one of the things that struck me—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —was how, since the closure of the mine was announced, quite a few businesses have closed, creating many empty shopfronts in the town centre. I am pleased to inform the house—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —that, with support of the Regional Development Fund, Arts South Australia, together with Country Arts SA and Alinta Energy, are creating a new Artist in Residence program, which will revitalise unused spaces in the town.

The program, which will start in April, will see three artists take up residence in Leigh Creek for up to four months to undertake a project inspired by the unique natural and cultural setting of the town and surrounding Flinders Ranges. The artists will undertake their own professional practice and will engage with the local community.

The expressions of interest for this project will open on 15 March, and I encourage members to promote and support this new initiative. Leigh Creek is such an important part of our state. I look forward to working with the rest of the government to provide opportunities to support this transitioning region.

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton.

Members interjecting:

DAVENPORT COMMUNITY

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:53): Sorry, sir, you took me by surprise. My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. Minister, what is the current status of Housing SA's investment within the Davenport community?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:53): I thank the member for Colton for his question. The Aboriginal community of Davenport is situated on Aboriginal Lands Trust land just north of Port Augusta. As a non-remote community, Davenport is eligible for housing investment to refurbish existing properties under the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing (NPARIH).

In June 2015 as Minister for Social Housing I executed an under-lease with Davenport, the Aboriginal Lands Trust and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, which has allowed Housing SA to invest in capital refurbishments and assume responsibility for both property and tenancy management in the community.

Last week I had the valuable opportunity to visit Davenport and meet the chair, Mr Malcolm McKenzie. I was very pleased to see firsthand the working partnership between the Davenport community and Housing SA. Together with the contracted builder this group is working to deliver improvements in the condition of properties and to provide high quality housing management and increased opportunities for economic participation by the residents of Davenport. Two Aboriginal residents from Port Augusta have been employed as a direct result of this investment. I also understand one contractor in Davenport is keen to engage a local Aboriginal apprentice.

I am encouraged by initiatives under development to establish work-for-the-dole activities within housing and community works later this year. Housing SA is working with the community development program provider and the community to identify specific projects. In particular, landscaping and streetscape improvements in Davenport will provide a significant community benefit and will equip more Davenport residents with skills and will connect people with local trades where

there are long-term opportunities to move into jobs. Over the next two years, a total of 36 houses will be refurbished in Davenport to the value of \$5.4 million, and I look forward to seeing the positive outcomes this investment will have on the community over time.

TRANSIT POLICE

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Does the minister stand by his written public statement, dated 29 January 2016, which claims there are 'now almost 100 transit police and more than 200 safety officers riding our public transport services'?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:56): I thank the member for Unley for his question about this; in fact, this is nearly a carbon copy of a question he asked me last sitting week. I confirm to the house what I confirmed back then, and that is the advice that I have, that we have made good our commitment in 2012 to increase the number of transit police by 28 funded positions.

He asked me for a particular figure and, given his recent performance where he has identified a number of police who attended work on one particular day and tried to represent that as being the full cohort of transit police, I am not going to engage in that. I have said to the house that I will seek what further information, if any, I can be provided with from the Minister for Police and provide that to the house accordingly.

TRANSIT POLICE

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:56): Does the minister stand by the policy commitment made by the Premier in February 2014 that, 'We have boosted the number of transit police to 114'?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:57): As I have said now twice, to this chamber and repeatedly in the media, the government has made a commitment to increase the number of transit police. I am advised that we have made good that commitment. We have increased the number of funded positions. The member for Unley is desperately trying to engage in an argument about numbers, and I am not going to engage in that debate.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir: the minister does not speak for the member for Unley.

The SPEAKER: I was about to uphold a point of order, but it did not come in the form of a point of order.

TRANSIT POLICE

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:57): A supplementary, sir: can the minister explain how he can tell the house that there has been an increase in the number of transit police when he confirmed his comments on 29 January 2016 that there were almost 100 transit police were correct and confirm the Premier's comments that there were 114 transit police in February 2014 were correct?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:58): I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I was listening closely, but could you repeat that question?

Mr PISONI: The question is: how can you claim that there has been an increase in transit police when you have just confirmed that there were almost 100 in February 2016, and the Premier's claims are that there were 114 in 2014?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Quite easily, because what I have repeatedly said both in this chamber and elsewhere is that we gave a commitment in 2012 to increase the funded number of transit police, and my advice is that we have made good—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier guarantee that local residents in and around my electorate and surrounding areas will not be out of pocket as a result of yesterday's significant water mains bursts?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:59): Well, we would certainly do everything we can to ensure that happens; we take seriously our responsibilities to the customers of SA Water. I know SA Water has made certain commitments about that: the first call, of course, is to work with those residents to identify their needs. I understand that emergency accommodation has been identified for a number of those affected residents and there is close engagement with each of the affected residents. Now we work with them, together with their insurance companies, to ensure that we meet the various costs as they arise. The first point of call is just to meet the needs of those people as they present themselves, and we're very much working towards that objective.

SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:00): Supplementary, sir: in the Premier's answer, he referred to those residents who have emergency accommodation. Can the Premier confirm that residents who have been forced out of their homes will, in fact, be supported with emergency accommodation for the duration until their homes have been repaired?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:00): That's a reasonably fair request, and I'll make sure that SA Water get an answer to the house very, very quickly.

SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:00): Supplementary, sir: will the cause of the burst be investigated, and who will undertake that investigation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:00): I'll seek a detailed answer from the Minister for Water and get back to the house.

PORT AUGUSTA CABINET

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Minister, can you provide details to the house on some of the innovative and community-minded schools you visited on the recent country cabinet visit?

Mr Pengilly: That's terribly leading.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the member for Finnis has a point. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:01): I was delighted to visit three schools during the recent country cabinet committee. Each of them brought something special to their community, and so I would like to briefly touch on each of them.

Quorn school has not only an extraordinarily good Stephanie Alexander kitchen garden, which is also a place used for working out some of the behaviour issues with some kids—so a very imaginative way of using outdoor space—but also separately, but adjacent, a bush tucker garden which has been built in combination with the local Aboriginal community, and an outdoor pizza oven decorated with the art of reconciliation by the kids; quite a magnificent suite of outdoor spaces for the kids. Not content with that, the parents group is also in the process of significantly upgrading the early childhood part of the school site—the early years—in order to have much more imaginative play spaces, but also to provide much-needed shade as everything gets hotter and drier in that part of the world.

They are also undertaking a project which has been in concert with the local Aboriginal community of creating seed bombs out of clay with wildflower and other plant seeds, which they then give to tourists to take up with them as they go further north to throw from the car, or to throw from

their hiking in order to regenerate a lot of the native vegetation around that area. It is a completely brilliant idea that the kids absolutely enjoy being physically part of creating, but also knowing that they are part of regenerating their local environment.

I then went to Hawker primary, which is a really very attractive primary school; incredibly well maintained, and extraordinarily polite kids. One of the kids who took me around is clearly destined to be a footballer. He is looking very seriously at getting into the state level, and he's interested, obviously, in moving on to AFL if at all possible—unfortunately for the wrong team, but we forgive these things; we're all South Australians.

The kids were terrific, and they asked the member for Giles and myself a number of searching and interesting questions about what it's like to be politicians. They, too, have an excellent kitchen garden, which is contributed to by all of the kids, and I was delighted to spend a bit of time with the younger kids doing their active play, which they do inside in air conditioning at this time of year. Nonetheless, it is extremely good for their fitness levels and their coordination.

They have a library, which is a shared library—and, in fact, so too did Quorn—where they have hooked into the local government network of libraries so that tourists can drop by either of those libraries, borrow a book, and drop it off later at another library in South Australia. That means that the schools are really acting, as we've often talked about, as a community hub; as a place for the rest of the community.

Finally, I revisited Leigh Creek Area School recently in November, with the member for Stuart. I was very pleased because when I was there in November I think it was about a week off the official closure and, to go back and see the school thriving, with far more enrolments than we anticipated—87 enrolments, which argues for a strong future for that school—was excellent. The spirit was very strong and the mood of the school was very good.

What I was there specifically to do was launch a book by George Ivanoff called *Remote Rescue*, which is one of a series of four he has written for primary school age kids about the Royal Flying Doctor Service, and we had a fellow from the RFDS there as well. The kids absolutely loved it. They loved hearing about the plane.

POLICE STAFFING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:05): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his election commitment to recruit a net additional 313 sworn police officers by June 2018?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:05): Yes, that is certainly our objective, and we are going to put—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and we will be putting the police commissioner in a position to allow him to make those decisions.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, that's not actually accurate. The election commitment that I have been asked about is the election commitment for this term of government, and it will be delivered.

POLICE STAFFING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:06): Supplementary, sir: given the Premier's answer, does the Premier agree with Commissioner Grant Stevens, who advised the Budget and Finance Committee that, currently, SAPOL will be able to afford to recruit only 120 of the 313 officers and that it would require an additional \$8 million per year in the SAPOL budget to achieve the 313 target?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:06): I am not going to canvass budget deliberations or the minutiae of the police budget in this forum. Suffice to say that it certainly

is the case that the police commissioner will be in a position to be able to meet the election commitment that we made. That is certainly the understanding I have. I have met with the police commissioner personally and we have discussed this matter. In those personal discussions he has led me to believe that he will have no difficulty in meeting that target.

POLICE STAFFING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:07): Supplementary: given the Premier's answer, can he confirm to the house his original commitment that the 313 net additional officers will be sworn police officers, excluding civilians and excluding cadets at the academy?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:07): I forget what the original commitment was, but we will be—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It doesn't sit within my portfolio, but the commitment that was made will be honoured, and I don't know whether the gloss that the—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: You need to actually compare notes. I know that those opposite don't talk—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is on the edge.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker, those opposite need to compare notes. I was being asked about whether we were going to keep an election commitment, not whether—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Don't tidy it up for him. It's embarrassing. We will keep the commitment that we made.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Is the minister aware that, yesterday afternoon, 10 mental health patients had been waiting in an emergency department for more than 24 hours: six at the Royal Adelaide and four at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:09): I thank the member for Davenport for his question and his ongoing interest in this portfolio. The issue of emergency departments and waiting times is actually a good story for this state. Over the recent period, we have had a continuous downward trend in this area. In regard to the arrangements yesterday, I spoke with the head of CALHN and the head of South Australia Health and impressed upon them the importance of meeting our targets moving forward, and I will continue to seriously monitor this space.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:09): Supplementary, sir: given yesterday's figures, was this the largest number of mental health patients waiting in an ED for more than 24 hours this year?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:09): I will go back and speak to the department and get some data.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:10): I think it was. Further supplementary: given that the government failed to achieve its goal of having no mental health patients wait more than 24 hours in an ED from 1 January this year, when will this goal be achieved?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:10): As I said, the government is continually monitoring this space. We have a good story to tell. The opposition fails to recognise the significant inroads we have made over recent months, and we continue to work with the department and stress on the department the importance of reaching our targets. We will endeavour to take this issue very seriously, as I know the Minister for Health has done over a number of months as well.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:10): My further question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Can the minister advise if full proceeds from the sale of Warinilla, the existing site of DAASA Central Services, will be used to help meet demands for alcohol and drug-related treatment and support in South Australia—and that is full proceeds?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:11): That is something I am happy to take on notice and talk to the department about.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:11): Supplementary, sir: how will the relocation of DAASA Central Services affect those seeking alcohol and drug-related treatment and support?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:11): The transfer of the new facility to Stepney is underway. I am looking forward to launching that shortly. I am going to talk to the department about the ongoing provision. As we always do, we will maintain our existing services and help the people who need help in this area, which is a critical area for South Australians. It is a whole-of-government approach and a whole-of-community approach. We take our efforts to help people who are suffering from the illness of an addiction very seriously.

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. What is the total cost of severance payouts for executives in the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, including Mr Rossi and Mr Elford, who were replaced as part of the department's recent reorganisation?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:12): I don't have those figures with me, but I am happy to look them up and provide them to the house.

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:12): Supplementary, Mr Speaker: can the minister let us know which budget that money is going to come out of? Is it going to come out of Treasury's budget or will it come out of the Premier's budget, or the departmental budget, for that matter?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:12): I am happy to provide that information to the house.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Disabilities. Will the government establish a sector development fund to assist providers of disability services to fully prepare for the full rollout of the NDIS and, if not, why not?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:12): Having come from the Disability Reform Council on Friday with the federal minister and state ministers attending, there are a number of issues that are being discussed in a national space. Workforce planning and the support of people who are moving into the contestable market were discussed, and we will be discussing it again in May.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:13): Again, to the minister as a supplementary: has the minister had any discussions with the local NDS committee regarding a sector development fund?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:13): I speak to not-for-profits, service providers, the department and consumers on a regular basis. They all have a variety of views, and we are endeavouring to support all of the community groups and organisations that are making changes in the way they deliver services as the NDIS reforms occur.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:13): Again, can the minister tell the house then what the government is doing and what the minister and her department are doing to help non-government providers of disability services to have a clear understanding of workforce demands and challenges, including recruitment, induction, career planning and flexible rostering under the NDIS?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:14): To start with the last point, rostering is a matter for those organisations that are in the not-for-profit sector. The government does not get involved in rostering. As far as the rest of the disability reform process that is underway, I continue to speak to consumers and their organisations and advocacy groups and people who are moving into this contestable space.

Workforce planning is certainly something that the government is looking towards. We have announced \$4 million in Look North for a disability training hub, where we are going to train people from the automotive and university sectors and anyone else who wants to move into disability services.

We know that there are around 6,300 jobs that will be coming into the sector that are additional. There are also significant contributions to be made from carers who will be moving back into the workforce and ensuring that they've got options as training—that's something we're looking at. We also know that for people with lived experience, people with disabilities, this is a world changing opportunity for them to engage in meaningful employment.

Grievance Debate

BRIGHT ELECTORATE VANDALISM

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:15): There is nothing worse in our community than a graffiti clad building overgrown with weeds, windows broken, fences falling over, attracting antisocial behaviour and a sense of foreboding. These buildings, all too often on major traffic thoroughfares, blight our communities, reducing their visual amenity and undermining civic pride.

What we see in the existence of these buildings is the broken window theory, where disrepair becomes the norm, triggering further vandalism and antisocial behaviour; and the downward spiral continues. The broken window theory states that maintaining and monitoring urban environments to prevent small crimes helps to create an atmosphere of order and civic pride which is self-fulfilling, lifting the amenity of communities, maintaining property values and a sense of belonging.

In February 2016, I commenced a local campaign to clean up unsightly buildings in my electorate. I targeted three buildings that were frequently raised by residents as being in such a state that they degraded our community. These buildings include one on Brighton Road, which extends back along Gregory Street in Brighton. Here we find a wall which has been covered in graffiti for several years, with additional graffiti spilling onto neighbouring private residential buildings and fences.

Further up Brighton Road at the corner of Stephenson Avenue is the old Mobil service station, which is by far the worst looking building in my electorate. The service station, the victim of a strategic commercial closure by a major South Australian private company a number of years ago, is in a state of extreme disrepair. It is covered with graffiti, overgrown by weeds, and has become a long-term parking lot for cars with 'for sale' signs on them. It sits in the midst of a beautiful coastal community and significantly damages the amenity of the surrounding area.

Graffiti and vandalism at this site have spread again into neighbouring private residential streets, as this sort of behaviour is normalised due to the former Mobil service station site. Moving further north, on Oaklands Road at Somerton Park, we find 64 Oaklands Road, a building owned by the Rawlings family, a forlorn looking site covered in graffiti tags, with broken windows and a generally unloved look.

As part of my campaign to fix up these buildings, I wrote to the City of Holdfast Bay seeking their partnership on this matter. The council in turn wrote to the building owners seeking urgent redress of these sites. I am delighted to report to the house today that the owners of the Gregory Street site have taken rapid action to fix up their property, and for the first time in many years the wall at the rear of the building is no longer a collection of graffiti tags but is in fact a bare wall. In many ways, this leaves a blank canvas for future vandalism, which is quite off-putting for some building owners to tackle, but equally it is important that building owners persevere with keeping buildings graffiti free, as I strongly believe that private owners have a civic responsibility to keep their buildings in a decent state.

Action has been less forthcoming at the Mobil service station and the Oaklands Road sites, but I hope the owners of both of these buildings rise to their civic responsibility and take action to clean up these buildings. I would like to thank South Brighton Neighbourhood Watch, led ably by community stalwart John Wallace, for joining me in this campaign, particularly in relation to the Gregory Street site at Brighton, which I know has been an issue for many members of the neighbourhood watch group for some time.

I have also been encouraged by the Marino Residents Association for joining me in this fight, and thank you to Des DeCean for his involvement in this. I am determined to continue this fight in the coming months, and will ensure that property owners and the council work with me to make these buildings more amenable for the community.

In particular, the Mobil service station on the corner of Stephenson Avenue is certainly a site that needs dramatic intervention. I will be looking at legislation that the council has and, if need be, will propose legislative amendments to this house to give councils the power to clean up these unsightly buildings and approach property owners for recompense.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:20): Happy International Women's Day everybody. I was honoured to participate in the launch of the second 'Let us be up and doing' exhibition on the pillars of Parliament House. I would like to thank all the members who came along to the launch yesterday. We really appreciate you being there, because I understand there were a number of competing meetings on at the same time.

With advice from Lisa Philip-Harbutt, artists Jennie Groom, Maya Graham and Megan Kerr have done a brilliant job in producing these beautiful portraits of what I call South Australian 'sheroes'. The exhibition was opened by Melissa Bailey and was supported by Jennie Groom, the Hon. Jing Lee MLC and with me as the person of ceremonies. I have to quote what Jing Lee said in her contribution. She wondered whether Mary Lee, who actually coined the term 'let us be up and doing', would have thought that 100 years later she as Jing Lee (no relative, she assured us) would be speaking as a member of parliament on the steps of Parliament House. I thought that was quite a good joke that she put forward, but she also made the point that we have made some progress.

The women who are depicted on the pillars of Parliament House include Mary Lee, as I have just said, who was instrumental in campaigning for South Australian women to be given the vote, the first in Australia. Catherine Helen Spence was another suffragist, but also the first Australian woman to stand for parliament in 1897 in the Federal Convention, but unfortunately she was unsuccessful. Deputy Speaker, you would be very aware that Muriel Matters is also depicted on our pillars. She was involved in a number of campaigns to do with the enfranchisement of women and was famous for being the first woman to unofficially speak in the British House of Commons by chaining herself to the grille in the Ladies' Gallery. I should also tell you that in 1924 she was a Labour candidate for the seat of Hastings. Unfortunately, she was unsuccessful in gaining that seat.

We also have Susan Grace Benny. I am sure the member for Bright will be interested that she was the first woman to be elected in local government in Australia, and that was in 1919. We

have Dame Nancy Buttfild OBE, who was the first South Australian woman to enter federal parliament as a senator for the Liberal Party. She was there from 1955 to 1965 and then 1968 to 1974.

We also have Joyce Steele, the first South Australian woman to be elected into the House of Assembly from the Liberal and Country League. Jessie Cooper was the first South Australian woman to be elected into the Legislative Council from the Liberal and Country League in 1959. Despite the fact that we were the first place for women to be able to stand for parliament, it took until 1959 for that to actually be realised.

We recognise Lenore Bishop. I know the member for Mount Gambier will know that she was the first woman mayor in South Australia, and we are looking forward to celebrating her contribution. We also recognise Kay Brownbill OBE, who in 1966 was the first South Australian woman to be elected into the House of Representatives, and she was a member of the Liberal Party. Janine Haines was the first South Australian Democrats woman to be elected in the Senate in 1977. We recognise Ruby Hammond as the first South Australian Aboriginal woman to seek election for the federal seat, again unsuccessfully, in 1988.

I would like to mention that we were very pleased to have Molly Byrne OAM, the Hon. Anne Levy AO, the Hon. Rosemary Crowley AO, Elizabeth Harvey, Natasha Stott Despoja AM and Dr Felicity-ann Lewis as trailblazers, who could actually turn up yesterday to our celebration. I urge members to go out to the front of Parliament House and have a look at the exhibition we have there and, please, encourage people over the next two weeks to view it also.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is until 20 March, is that correct, member for Ashford?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And it is a 24/7 installation, I understand.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: It is a 24/7 installation, thank you, Deputy Speaker.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:25): I rise today to speak about International Women's Day and some of the amazing women in my community and my life. International Women's Day is a global day celebrating the social, economic, cultural and political achievements of women. The day also makes a call to action for accelerating gender parity.

I am lucky and privileged to have many strong influential women in my life, starting with my mother, who has had the biggest influence on me. She is a woman who worked hard to raise her family, grow a business to support her family and also give back to the community through numerous charity groups, from establishing a Meals on Wheels in the Quorn region (when we lived in the country) to her work in the disability, aged care and Indigenous sectors as well. My wife and two daughters have a similar strength. They all show wonderful leadership and compassion and give very generously to our community through coaching, school leadership and regular blood donation. I have other family members who display the same attributes, as do the three female members of my working team: Emma Andrew, Allison Mildren and Jasmine Pollock.

In my community there are a number of groups that display these similar qualities, and I would like to mention the Marion VIEW Club, which supports the voice, interests and education of women. The current president is Shirley Jenner, vice president is Vera Cornell and the secretary is Jill Cunningham. Last Friday, the Marion VIEW Club held a community fundraiser at the Marion Hotel. Eleven VIEW clubs attended from around the state, as well as ladies from bowling clubs, Red Hatters and book clubs. In all, 175 guests joined together to raise funds and enjoy lunch. Next Friday, the Marion VIEW Club will celebrate its 14th birthday. They do some marvellous work, raising funds for The Smith Family charity, helping those less fortunate receive an education. I have been along to their functions on a number of occasions and they are incredibly welcoming and do wonderful work in the community.

I am also very proud to work with a number of female school principals in my electorate: Kathryn Entwistle, the principal of Darlington Primary School, is on leave at higher duties at the moment. The acting principal there is Jo Miller, and she is doing an outstanding job. Jenny Englehardt

is the principal at Sheidow Park Primary School. Jo Meredith is the acting principal at Reynella South Primary School, again doing an outstanding job as she fills in for the regular principal, Barb Hall, who has also been elevated to a new posting. Penny Tranter is the principal at Seaview High School.

I was pleased to see seven female year 11 and 12 Seaview High School students participate in the 'Hydro-powering a better future' challenge at Flinders University Tonsley campus on Thursday 3 March as part of the STEM program, which encourages children to get involved in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. At present, only 34 per cent of graduates in science, technology, maths and engineering are women, and it is wonderful to see Seaview High School, led by their principal, doing everything they can to grow those numbers.

The Reynella Neighbourhood Centre is another group that is actively involved in the Days for Girls project, which creates a more dignified, free and educated world through access to feminine hygiene solutions. Recently, the neighbourhood centre held a sewing bee project where 340 liners were sewn and 60 kits were packaged and are now ready to be sent to Timor Leste very soon. Four Days for Girls events have been run through the Reynella Neighbourhood Centre this year, with volunteers helping to make liners and bags for girls in Cambodia, Congo, Nepal and Timor Leste. Thank you to all the people who took part. They are just some of the great women in my community. Unfortunately, I don't have time to mention more on this occasion, but I look forward to working with more of them into the future.

We have some brilliant women in our community, and on this day it is important to recognise their achievements, but it is also important to address the gender equity issue. There are three accelerators that can either work independently or together to change the trajectory of women's advancement. They are:

1. illuminate the path to leadership by making career opportunities more visible to women;
2. speed up culture change with progressive corporate policy, such as paternity leave and flexible working; and
3. build supportive environments and work to eliminate conscious and unconscious bias.

These are areas that I am very passionate about, as I said. More specifically, having young daughters myself, I see it as something we need to work towards and, as a community, I think this is a great direction to take.

NORTHERN ECONOMIC PLAN

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:30): When I first came into this place, I spoke about my close personal connections to Holden—my dad, my uncle, brothers-in-law and numerous cousins and friends all worked at Holden at one stage or another—and I spoke at length about its place in the fabric of the northern suburbs. In that first speech I also said that jobs for families in the north and north-east will always be my first priority, and that commitment could not be any more important than right now when the north faces an important turning point as Holden continues its slow wind-up of operations in South Australia.

This is obviously a challenge as the economic landscape changes forever, and it has to be said we have seen some less than encouraging employment figures in the northern suburbs in recent times. But, as you know, Deputy Speaker, we in the north are rallying. We have seen a renewed urgency and a renewed commitment not only from this state government but from local government, local businesses large and small, and the wider community. We are seeing more than ever a spirit of cooperation in the face of what are significant challenges.

Last month the Premier and minister Maher, in partnership with businesses, and with the mayors of Playford, Salisbury and Port Adelaide Enfield, launched the Northern Economic Plan. This is the culmination of wide consultation, seeking ideas from those who live, work, manufacture, grow and trade in the northern suburbs. The plan sets the broad parameters for a way forward for the northern suburbs building on strengths that are already present and identifying opportunities into the future. The north represents 16.5 per cent of gross state product, it is the home to more than

300 construction companies, it is the centre for the defence industry and it has a huge and growing potential as a centre for health industries and clean green food manufacturing and value adding.

The Northern Economic Plan is, at its heart, about jobs and jobs for locals. The plan identifies the possible areas for growth and support as construction and urban renewal; health, ageing and disability; agriculture, food and beverages; defence; mining equipment and technology; and tourism, recreation and culture. The plan, as I said, is all about supporting businesses to create jobs, and it is my job and the job of other northern MPs to do what we can to see that locals get those jobs, which is why I am particularly excited to be working on the jobs task force around the Northern Connector project, and I want to thank the minister for his support in that role.

The Northern Connector, for those who do not know, is a billion dollar piece of road infrastructure funded jointly by the federal and state governments, connecting the South Road Superway and the Northern Expressway. It is an essential piece of infrastructure for commuters and for businesses in the northern suburbs and, indeed, further north. But, more than that, it is a huge potential source of jobs and training in the north, and a much needed economic driver in that region.

It is vital that we capitalise on this investment by ensuring local people and local contractors are the ones who build it, supporting the economy in the north. The project will support nearly 500 jobs per year on average throughout construction, including many training places, and it is my job and my absolute intention to ensure that at least half of these jobs go to people who live in the northern suburbs.

I intend to do this and, indeed, have already started to do this by establishing connections between workers and businesses operating in the north and the successful contractor; by working with the northern councils, the education sector, job networks and trade development groups; by working with the Holden Transition Team and Beyond Auto to make sure that skilled auto workers are able to translate their skills across; and by working with the construction sector and training providers in establishing the connections to ensure that local people who need the jobs get those jobs.

Importantly, this all needs to be closely monitored to make sure we are on track. I intend to work with the successful contractor with DPTI and the Office of the Industry Advocate to make sure that, once those connections are established, they are transformed into real on-the-ground jobs for local people. As well as this focus on northern suburbs jobs, the project is subject to the South Australian Industry Participation Policy, which means that all tenderers are required to submit an industry participation plan, which includes the requirement that a minimum of 20 per cent of the total labour hours is to be carried out by apprentices and trainees, Aboriginal workers and people facing barriers to employment.

It is clear that Elizabeth and the northern suburbs generally have been facing challenging times recently, particularly in light of the closure of Holden and its impact on the local economy, but my overarching goal is to see Elizabeth become once again the vibrant working-class community that I grew up in, that is, a place where kids aspire to meaningful work and aspire to raise their own families in the north and in turn give back to the community. I want to ensure that projects like the Northern Connector support jobs for local people and therefore support the local economy.

Time expired.

GLENELG POLICE STATION

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:35): There is a web page on the South Australia Police website titled Finding Your Local Police Station. Well, let me tell you, that is going to get harder and harder under this government. The Glenelg Police Station is a vital facility in Glenelg. When I started as the member for Morphett in 2002 we had a patrol base down there, and I remember that on my first electorate flyer introducing me was a photograph with about six or seven police cars behind me at that Glenelg Police Station.

Now, I admit that it was the Liberal government that moved that patrol base from there to the Sussex Street shopfront, but let me say that, while we do not have the patrol base anymore, the police station is an absolutely vital part of the Glenelg business district, and I will give you some reasons why. Glenelg is one of the two declared tourist zones in South Australia, and I am very proud

to say that, from my office in Byron Street, I have 106 restaurants and cafes within walking distance of my office and try to do them all justice.

Glenelg North is, I think, one of the most densely populated parts of South Australia. Depending on the figures you look at, about one million visitors a year come down to Glenelg. What is the government proposing to do by cutting police budgets, which it has done for many years now? It is getting harder and harder for police to do their job, forcing the police into a position where they are having to reduce services.

It is this government's and it is this minister's responsibility. John Hill said it. He said, 'The buck stops with me' when he was health minister. Well, let me tell every minister in here that they are accountable. There is ministerial accountability, and the buck stops with the police minister. He may be in the other place, but the buck stops with him.

With respect to my electorate of Morphett and Glenelg, I will not rest until we get the services we deserve down there and have those services being maintained. We will not accept a reduction in police attendance and police opening hours down there. The website says 7.30 till 10pm seven days a week. I understand it is 8.30am until 10pm seven days a week. What do they want to do? They want to change it to nine till five, five days a week.

Look, I will be a conciliatory person here. You could go nine to five during the winter time seven days a week because it is cooler down there, and you might want to keep extended hours on the weekend, but anything less than that is completely unacceptable. It is not acceptable at all, and I proved that. I distributed petition forms around my electorate on Friday last to the pubs, the clubs and to all the businesses on Jetty Road, and let me tell you, they are already phoning me to get more sheets. I gave them probably half a dozen sheets each. They are phoning me to get more sheets to have more petitions signed to have this government realise what it is doing, the mistake it is making, in reducing the hours of the Glenelg Police Station.

Originally the Sussex Street police station was set up, and, again, there was a real issue. The police who were there were considered 'no offender contact'. They were just behind the counter. I understand that they were either women police officers who were pregnant or other police officers who were on WorkCover or on restricted duties—'no offender contact'.

Well, that was completely unsatisfactory. I lobbied hard with the then police minister to make sure that we had police officers who were fit to get out and about if they were needed from behind those counters down there. The police officers who are down there now are just not the police officers at the Glenelg Police Station: they are part of the community, they go out on the beat, they go up and down the street, they know the people, they know the businesses and the businesses know them. They have terrific relationships there.

We will not accept anything less than what we have got now. We want police down there, we need police down there. The people of Glenelg and the visitors who come down there deserve to have some point of contact. The Find Your Police Station website says that you can go in and do crash reports, get crime prevention advice, crime reports, firearms licence and registrations, freedom of information requests, intervention orders, lost property, missing person reports, police record checks, national police certificates, suspicious behaviour reports, vehicle defects and complaints or compliments about a police service.

Let me tell you that one of the things they would be getting most is compliments about police service because they are doing an exceptional job. It is a very busy station, to the point where my office does a roster of justices of the peace because the police station is very busy, not just with receiving compliments but all these other things. There is nothing worse than what this government wants to do, and that is reduce services again to the people of Morphett, the people of Glenelg and the visitors who come down there. It is completely unacceptable, and I will not stop until they realise the error of their ways.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:40): I rise today to speak about International Women's Day (IWD). International Women's Day (or as it was originally called, International Working Women's Day)

is marked each year on 8 March. It was first celebrated as a tribute to working women and it provided an opportunity to raise issues about pay and conditions, as well as women's rights more generally.

In honouring our women forebears, I pay tribute to union women who fought the earliest of fights for decent pay and conditions. Those women had a strong influence over the formation of this day and continue to play a pivotal role in our women's movement. IWD is important for many reasons. It is a time to reflect on past political, social, economic and cultural achievements and to consider how we can work together to achieve equality for women in all areas of life in our local communities and across the globe.

On IWD we reflect on how far we have come and focus on how far we still have to go. Over the past week alone we have seen a fiery response to the notion that perhaps the time for our Clipsal grid girls has passed. Yes, women absolutely have the right to choose what they wear, where they wear it and the sort of work they do, but let us not pretend that when an event has only male competitors and that women only get on the winner's podium to present trophies and kiss the place getters that this is in any way empowering or focused on promoting women in sport.

Our sports minister rightly remarked that perhaps young sporting hopefuls of both genders could get behind the wheel and replace scantily clad women historically found on the side of the track. I commend minister Bignell for his statements, for his support for women in sport and women sporting events like the Australian Women's Open and Tour Down Under, and I commend journalists Petra Starke and Ali Clarke for their comments over the weekend about this issue.

I cannot wait to see women behind the wheel at Clipsal—in fact, I would love to get behind the wheel of one of those cars myself—and I cannot wait to see more outrage about issues for women in sport like pay inequity and a lack of media coverage. Whenever we promote women and create role models—whether that be in sporting life, our parliaments, workplaces or anywhere else—we empower women.

On this IWD, we must recommit to ensuring that our community make up is reflected in the make up of our parliaments, in all leadership positions and in all other places so that girls and young women are able to aspire to and succeed at doing whatever they have their heart set on. I am very proud that last month the SA branch of our Labor Party historically resolved to ensure 50 per cent women's representation in our parliaments by 2025. A resolution that through its enactment will make a real difference to many women political aspirants, and our parliament and our community will be better for it.

However, it is hard to mark IWD without turning our minds to the many ongoing issues that we confront. More than one woman per week in Australia now dies at the hands of a partner or former partner and more than 1 billion women across the globe experience sexual and/or physical violence during their lifetime. As women working in female dominated industries continue to experience pay inequity, our Australian gender pay gap remains at about 18 per cent. Reproductive choice and sex work remain subject to criminal penalties in South Australia, and an estimated 31 million girls of primary school age around the world are prevented from attending school.

Yes, we have achieved much but we have much to do. This year the IWD theme is 'Planet 50-50 by 2030: step it up for gender equality' as a statement about the equal place women must take in all areas of society. Here in South Australia we can celebrate our government's new women's economic empowerment blueprint and the fact that we still have the largest IWD event in Australia—a breakfast for UN women hosted by Senator Penny Wong.

Over 2,400 women and men gathered to listen to the fabulous Fran Kelly last Friday to discuss the F word, feminism. She spoke passionately about the need for everyone who believes in women's equality to claim that title and that, with so much still to do, we must. She posed a question to us all: 'if you've only got a certain number of fighting hours in you, what are you going to use them for?' I look forward to using my fighting hours to achieve equality for all.

I look forward to celebrating International Women's Day at this evening's rally inspired by Peter Dutton's statement about a female journalist being a witch, as well as another adjective which would not be considered parliamentary language. I also very much look forward to honouring women

in our southern community, in Reynell, at my annual International Women's Day dinner and community awards.

Happy International Women's Day to you all, and thank you to the many women and men in this house, and across our South Australian communities, who have done so much to advance women's rights over many years. I look forward to continuing the fight for equality with you all.

Bills

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 13.

The CHAIR: We are looking at amendment No. 13 on schedule 1 in the name of the member for Adelaide: clause 13, page 13, line 35.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 13 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 13, line 35 [clause 13(7), penalty provision]—Delete '\$20,000' and substitute '\$10,000'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is accepted.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 14.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 14 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 13, line 37 [clause 14(1)]—Delete 'The' and substitute 'Subject to subsection (1a), the'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is not supported. The fundamental principle of this legislation is to protect all members of the community from health and safety risks that are present in residential buildings.

Ms SANDERSON: This was part of the suite of amendments that were related to the owner/occupier being excluded, which the government has indicated they will not be supporting, so I have no further questions on this matter.

The CHAIR: The member for Schubert is looking very keen to contribute.

Mr KNOLL: I am. Can the minister advise how many buildings have actually been demolished? Again, if you have a time line that would be wonderful.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As I am advised, on recent history, no buildings have been demolished, but I will take that on notice to come back to you—given that this bill has been around for 76 years.

Amendment negated.

The CHAIR: Amendment No. 15 on schedule 1 is consequential, so we are not proceeding. Are you happy with that?

Ms SANDERSON: Yes.

The CHAIR: That brings us to amendment No. 16, clause 14, page 14, line 22.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 16 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 14, line 22 [clause 14(4), penalty provision]—Delete '\$20,000' and substitute '\$10,000'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is accepted.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 15.

Mr KNOLL: I am keen to understand, and, I must admit, I missed, in the flurry of figures that the minister provided before, the number of houses that are under rent control. Am I right that it is about 1,400? Is that figure about right?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes.

Mr KNOLL: Does the minister have any understanding of whether the number of houses under rent control is increasing or decreasing over time? Is there a permanent pool of houses that will be subject to rent control because people are not going to upgrade them, or is this number falling over time? Is there a consistent trend?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As we said before, 1,409 properties have rent control. Obviously, there is a churn from time to time but this is, on average, what we would expect, or have seen in the past.

Mr KNOLL: So it is fairly consistent: we have not seen an increase or decrease in the number of houses, roughly?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As I am advised.

Clause passed.

Clause 16 passed.

Clause 17.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 17 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 16, line 32 [clause 17(3)(c)]—After 'residential tenancy agreement' insert:

under which rent is payable

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is not supported. Clause 4, page 7, already provides the definition of 'residential tenancy agreement' which is:

...an agreement under which a person grants another person, for valuable consideration, a right (which may, but need not, be an exclusive right) to occupy residential premises...

The amendment is not supported.

Mr KNOLL: If there is a little bit of licence taken, I think this could be my last question. We were talking earlier about the office and the fact that there are seven permanent staff who look after this area. Can the minister provide any detail whether these officers administer provisions under any other bill? What I am trying to get at is: is there other work that these people undertake outside of administering the types of controls we have been talking about today?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As I am advised, obviously the three officers do entirely that, as with the administration officers. As I am advised, the manager of the unit, however, also looks after the NPAH (National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness) contract.

Mr KNOLL: To elaborate on that area, does the department outsource to local government any of this work? You said before that 40 per cent of the houses are outside metropolitan Adelaide. Does the government contract out to local councils to undertake some of this inspection work of rent control properties on their behalf?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As I am advised, we do not currently contract out to local government. However, we do heavily liaise with them. The act as it stands now does not enable us to contact a private provider to provide this work. However, the bill does. It would be, for example, someone like a building certifier who we believe would be able to support us with efficiency and effectiveness to do our recognition.

The CHAIR: Your question needs to be about the amendment. If you want to ask questions generally about the clause, it needs to be done afterwards. We have given you leeway.

Mr KNOLL: Certainly, and if I can have one more leeway then I will leave everybody alone.

The CHAIR: That will be the end of you for clause 17 then, because we are giving you lots of leeway.

Mr KNOLL: How often are inspections undertaken? As in, if we say the 1,400 properties under rent control, how often on average would these properties be inspected?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We will come back to the member for Schubert with some exact details about those inspected. There is an annual survey of all those under rent control and then a proportion of those will be inspected, but I will take on notice to come back to you with the mechanism of how that works.

The CHAIR: Any further questions on the amendment?

Ms SANDERSON: Yes, I do. Clause 17, page 17, line 5—

The CHAIR: You are moving off the amendment then. I am being reminded I must bring everybody back to the actual amendment and general discussion on the clause will be later. So, is there any question on amendment No. 17?

Amendment negatived.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 18 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 17, lines 6 to 7 [clause 17(4), penalty provision]—Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty: \$2,500.

Expiation fee: \$210.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is accepted.

Amendment carried.

Ms SANDERSON: My question relates to clause 17, page 17, lines 4 to 7. Subclause (4) states:

A landlord who is given notice under subsection (3)(c)(iv) must ensure that any rent received by or on behalf of the landlord in respect of the premises is forwarded to the Minister within 14 days.

I just question the government's payment policy of having to pay people within 60 days (their suppliers) and how fair it is to expect a 14-day payment when in reverse.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As I am informed, this clause reflects similar considerations in the Residential Tenancies Act.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 18.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I move:

Amendment No 1 [SocHousing-2]—

Page 17, lines 23 to 29 [clause 18(1)]—Delete subsection (1) and substitute:

- (1) If the requirements of a housing assessment order, housing improvement order or housing demolition order are not complied with, any tenant or registered mortgagee or encumbrancee of the premises to which the order applies may take such action required by the order as may be authorised by the Minister.

The opposition's amendment removed the wording 'Residential Tenancy Act' which may limit the application of the clause where there are multiple tenant arrangements. The clause is to address circumstances where an order is not complied with and a registered mortgagee encumbrances or tenant seeks authorisation from the minister to take such action.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 19 and 20 passed.

Clause 21.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 20 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 18, line 33 [clause 21(1)]—Delete 'occupiers' and substitute 'tenant'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is not supported.

Amendment negated.

The CHAIR: Member for Adelaide, is it your intention not to proceed with your amendments 21 and 22?

Ms SANDERSON: Yes. I move:

Amendment No 23 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 19, line 1 [clause 21(2)(e)]—Delete 'if the premises are occupied under a residential tenancy agreement'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is not supported.

Amendment negated.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 24 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 19, line 16 [clause 21(4), penalty provision]—Delete '\$5,000' and substitute '\$2,500'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is supported.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 22.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 25 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 19, line 18 [clause 22(1)]—Delete 'occupiers' and substitute 'tenants'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is not supported.

The CHAIR: Member for Adelaide, any further discussion?

Ms SANDERSON: The reason I am bringing this up again in reference to owner-occupiers is because this gives the tribunal the power to make an order for ejection from a home or compensation. Again, I think it is unfair for an owner-occupier to be ejected from their home. If it is because it needs to be demolished or if they are in grave danger, that is one thing, but that would be covered under building codes, development acts, the health act and many other acts. However, if it is simply because they are undergoing minor works, as I discussed in my second reading speech regarding this bill, I think it is completely unfair to be forced out of your home because it does not comply with the standards that this government seeks to enforce.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is not supported. I think we have made it very clear about safety being at the forefront. Whether an owner-occupier or a tenant, safety and the structural safety of your home has to be paramount.

Amendment negated.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 27 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 19, lines 22 to 23 [clause 22(2)]—Delete 'If premises in respect of which a notice to vacate has been issued have been occupied under a residential tenancy agreement, the Tribunal may, on application by the tenant' and substitute:

The Tribunal may, on application by a tenant

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is not supported.

The CHAIR: Any discussion?

Ms SANDERSON: No, that is fine.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 23.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 28 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 20, line 5 [clause 23(5), penalty provision]—Delete '\$2,500' and substitute '\$1,250'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is supported.

Amendment carried.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 29 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 20, line 8 [clause 23(6), penalty provision]—Delete '\$2,500' and substitute '\$1,250'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is supported.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 24 passed.

Clause 25.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 30 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 21, lines 27 to 28 [clause 25, penalty provision]—Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty: \$2,500.

Expiation fee: \$210.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is supported.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 26 passed.

Clause 27.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 31 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 22, lines 37 to 38 [clause 27, penalty provision]—Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty: \$1,250.

Expiation fee: \$160.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is supported.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 28 passed.

Clause 29.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 32 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 24, line 4 [clause 29(4), penalty provision]—Delete '\$2,500' and substitute '\$1,250'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Amendment 32 is supported.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 30.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 33 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 24, lines 18 to 19 [clause 30, penalty provision]—Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty: \$2,500.

Expiation fee: \$210.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is supported.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 31.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 34 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 24, lines 26 to 27 [clause 31(1), penalty provision]—Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty: \$2,500.

Expiation fee: \$210.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is supported.

Amendment carried.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 35 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 24, lines 38 to 39 [clause 31(2), penalty provision]—Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty: \$2,500.

Expiation fee: \$210.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is supported.

Amendment carried.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 36 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 25, lines 4 to 5 [clause 31(3), penalty provision]—Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty: \$2,500.

Expiation fee: \$210.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is supported.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 32 passed.

Clause 33.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 37 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 25, line 33 [clause 33(1)]—After 'residential premises' insert 'that are occupied under a residential tenancy agreement'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is not supported.

Amendment negated.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 38 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 25, lines 35 to 36 [clause 33(2)]—Delete ', in the case of residential premises that are occupied under a residential tenancy agreement'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is not supported.

Amendment negatived.

The CHAIR: We are now looking at amendment No. 39 to clause 33 on schedule 1. Do you still want to move that?

Ms SANDERSON: It is superfluous.

The CHAIR: So, you are not proceeding.

Clause passed.

Clauses 34 to 40 passed.

Clause 41.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 40 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 28, lines 35 to 36—Delete 'if requested by a person affected by a decision of the Tribunal, where written reasons have not been given' and substitute 'in all cases'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We are not supporting this amendment. In fact, I thought we were not going ahead with it, but that is okay. The amendment is not supported. It seeks to impose a requirement on SACAT to produce written reasons for a decision in all cases. The clause states that written reasons will be provided if requested by a person affected by a decision of the tribunal. This is consistent with the current practice of SACAT in relation to other enabling legislation. It supports SACAT's approach to provide efficient judicial practices. The bill is not intended to produce differing procedures. Reasons for decisions are provided verbally at the hearing. This, combined with the provision of the orders made by SACAT in writing, is often sufficient for the parties.

Where a matter is complex or the reasons for decision cannot be sufficiently explained orally, SACAT will usually publish written reasons. As previously advised, SACAT must provide written reasons for decisions on request. Where a party to the proceedings is from a non-English speaking background, SACAT can arrange for interpreters at hearings and can provide parties with a copy of the transcript on request. It is also consistent with the requirements of tribunal members under the Residential Tenancies Act 1995, section 39. The amendment is not supported.

Ms SANDERSON: Yes, I am sorry, I agreed that I would not bring that forward. However, I wanted to speak on this amendment, so it will have the same effect. The reason that I suggested an amendment to this is because there are so many people in South Australia who have English as their second language. I have had many people come to my electorate office—even when they have been given letters or information, particularly about heritage listing of their home or different development things—when they completely misunderstand what they have been told. I feel that if they are given it only verbally and they do not know, they could go away with a completely different idea in their mind of what has actually happened.

However, I am told that that is standard, and they can ask for it to be put in writing afterwards, and there are interpreters available if requested. I hope that all of them know that going in, so that they know to ask for it in writing because it is a common problem in my electorate. We have a lot of Italian, Greek, Chinese and Indian people in particular—Indian people speak very good English, I must say—but particularly older Italians and Greeks often bring in mail to my office for me to help them read, interpret and understand, so that was the idea behind requesting that in writing.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 42 to 43 passed.

Clause 44.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 41 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 30, line 12 [clause 44, penalty provision]—Delete '\$15,000' and substitute '\$7,500'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is supported.

Amendment carried.

Ms SANDERSON: Just to put on the record, the reason for the amendment (which the government has accepted) is that we have halved all of the penalties because there was such a huge increase from the previous \$100 fine, right up to \$15,000 in this case, which we thought was extraordinarily high, so I thank the government for accepting all those amendments.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 45.

Ms SANDERSON: Some discussion on this section: it states in here that there will be a website. At the moment all of the different houses that are subject to orders are printed in the *Gazette* on a monthly basis, which is very difficult to keep track of, and there is no central place that you can go to get a listing of all the houses. If you were purchasing a house, it would be harder to find out if there was an order placed over that house, so I welcome the government's idea of having a register.

I question how much that would cost to access that information, if any fee structures have been worked out. I think it is probably free if you own the house, but if you are an investor or somebody looking at purchasing homes, how would you find out? There is also the question of people who might be fleeing domestic violence or in a situation where they do not want their homes to be on a register so that people know where they are. What information is on that register?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I thank the member for Adelaide for her question. We expect that the website will be up in the short term. There will be no cost to look up if there is a property on there, but there will be no identification about the owner of the property or the tenant.

Ms SANDERSON: One further question: line 30 states:

A member of the public may, on payment of a fee fixed by regulation obtain a copy...

Are you saying now that it is actually free?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As in many situations, if it is off the website it is free, if you wanted it printed out and sent to you, as I am advised, there is a cost.

Clause passed.

Clause 46.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 42 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 31, line 3 [clause 46(3), penalty provision]—Delete '\$10,000' and substitute '\$5,000'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is supported.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 47 and 48 passed.

Clause 49.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 43 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 31, line 31 [clause 49(3), penalty provision]—Delete '\$2,500' and substitute '\$1,250'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is supported.

Amendment carried, clause as amended passed.

Clause 50.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 44 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 31, line 35 [clause 50(1)(a)]—Delete ', subtenant or occupier' and substitute 'or subtenant'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is not supported.

Amendment negated.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 45 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 32, line 19 [clause 50(2)]—Delete 'occupiers,'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is not supported.

Amendment negated.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 46 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 32, line 21 [clause 50(2)]—Delete 'them' and substitute:

those persons, provided that reasonable attempts have been made to locate, and effect service on, each of the other relevant persons

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is accepted. This clause relates to the service of notice or orders on a person, and the government agrees to the amendment on the basis that all reasonable attempts will be made to effect service orders and notices on relevant persons.

Ms SANDERSON: The reason that I put this forward was in the instance of multiple landowners, people who are separated and might be interstate but there have not been property settlements, so I think it is quite important that reasonable attempts are made to contact everyone to let them know that an order has been placed on that property, whether it is a trust, a company, a partnership or a husband and wife, or whatever. I thank the government for accepting the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 47 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 32, lines 22 to 23 [clause 50(3)]—Delete 'an occupier or subtenant under this Act need not address the occupier or' and substitute:

a subtenant under this Act need not address the

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is not supported.

Amendment negated; clause as amended passed.

Clause 51.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 48 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 32, line 28 [clause 51, penalty provision]—Delete '\$20,000' and substitute '\$10,000'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is supported.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 52 to 55 passed.

Clause 56.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 49 [Sanderson—1]—

Page 34, lines 12 to 15—Delete section 56 and substitute:

56—Joint and several liability

- (1) Subject to subsection (2), where an amount is recoverable by the Minister from 2 or more persons under a provision of this Act, the provision is to be construed as if those persons were jointly and severally liable to pay the amount to the Minister.
- (2) Subsection (1) does not apply in relation to an owner of residential premises if—
- (a) his or her liability arose as a result of not having been given a housing assessment order, housing improvement order or a housing demolition order; and
- (b) the Minister is satisfied that the owner was not aware of the giving of the order to another owner of the premises,
- by virtue of section 50(2).

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The amendment is not supported.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 57 passed.

Clause 58.

Ms SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 50 [Sanderson-1]—

Page 35, lines 17 to 19 [clause 58(2)(e) and (f)]—Delete paragraphs (e) and (f) and substitute:

- (e) prescribe penalties, not exceeding \$5,000, for breach of any regulation; and
- (f) fix expiation fees, not exceeding \$315, for alleged offences against the regulations.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This amendment is accepted.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (16:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REFERENDUM (APPROPRIATION AND SUPPLY) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 February.)

The ACTING SPEAKER (The Hon. A. Piccolo): Member for Bragg, I understand you have the call.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:28): I have actually spoken, sir. I confess, I would love to speak again.

The ACTING SPEAKER (The Hon. A. Piccolo): I am not sure that is going to be seconded by anybody.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:28): If I can misquote Shakespeare, we have come here to praise the member for Bragg, not to listen to her. I wanted to thank her for her contributions. They have been,

as always, erudite and succinct but unfortunately not comments with which I entirely agree, but there you are, that is the ever the life of—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: That is the Westminster system.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —the Westminster system. It is one of the vexing aspects of it that we do not always agree on everything, including sometimes really good things that we are often doing. Nevertheless, I thank her for her contributions. We all realise that the referendum bill, as such, is simply a method by which the other matters of substance are being—

Ms CHAPMAN: Like majority votes.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes—delivered. On the majority vote, that is very interesting because that was not my understanding of what the law was. Anyway, there you are. You learn things as each day goes by. Thank you to everyone who contributed, and a late message to hand indicates there are a couple of things I neglected to mention.

There were some points raised in the second reading which we should address. Firstly, the member for Bragg noted this bill has been 'sloppily' drafted, in that it proposes that the question that would be put to voters at a referendum is: 'Do you approve the Constitution (Appropriation and Supply) Amendment Bill 2015?' I am assured that is not sloppy drafting, I am advised. It has been drafted having regard to the requirements of section 10A of the Constitution Act, and is consistent with the manner in which the approach was taken in relation to the last referendum in South Australia which was conducted in 1991, I am further advised.

Secondly, in the debate on the bill in the parliament, the member for Bragg indicated the Electoral Commissioner's annual report for the year ending 30 June 2015 had not been filed, and I am able to advise that it was, in fact, tabled on 1 December 2015; and that is reflected in *Hansard*.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am just advised of that. That is basically it.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

Ms CHAPMAN: This relates to the question to be put to the electors in the form of: 'Do you agree with the bill or not?' You have indicated in your response that that is your understanding of what occurred in 1991; that is the question that is put on the ballot paper for the referendum. As the Attorney is well aware, there is explanatory memoranda that are prepared for the pro and con of the case—and I will come to the quotes, in a minute, that you have given of the money to be applied for this purpose if it ever goes as far as to become a bill that is assented to. How is the person who is to be the elector to understand what is in the terms of the bill?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised the answer to that question is as follows: the Electoral Commission of South Australia will take the lead in terms of informing people about how to vote at the referendum—in other words, the formality of the casting of their vote.

In addition, there will be a communication strategy to inform people about the proposals that are the subject of the referendum and the arguments for and against. It is anticipated that there will be broad community engagement and discussion on the proposals that will be put at a referendum. The community strategy will aim to educate voters about the issues rather than advocate for a specific position one way or the other. This would aim to ensure electors are equipped with whatever information they would need to deal with it.

I am also advised that, in many jurisdictions, and I think, in particular, the commonwealth, there are legislative requirements associated with conducting a referendum which would require there to be a yes and a no campaign, but that is not the case in South Australia. This is probably a

good thing, as there are some good questions to ask about whether the distribution of a 2,000-word written yes or no case is really the most effective way of communicating with people.

The final form of any material has obviously not been settled, because the bills have not been passed but it is proposed that there would be a balanced information sheet on the issues that go to the referendum, and the proposal to reform the deadlocks mechanism and the proposal about appropriation and supply would be both subjects of that sort of material.

Ms CHAPMAN: Whilst the question 'Do you approve the Referendum (Appropriation and Supply) Amendment Bill 2015?' is what is actually printed on the ballot paper, there will be a succinct and clear explanation as to what the effect of that would be and, obviously, it would be left open to the elector to determine whether they want to vote yes or no. Is that the process?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, and I would expect that there would be a very succinct, plain English summary of the opinions of those who are not persuaded to vote yes and, likewise, a succinct summary of the views of those who do wish to vote yes, so that people would have the chance of making up their own mind.

Ms CHAPMAN: The person who is responsible for the conduct of the referendum is identified later in the bill to be the electoral commissioner. Does he or she take responsibility for what is drafted and/or finalised in the content of the explanatory document?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that, as to the provision of information about the method by which a formal vote might be cast, that would be a matter for the electoral commissioner of the day. Inasmuch as we are talking about the preparation of the summary of yes and no propositions, that would be a government agency. I expect either AGD or DPC would be the relevant agency.

Ms CHAPMAN: In 1991, who prepared it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I would have to check.

Ms CHAPMAN: In 1991—I cannot even recall what the referendum was for—was there, similarly, a question on the ballot paper to the extent of identifying whether the elector supported a piece of legislation, or not?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: I do not think so.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This is basically following the 1991 model and, if I am not mistaken, it was the fairness test and associated bits and pieces that was the subject of that. I am advised that the actual legislation was No. 80 of 1990, an act to provide for the submission of the Constitution (Electoral Redistribution) Amendment Bill to a referendum, and it appears that the same methodology was employed, namely, 'Do you agree with this, or don't you?'

Ms CHAPMAN: 'Do you agree with X bill?' rather than, 'Do you agree to a fairness test?' is really what I am getting to.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Ms CHAPMAN: The conduct of the referendum is essentially to be the responsibility of the Electoral Commissioner, as is identified. In correspondence that you provided on 23 February 2016, you indicated that you would expect there would be two questions on the same ballot paper so that it would not be necessary to have two separate referenda, or even two separate ballot papers, for that matter: it would just be two questions. The cost for doing this you say is estimated at \$1.9 million. Who provided that estimate?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that came from the commission.

Ms CHAPMAN: What did it cost to do the referendum in 1991?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that the answer to the question is approximately \$2.6 million, but significantly it did not occur in conjunction with a general election. It was a stand-alone exercise.

Ms CHAPMAN: The breakdown of the \$1.9 million in respect of the costs is for conducting the referendum (which for the reasons you have just explained would be less than normally, if it had been stand-alone), advertising and communications, and any other public education that is in it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think the answer to that is yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: I was seeking the breakdown of the \$1.9 million, if that could be provided.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We will try to get that. Can I say at this point—this is obviously a guess—we will try to find more particulars in that.

Ms CHAPMAN: Having asked the Electoral Commissioner to do it—that is, give an estimate of what the cost would be—you will know from forensically perusing my second reading contribution that we raised this question of the fact that there was no provision for this in the budget. There is no provision for it in the identified areas of need, even as a contingency, by the Electoral Commissioner in her annual report, which I note has been tabled. I will take it up with the table officers as to why that had not been confirmed earlier, but in any event thank you for that having been filed, nor was it in the Mid-Year Budget Review, which I would have thought would have been at least a document where that would be identified.

Bear in mind, especially in the Electoral Commissioner's report, when he or she knows an election is coming up, they identify the contingency when they know they are going to have to conduct a special provision—for example, Aboriginal territory and board elections or a special provision outside of the usual state and local government elections—and they flag it, not just in the highlights but in what we are about to receive. It just seems incredible to me that the Electoral Commissioner has provided this information but not mentioned it in the report. My question is: when was this information provided to you by the Electoral Commissioner?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think the information was provided in response to the member for Bragg's question, if I am not mistaken. I was wrong in that; we did have a number before the question was asked by the member for Bragg. If you have a look at the Mid-Year Budget Review, page 27, at the top of the page there is an estimate—and this is a contingency only—under the heading of 'Constitutional reforms', and it puts an estimate of 2.328, which includes both the amount of money (the 1.9, which was the money that I have indicated would be the cost to the Electoral Commission for them doing their bit) and then the balance would be the cost of the preparation and dissemination of the yes-no case by an agency.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is still the current estimate, then—\$2.328 million?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes; if you are including both the cost to the Electoral Commission, which is the 1.9 that we were talking about, and a notional cost for the preparation and dissemination of the yes and no case, yes, that is the proposition.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (4) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:46): I move:

That this bill be read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REFERENDUM (DEADLOCKS) BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 February 2016.)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:47): Again, I acknowledge and thank the members for their contributions, particularly the member for Bragg. I think it is fair to say the conversation we had about the last bill is substantially the conversation that we would have about this one, so I will not take up any more time.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:48): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Adjournment Debate***SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:48): I would like to move an adjournment of the house, and in so doing I wanted to thank the member for Bragg for the very expeditious way in which she has assisted the house to dispose of its business today. I do not want it ever to be said that I am not generous in my praise of the member for Bragg when she—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Indeed; I just wanted to be on the record as saying I do appreciate the way she has assisted us, the way the member for Bragg has been helpful. I am looking forward to a new sort of détente here in this chamber, where we increasingly have this very constructive method of engagement. All of us have been overwhelmed by this atmosphere of cooperation, and I think we need to adjourn in order to really absorb it properly, so I do so move.

AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL ADJUDICATION

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (16:50): Michael Owen of *The Australian* newspaper wrote a series of nine articles, commencing on 3 February 2015, about my resignation from the South Australian ministry. The first article was headed, 'Weatherill minister quits amid inquiry into staff appointment', and so it went on. The clear imputation was that I had stood down because I was under investigation for some inappropriate behaviour. Well, I had not, and I was pleased that the ICAC Commissioner confirmed I had not.

Following the publication of these articles, I lodged my first and only complaint in my 18-year career as a politician to the Australian Press Council. My complaint was essentially that Michael Owen implied I resigned owing to investigations (plural). One investigation was under way, but I was unaware of it, as was confirmed by the ICAC Commissioner. Michael Owen claimed the Ombudsman had been investigating me since 2013—factually incorrect. Michael Owen wrote in one of his stories:

Opposition Deputy Leader Vickie Chapman yesterday said, '...when parliament resumes we'll continue to raise questions.'

Opposition frontbencher David Pisoni, who has pursued the matter since 2013, yesterday said the government would face questions about the matter when parliament resumed next week.

Of course, they did not and Owen failed to follow up these falsified predictions. On 5 May, Owen wrote:

In February, the Australian revealed that Ms Rankine had quit cabinet amid an ongoing, high-level probe and that this had 'absolutely no bearing' on her decision to move to the backbench.

The Australian did not reveal that a high-level probe had absolutely no bearing on my decision to move to the backbench. On the contrary, it imputed that I had resigned as a minister owing to at least two high-level probes. Then, after an eight-part series about my being investigated by ICAC, Michael Owen buries Commissioner Lander's clearance of me at paragraph 7 in his story. In the lead-up to paragraph 7, he reagitates the claims found to be false by Commissioner Lander, but not the reason that the commissioner took this very unusual step of making a public statement. The reason was, of course, because of Michael Owen's stories. Michael Owen writes the story this way because the outcome does not accord with his preconceived trajectory for the story.

I claimed this nine-part series failed to be fair and balanced. The process took many months negotiating many points. The council decided, for example, not to include the chest-beating claims made by the member for Unley and the member for Bragg that they would be asking questions when parliament resumed. However, my complaint was eventually accepted and listed for a hearing, which took place on 22 October. I received the final adjudication on 22 February. I will read directly from the Press Council's paper. I quote:

The Council concludes that the use of the word 'amid' to describe events at the time of the complainant's resignation was not technically incorrect and was not implying a causal link. However, the Council concludes there was no basis for reporting there were multiple investigations and that the OPI's referral of the matter to ICAC was not a sufficient basis for reporting there were investigations by two bodies. The publication had apparently been aware of matters referred by the OPI to ICAC, but Council considers a referral by OPI did not amount to an 'investigation'.

The purported paraphrasing of the complainant's remarks in the article on 4 February as 'Ms Rankine has said ongoing investigations that first began in 2013...' was not an accurate paraphrase and repeated the inaccuracy. Accordingly, this aspect of the complaint is upheld.

The Council notes the final article on 5 May is headed 'Ex-minister cleared by ICAC', but the main section of article unfairly reprises the allegations that had been found to be unsubstantiated and not until late in the article is the clearance by the ICAC Commissioner mentioned. Accordingly, the Council concludes the article is not fair or balanced and this aspect of the complaint is upheld.

In considering whether the complainant was provided a fair opportunity to respond to what was reported, the Council takes account of the publication's attempts to solicit comments, the substance of the article published on 5 May, and that the letter to the editor submitted by the complainant in substance focuses on the principal issues addressed in that article. The Council concludes that no case had been made for any further correction and accordingly, this aspect of the complaint is not upheld.

Of course, if I had had an opportunity, and it is not possible to challenge a finding, that is one that I would, clearly, have done. However, what we have here is, of course, Michael Owen found guilty on two out of three charges. A hearing that was scheduled for 20 to 30 minutes went for an hour, hour and a half. Michael Owen was true to form, not only talking and shouting over me (that is normal; that is his normal interviewing technique), but shouting over the chair of the panel, to the point that the chair had to warn him to remain silent. Michael Owen could not even let the chair speak.

Michael Owen was not deterred, however; he continued. The chair became so frustrated with his behaviour that he warned *The Australian* representative to keep him quiet or he would be removed from the hearing hook-up. Did that deter him? No. In the end, the person representing *The Australian* told him that if he spoke out of turn again she would remove him.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Helen Trinca.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am so pleased that Mr Speaker can remember her name, and I note that he is speaking out of order. Nonetheless, this finding must have hurt and must have embarrassed Michael Owen. I am sure it hurts and embarrasses him amongst his colleagues, but not so much as they are embarrassed by him. Anyway, he goes on the ABC *Spin Cycle* with Matt and Dave on the Friday morning after the adjudication comes down and brushes aside their questions, saying, don't worry, there's nothing to see here. This was just a 'technicality'. It was a

technicality that took many months (from May until February) to get a finding and that took a lot of work and a lot of effort by, certainly, the Press Council and, on my part, negotiating through these points.

What was really interesting, what was really beneficial, from my point of view, throughout this hearing and throughout the adjudication process, the negotiating process, was the fact that Michael Owen admitted that he was writing about an ICAC investigation. So, whilst he skirted around it in his articles and whilst the ICAC commissioner found that no other conclusion could be drawn, he finally had to admit that he was writing about OPI and the ICAC investigation. That clearly breaches the law. We now have evidence directly from him, now documented by the Australian Press Council, and these are matters that I will be putting to the South Australian police for prosecution. Let us see whether he considers that to be trivial.

EAST MARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:59): I rise today to speak about a specific issue in my electorate, namely East Marden Primary School. In the past I have brought this house's attention to the state of some of the facilities at East Marden Primary School in Campbelltown in my electorate. East Marden primary is an outstanding school. It has an excellent culture, it has exceptional results and, not only that, a supportive teaching group and a tireless governing council in support as well.

In regard to the enrolment numbers at the school, I have been recently advised that, as at early March 2016, the school had official enrolment number figures of 685, including 321 in the junior primary and 364 in the primary years. It is also expected that more enrolments will follow this year. I note that the school continues to have inquiries from parents regarding future available places.

The state Labor government has not delivered East Marden Primary School with the facilities that it needs to give our students the best learning environment possible. Why do I say that? Current enrolments display a sharp increase from previous years for many reasons, and I have the figures here in front of me. Obviously, the popularity of the school is a part of these reasons; however, there are also other factors. One only has to look at the increased density being pushed by this government in Campbelltown and nearby areas. With the increased demand for schooling, the state government must—and it has a clear obligation to—increase funding to this school for what are badly needed facility improvements.

This school has many functional needs. It is doing an exceptional job with the facilities that it has but this government has a clear responsibility to this school to improve these facilities and improve these facilities fast. Extra classrooms must be given to East Marden Primary School. Extra toilets must also be given to East Marden Primary School. With the growth that the school has experienced, it goes without saying that more buildings and improved facilities are needed. Not only this, but greater space is also required for the administration of the school.

With the growth that the school has experienced, this is certainly needed. Currently, staff, parents and students do not have enough space and they require more space and they require more buildings. When you look at the size of the school and the size of the gym, it also goes without saying that this school requires a much larger gym to address the rapid increase in enrolments. Obviously a gym would serve many functions, not only for sport but also for music, performances and hosting functions when students and parents cannot meet outside because of weather, for example.

There are many buildings on site—and the government has had notice of this—where asbestos is present. Where those asbestos buildings are present, and they are dated, these buildings must be upgraded and replaced with state-of-the-art buildings. As the member for Hartley, I will continue to advocate for improved educational facilities to ensure that every child has the best learning opportunities possible in our local area.

DAVENPORT ELECTORATE SPORTS CLUB FACILITIES

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (17:03): I rise today to express my concern about sports funding in my electorate. Recently I was disappointed to hear that the Mitcham council, which shares much of the same constituency as I do, has put on hold their planned upgrade to the Hewett Reserve clubrooms. The reason that the very much needed upgrade has been delayed is not that council has no money—indeed, it has pledged \$400,000 for the upgrade—it is because the state government

has not come to the party and, once again, it has let the people of Davenport down by refusing to match council's contribution to bring these clubrooms into the 21st century.

The Hewett Reserve clubrooms are home to three great longstanding local sports clubs: the Blackwood Tennis Club, which has celebrated over 100 years; the Coromandel Cricket Club; and the state league Woods Panthers Netball Club. All these clubs have hundreds of members between them and share small and outdated clubrooms.

First, I would like to highlight how unacceptable not only the sharing arrangement is at present but also how a netball club of the standard of Woods Panthers is left to share unsuitable and degraded facilities. As many would know, Woods Panthers Netball Club is a state league club that trains girls to play the great sport of netball in the Mitcham Hills area. Girls as young as eight and nine are members of this club and train at the Hewett Reserve courts which double as tennis courts. The club does a fantastic job at keeping the girls of the Mitcham Hills active, fit and healthy and participating in sport from the sub-primary level right through to senior levels.

Not only does Woods Panthers train many hundreds of girls and young women to play their sport competitively but they are also a state league club, one of only eight state league netball clubs in South Australia. State league netball clubs are the equivalent to the SANFL in the football world. I cannot imagine any SANFL club having the facilities that the Woods Panthers Netball Club has to tolerate.

In terms of the netball club, of course all the high level netball is played at Priceline Stadium, and indeed these teams have their own grounds, but I do remind the house and it is important to know that netball is one of the most active participant sports in this state and indeed in this nation, and that our state league netball is only one step away from the national level, and those who play state league play at the national level. The Thunderbirds team is chosen from our state league clubs; so, why are clubs such as the Woods Panthers still operating out of substandard facilities? It is a very good question.

Hewett Reserve is centrally located within the electorate of Davenport and should be a popular sporting venue, but it is underutilised because of its current condition. The Sturt Lions Soccer Club, another growing club in my electorate with hundreds of junior members, is another excellent example of a growing club that could potentially relocate to Hewett Reserve if the proposed council upgrade is undertaken. However, it would all be a bit too cosy at the moment for them to shift, for the soccer players to share the Hewett oval clubrooms with the netballers, tennis players and the cricket club.

Really, if we want to see a growth in sport and junior participation, the state government really needs to get behind this upgrade and fund local sport in Davenport. I note that much of the funding is provided for sporting groups across metropolitan Adelaide. In 2012-13 the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program allocated funding to 46 projects, including a \$2 million grant for softball and baseball facilities at Adelaide Shores.

Again, in the 2014-15 funding allocation round the West Adelaide Hellas and the Port Adelaide Lions both received \$500,000 grants for their clubs. I do congratulate those clubs for the excellent work they do and continue to do to provide services and sporting services, and no doubt they are worthy recipients. My grief is not with the clubs. My grief is with the government that seems time and again to provide sports funding to areas that are in Labor-held seats, and, of course, we see this across the board and we see this in infrastructure funding as well.

I do remind the government that it should govern for all, not just for those facilities, those members and those clubs that are in Labor electorates. Once again, Davenport has missed out on funding of a very worthy venture. Mitcham Council is asking only for a co-contribution from the state government to meet half the costs that are required, costs that will see an increase in junior sport participation, an increase in women sports participation (and today, of course, we celebrate International Women's Day), an increase in tennis participation and an increase in cricket participation, all extremely worthy sports and all extremely worthy of pursuits.

This government and especially the Minister for Recreation and Sport often tell us that they believe in funding grassroots organisations. They espouse the benefits of funding grassroots organisations. They talk about the flow-on effects of attracting young players and sponsorship

opportunities for spectators and the broader community. I would love to see the government match this rhetoric when it comes to sports funding by providing funding to the Hewett Reserve upgrade. I would like to see it upgraded for the benefit of the community so it can continue to be a longstanding and wonderful sporting hub in my electorate.

Time expired.

At 17:10 the house adjourned until Wednesday 9 March 2016 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***APY LANDS**

94 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 September 2015). For the Budget year 2014-15, what was the \$6.2 million in expenditure associated with APY Lands additional services transferred from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and what additional services were provided and transferred as a result of this expenditure item?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has been advised as follows:

The increase in expenses from 2013-14 estimated result to 2014-15 budget was primarily due to transfer of APY Lands additional services from the Department of Premier and Cabinet to the Department of State Development.

In 2014-15 the services provided included:

- Community services for aged, disability, young families, homemaker programs and youth program (Department for Communities and Social Inclusion \$2.355 million);
- The Amata Wellbeing Centre (SA Health \$1.07 million);
- Maintenance of swimming pools in Amata, Mimili, and Pipalyatjara (Department of Education and Child Development \$0.55 million);
- The Nganampa Health Environmental Health Program (SA Health \$0.4 million);
- Rural Transaction Centres (Department of Premier and Cabinet—Services SA \$0.1 million); and
- Other general services and programs on the APY Lands (\$1.7 million) which includes APY financial management and controls, housing, vehicles, electricity and funding for RASAC.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

153 Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (9 September 2015). For the Automotive Supplier Diversification program in 2014-15, please advise:

- (a) How many successful grant applications and what was the value of those applications?
- (b) How many unsuccessful grant applications and what was the value of those applications?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): The Minister for Automotive Transformation has provided the following advice:

- (a) For the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015, six applications were approved for a total of \$1.23 million in grant assistance under the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program.
- (b) For the same period, two applications were declined, seeking a total of \$134,500 grant assistance under the program.

O-BAHN

157 Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (23 September 2015). What changes have been made to the O-Bahn City Access project—announced on 25 February 2015—that allows residents of southern Hackney to enter and exit their suburb with ease?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised of the following:

Following the community consultation process after the project was announced on 25 February 2015, the following refinements to the design were made:

- the provision of an additional u-turn/right-turn facility at Vailima Court
- the provision of an additional u-turn facility on Dequetteville Terrace, opposite King William Street; and
- modifications to the 'Bus Lane' and red 'Bus Only Lane' pavement markings to facilitate easier access to the proposed u-turn lanes.

Alternative routes utilising North Terrace and/or College Road are also available for residents in southern Hackney in addition to the u-turn facility on Dequetteville Terrace, south of North Terrace.

O-BAHN

160 Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (23 September 2015). As a result of the O-Bahn City Access project, will there be any changes to the size of the footpath running on the eastern side of Hackney Road from North Terrace through to Athelney Avenue in Hackney?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised of the following:

No changes to the footpath on the eastern side of Hackney Road will be made as part of the O-Bahn City Access Project.

O-BAHN

161 Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (23 September 2015). Will the two bus stops on the eastern and western sides of Hackney Road remain during all phases of the O-Bahn City Access project?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised of the following:

The two existing bus stops on the eastern and western sides of Hackney Road will be retained, although the exact location of these two stops may be altered slightly to ensure the safety of commuters and pedestrians.

O-BAHN

165 Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (23 September 2015). In reference to the O-Bahn City Access Project, please advise whether DPTI has considered allowing right hand turns onto Hackney Road from southern Hackney during non-peak hour times?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised of the following:

Allowing right turns during the off-peak period does not sufficiently mitigate the risk of accidents occurring from these movements, as there is a large percentage that still occur during off-peak times.

A total of 54 right angle crashes have occurred along Hackney Road within the last decade with 13 of these resulting in casualties. Approximately 45 per cent of right angle crashes along Hackney Road occur during peak periods (7 to 9 AM and 4 to 6 PM), and approximately 55 percent of crashes occur during the off-peak periods.

The proposed restrictions to various right turn movements, and replacement with alternative u-turn facilities to provide access to the local road network, help address the significant existing safety issues associated with these movements, and aid in reinforcing Hackney Road's functional role as part of the Inner Ring Route.

HOSPITAL STAFF, SAFETY

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (11 November 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):

The decision to pursue criminal charges against an assailant is a matter for South Australia Police (SAPOL) and of personal choice for staff members. Given this, SA Health does not record whether an individual staff member has pursued criminal charges and, therefore, this information cannot be extrapolated from the Human Resource file for statistical purposes.

SA Health takes incidents of assault against staff members very seriously. Matters are reported to SAPOL and immediate action is taken to ensure the continuing safety and well-being of the staff member.

If a staff member is assaulted, they are provided with immediate first aid, if deemed necessary. If the staff member is injured and needs time from work or medical assistance, they may make a claim for compensation and the rehabilitation consultant can help the staff member and coordinate their return to work and recovery.

The staff member or their supervisor is required to report the injury to the injury hotline, where referral occurs to a rehabilitation consultant, as required. Daily reports are provided to senior management.

The staff member, or delegate if needed, is required to complete an Incident Report. The circumstances are then investigated and assessed with respect to prevention of future occurrences.

Staff members are also encouraged to contact the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) for confidential counselling, which is provided at no cost to the employee and their immediate family members. The EAP service is also available 24/7 to provide critical incident response, when required.

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 March 2015).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):

1. It is estimated that around \$4.5 million GST exclusive had been spent as of 31 March, 2015. This figure is expected to reach the budgeted \$6.4 million once all invoices are received and paid.

2. The \$6.4 million funding allocated to Transforming Health in the Mid-Year Budget Review was for the development of a plan for a sustainable health system, including a full business case, and community consultation. In addition, \$2.4 million GST exclusive was subsequently approved for additional resources, to support the initial

implementation of the Transforming Health program, in particular to commence productivity improvements in the health system to prepare for winter demand including improvements to mental health patient flows.

3. As at 31 March, 2015, included in the total project expenditure, \$645,000 (GST exclusive) was paid for advertising and promotion.

4. At the Mid-Year Budget Review, the funding allocated for material and production costs associated with stakeholder engagement, including advertising, was \$735,000 (GST exclusive).

5. SA Health has not spent any money on opinion polling.

LYELL MCEWIN HOSPITAL

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (17 June 2015).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):

I am told that on Tuesday 16 June, 2015, the Lyell McEwin Hospital had 11 ICU patients who were managed within the ICU area. No recovery areas or flex beds were necessary on this day and no elective surgery was cancelled due to ICU pressures.

HOSPITAL BEDS

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2015).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):

1. The correct figures about beds per 1,000 population from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Hospital Statistics are 2.9 for South Australia, the highest in Australia, compared to the national average of 2.5. Each South Australian also spends an average of 3.6 days in hospital per stay, nearly 10 per cent higher than the national average of 3.3 days.

The Transforming Health program has involved the engagement of clinical leaders across the health system and by consensus it was agreed to benchmark to a Health Round Table peer hospital which had the third shortest length of stay. Improvements in the length of stay and processes in hospitals will mean that we will be able to provide current services, including allowing for growth in both population and ageing, with fewer acute beds.

2. To achieve the clinical standards of care developed by our clinicians, the structure of the system and how services are delivered needs to change. The benchmarking to the Health Round Table peer hospital provides an opportunity to become more efficient in how we best care for our patients.

By improving pathways within the hospitals, the requirement for the number of acute beds in the system decreases compared to the number of beds used in 2013-14, however, through this process there will be more sub-acute beds available.

These reductions in acute beds are achieved through practice improvement strategies which can reduce length of stay for the patient. This means a potentially greater number of patients can be treated using fewer acute inpatient beds. Under the leadership of clinicians the things we need to measure going forward are quality of care and patient health outcomes, not the number of beds.

3. Transforming Health is an ongoing initiative designed to optimise care so South Australians get the best care, first time, every time. This includes continually reviewing the clinical evidence and applying new technologies which will improve how services are delivered. Initiatives to improve the quality of care and achieve better health outcomes for all South Australians will continue into the future.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey)** (29 October 2015).

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

The \$676,000 relates to:

- \$277,000—costs associated with Austrade in the Shanghai embedded office.
- \$155,000—costs associated with Austrade in the Mumbai embedded office.
- \$205,000—post closure activities for the Shanghai office.
- \$39,000—Health Industries SA which comprised quarterly payments to the Agent General's Office in London for the Health Industries European Associate Project.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey)** (29 October 2015).

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

Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show Western Australia's International Trade (merchandise exports) declined 16.3 per cent (\$21.1 billion) over the 12 months to August 2015.

GOVERNMENT OFFICE ACCOMMODATION

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (29 October 2015).

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised:

357,000 m² of property under DPTI management is office accommodation leased from the private sector.

98.2% of this space is currently occupied.

Vacancies comprise a number of different circumstances:

- Leases with imminent expiry that have been vacated for alternative accommodation; and
- Leased space which is vacant due to various changes in government, that we are confident of backfilling, and backfill options including private occupancy are being pursued.

Estimates Replies

CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):

1. Child Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) provides a service to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Lands. The service includes both lands based and fly in, fly out workers. CAMHS work on the APY Lands has been funded through both State and Commonwealth sources, some of which is time limited.

Currently the CAMHS APY Lands service consists of 6.8 full time equivalent (FTE) staff. Three of the clinical staff live on the APY Lands, two staff fly in, fly out on a fortnightly basis (one week on/one week off), and 1.5 clinicians who drive to the lands from Port Pirie three times a term (one or two week trips) There is also 0.3 of a position for psychiatry to provide clinical supervision and support to clinicians and assessments of children and adolescents one week per school term and urgent telehealth assessments as required.

The cost of delivering CAMHS services on APY lands is approx. \$1,689,876 per annum.

2. CAMHS does not use charter flights. Transport to and from the APY Lands is a mix of commercial flights and cars. The service is funded for the cost of commercial flights from Adelaide to Yulara at approximately \$700 per person one way, and vehicle hire which is also required while on the APY Lands at \$1,700 per month per vehicle.

In the 2014-15 financial year, CAMHS spent \$118,292 on travel for APY lands staff.

MOTOR NEURON DISEASE CLINICAL SERVICES

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):

Motor neuron disease requires input from many specialities. The priority consideration when planning its future location is the maintenance of key interdependencies with gastroenterology, neurology, speech pathology and palliative care. Clinicians and consumers will be involved to ensure the future location delivers the same or improved service.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):

The total budget for the Repatriation General Hospital (RGH) project was \$32.19 million.

\$31.3 million was funded by the Federal Government and the project came in under budget at \$31.23 million.

The project successfully delivered ViTA, a joint SA Health/ACH facility as well as some minor works.

JAMES NASH HOUSE

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):

The state government has provided \$1.6 million in funding for building works and to recruit a specialist team. The building works involve refurbishment of an existing ward to accommodate forensic patients who have an intellectual disability and/or acquired brain injury. The refurbishment is required to provide a therapeutic environment for these patients, consistent with evidence-based practice in other jurisdictions.

The specialist team is currently being recruited and will comprise senior Allied Health clinicians with skills and experience in developing and implementing programs to support the rehabilitation of patients with intellectual disability and/ or brain injury. This team will work with the medical and nursing staff to design and implement these specialist programs.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries):

1. The older persons' mental health service at the Repatriation General Hospital comprises 30 beds and provides an acute inpatient service to look after older people with mental health issues that require hospitalisation. This service is a component of a wider service model which also includes a Community Team located in Edwardstown.

The new older persons' mental health facility to be provided at Flinders Medical Centre is expected to be completed in mid-2017 and comprises 30 purpose built psychogeriatric beds, spaces for supporting allied health staff and clinical consulting rooms, all of which will enable the integration of all older persons' mental health services currently provided at Repatriation General Hospital.

2. There is currently an outpatients older persons' mental health service at Repatriation General Hospital and this service will continue from the new facility at Flinders Medical Centre.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier):

This question has been asked during the 2015 Estimates Committee.

The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circulars PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements and PC027—Disclosure of Government Contracts covers all payments to consultants and large payments to contractors.

The Annual Report will show all payments to consultants and the nature of their work.

Contract Disclosure requires certain information about contracts to be published on the Tenders SA website:

- Contract title
- Contractor's details
- Start and end date of the contract
- Contract value
- Procurement process used.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier):

Primary Industries and Regions SA

(1) Abolished

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Management Accountant	\$105,134
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Manager, Strategic Policy	\$118,696
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Manager, Marine Biosecurity	\$122,549
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Principal Industry Coordinator	\$122,549

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Principal Food Technologist	\$126,798
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Research Scientist, Marine Ecosystems	\$108,245

Note: TEC based on Annual Salary plus 19.1% on-costs

(2) Created

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Senior Project Officer, Premium Food and Wine	\$102,096
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Senior Project Officer, Strategic Development	\$105,134
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	International Marketing Manager	\$105,134
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Program Leader, Fish Enhancement	\$108,245
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Project Manager, Food Park	\$109,346
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Policy Officer, Murray River Sustainability Project	\$109,346
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Contracts Manager, Murray River Sustainability Project	\$109,346
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Senior Policy Officer, Murray River Sustainability Project	\$112,535
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Manager, Strategic Development	\$115,556
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Team Leader, North	\$118,696
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	3IP Coordinator, Murray River Sustainability Project	\$118,696
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Senior Food Development Officer	\$123,443
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Senior Consultant, Community Engagement	\$126,798
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	Competitive Foods Initiative Manager	\$128,113

Note: TEC based on Annual Salary plus 19.1% on-costs

South Australian Tourism Commission

(1) Abolished

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
South Australian Tourism Commission	International Operations Manager	\$107,191

(2) Created

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
South Australian Tourism Commission	Senior Contracts and Procurement Officer	\$109,128

The former South Australian Motor Australian Motor Sport Board had no jobs abolished or created with a total estimated cost of \$100,000 or more in 2014-15.

**Please also refer to the APF II General Purpose Financial Statements Framework APS 4.8 (a & b) and APF VI-Definitions ('normal remuneration')

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (28 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

(a) Abolished:

Department/Agency	Position Title	Total Remuneration Package Value (TRPV)
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Head, Internal Consultancy Services Group	\$360,396
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Executive Director, Public Sector Workforce Relations	\$321,119
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Executive Director, Government Services Group	\$295,610
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Chief Information Officer	\$269,395
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Executive Director, Corporate Services	\$250,795
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Executive Director, Business and International Development	\$250,795
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, Financial Strategy	\$224,358
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, State and Administrative Services	\$194,109
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, ICT Reform	\$189,428
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, Financial Projects	\$184,809
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, State Development Projects	\$173,455
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director eGovernment	\$157,793
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, Human Resources	\$153,324
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director Strategic Programs, Investment & Assurance	\$167,269
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, Workers Compensation Performance	\$186,395
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, Operational Improvement	\$185,346
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, Accounts Receivable	\$165,496
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director Business and Finance	\$153,676
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director Government Communications	\$166,507

(b) Created:

Department/Agency	Position Title	Total Remuneration Package Value (TRPV)
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	D/CE Services & Intergovernmental Relations	\$350,000
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Chief Operating Officer Services	\$320,000
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Executive Director, Shared Services SA	\$250,795
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Executive Director, Implementation and International	\$232,830
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Executive Director, Priority Projects	\$230,000
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director Reform	\$220,000
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, Office of the Chief Executive	\$220,000
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director Digital Government	\$201,648
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	State Coordinator General	\$198,565 (TRPV based on part-time hours of 17 hours per week)
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, Implementation and International	\$152,974
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Director, Sustainability and Prosperity	\$169,572

Only positions where the Total Remuneration Package Value (TRPV) exceeds \$141,500 per annum, which is the base executive remuneration level, have been included. The TRPV includes employer superannuation.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (23 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

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):

All ministerial appointments are as follows:

Position Title	Total Employment Cost *
Chief of Staff	\$171,444
Ministerial Adviser	\$123,173
Ministerial Adviser	\$123,173
Ministerial Adviser	\$123,173
Ministerial Adviser	\$123,173

**Based on Annual Salary plus 19.1% oncosts*

Non ministerial appointments are as follows:

Position Title	Total Employment Cost *
Ministerial Liaison Officer—PIRSA	\$105,134
Ministerial Liaison Officer—PIRSA	\$102,096
Ministerial Liaison Officer – SATC	\$102,096
Ministerial Liaison Officer – Recreation and Sport	\$102,096
Office Manager	\$115,557
Parliamentary/Cabinet Officer	\$95,786
Senior Business Support Officer	\$78,444
PA to the Minister	\$85,508
PA to the Chief of Staff	\$76,672
Business Support Officer	\$67,089
Business Support/Receptionist	\$62,351

**Based on Annual Salary plus 19.1% oncosts*

The South Australian Tourism Commission employs one staff member located within the Minister for Tourism's Office in the capacity of Ministerial Liaison Officer.

The Department of Transport, Planning and Infrastructure employs one staff member located within the Minister for Recreation and Sport and Minister for Racing's Office in the capacity