

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 13 April 2016

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

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: VICTOR HARBOR WASTEWATER NETWORK UPGRADE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:01): I move:

That the 542nd report of the committee, entitled Victor Harbor Wastewater Network Upgrade, be noted.

The current wastewater network is at capacity. It supports a population in excess of 14,000 people, which can double at peak holiday periods. There is some urgency to upgrade and expand the wastewater network in the Victor Harbor area, given the new residential developments soon to occur in the region and the construction of the new Fleurieu Regional Aquatics Centre due for completion by the end of this year. SA Water has already agreed to accept its wastewater.

To address the increasing wastewater demands, SA Water proposes to build a new wastewater pipeline from the aquatics centre along Strawberry Hill Road, the Hindmarsh River and Day Road to the Victor Harbor Wastewater Treatment Plant. This is to be a 6.2 kilometre gravity and rising wastewater mains pipeline, and will include three wastewater pumping stations. Although this is not the shortest length, it makes use of road reserves and current easements where possible, minimising the need for additional easements on private land. The cost of the proposed project is \$7.289 million, GST exclusive, and it will meet the needs of the area until 2030.

The committee questioned the current capacity of the wastewater treatment plant and was reassured by SA Water that the facility is able to manage the additional flows. However, the committee is concerned with the occasional outflow from the treatment plant into the Inman River. The member for Finniss has received a number of complaints regarding the odour from such events. The committee has suggested to SA Water that this issue could be considered as part of the project. The construction works are due to commence in April 2016 with completion in November this year, in time for the opening of the new aquatics centre at the end of this year.

I would like to thank all my fellow committee members, the members for Colton, Torrens, Finniss and Chaffey, for all their hard work and diligence, the committee staff for their hard work in their support, as well as the witnesses who give all the information. Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:04): I thank the member for Elder for her comments in her capacity as Presiding Member of the Public Works Committee. It is an important project for the burgeoning South Coast, which is continuing to grow at pretty well record rates with population increases and everything else that goes along with it. This was a priority project.

As mentioned, it is hooked in to work in with the new aquatic centre, which is well underway and is a project of the Alexandrina and Victor Harbor councils. It is an excellent project although, once again, it has had its detractors, but I think, once it is up and running, it will be of enormous benefit to the people of the South Coast and give people of all ages an opportunity to swim in a facility. More to the point, the wastewater treatment plant extension cuts through to join that and goes right back to the effluent ponds.

As mentioned, the issue of odour in the Inman River has been a problem for some time, particularly during the summer months. I think sometimes humanity overengineers its own destiny, quite frankly. The simple fact is the amount of nutrient and what not over the years that went into the Inman has caused it to have a few problems during the summer months.

I raised the issue of the smell during the course of the hearing. We do not want any more capacity to increase that if there is an outflow, but a lot of the water is used, particularly in the Victor

Harbor region, of course. The Victor Harbor township area has irrigation water, and I think at least one private line comes out of it to cater for some irrigation purposes on private property. It does not seem to be an enormously important project probably in the parliament, but it is an important project for the South Coast and that area. I am sure that, in times to come, there will be more and more of these coming through.

The issue for me—and I am meeting shortly with SA Water on it—is the capacity of Myponga Reservoir to cope in the foreseeable future as the population grows on the South Coast. It appears to be quite comfortably handling it at the moment, but it would be my desire to have the water extended down on the Western Fleurieu to Rapid Bay and Cape Jervis through Wirrina, which would certainly enhance what is going down there, but that in itself will also lead to more wastewater projects on the other side of the Fleurieu as well. We are enormously supportive. I am very pleased that and the roundabout, which we have talked about previously in the house, have got up so, without further ado, I support the project.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:07): I thank the member for Finniss for his contribution to this debate, and I also recognise the importance of this particular facility to his area and his electorate. I thank him for the contribution he made on this project to the committee, and I recommend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION: SITE VISIT TO HILLGROVE RESOURCES GROUP COPPER MINE AND KANMANTOO QUARRY

Ms COOK (Fisher) (11:08): I move:

That the 23rd report of the committee, entitled Site Visit to Hillgrove Resources Group Copper Mine and Kanmantoo Quarry, be noted.

Last year, as a committee, we made a concerted effort to get out to the regions and actually view some of the areas that we are focusing on within our inquiries. We took a trip to just outside of Murray Bridge and visited both the Hillgrove copper mine and Kanmantoo quarry. It was a very interesting exercise in contrast, with the Hillgrove copper mine being an enormous open-cut deep quarry, whereas the small Kanmantoo quarry is a very hand-laboured driven-type industrial family-owned quarry. The contrasts were enormous.

We noted the issues being faced by both work environments and how they were being managed by the resources that they had available. It was really great to attend that also with people from SafeWork SA and get their insight into forward planning in terms of supporting the sectors. It was a really great experience, one that we have taken away and embedded into our reports. I table our thanks to MAQOSHC for supporting us in going out to these places and thank the house for noting our report.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: PARTIAL DEFENCE OF PROVOCATION

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

That the interim report of the committee, entitled Review of the Report of the Legislative Review Committee into the Partial Defence of Provocation, be noted.

On 1 May 2013, the Hon. Tammy Franks in another place introduced the Criminal Law Consolidation (Provocation) Amendment Bill 2013 into the Legislative Council. This bill proposed to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 by way of the insertion of a new section 11A to limit the partial defence of provocation (the 'provocation defence').

The provocation defence, if established, allows for a court to reduce a charge of murder to the offence of manslaughter. It is referred to as a partial defence because it only lessens the charge and potential consequences. By way of comparison, self-defence can provide a complete defence to a charge of murder, entitling the accused to a full acquittal without further penalty. The bill sought to address the possibility that a nonviolent homosexual advance could be pursued to establish a provocation defence, or what has often been termed the 'gay panic defence'.

On 30 October 2013, following debate in respect of this bill, the Legislative Council resolved that the bill would be withdrawn and referred to the committee for inquiry and report, pursuant to section 16 of the Parliamentary Committees Act. This resulted in the committee's initial inquiry into the partial defence of provocation. The judgement of the South Australian Court of Criminal Appeal in *Lindsay v The Queen* was referred to in a number of submissions to the initial inquiry.

The case involved an accused who had sought to establish a provocation defence following the killing of a gay man, after that man had allegedly made sexual advances towards the accused. The judgement of the Hon. Justice Peek in *Lindsay*, with which the Hon. Chief Justice Kourakis agreed, observed:

...that homosexuality is now largely accepted as part of contemporary Australian society, and...it was no longer unlawful for consenting adults to engage in homosexual sexual activity.

Consequently, Justice Peek did not allow a provocation defence be put to the jury in the circumstances of *Lindsay*. Then, on 2 December 2014, the committee tabled the Report of the Legislative Review Committee into the Partial Defence of Provocation, which noted the observations of Justice Peek. On 6 May 2015, in the matter of *Lindsay v The Queen*, the High Court of Australia set aside the order of the South Australian Court of Criminal Appeal and ordered a new trial.

The majority judgement of the High Court observed that there were a number of potential sources of provocation which should have resulted in the defence being left to the jury for consideration in the circumstances of *Lindsay*. Particularly, the High Court noted, for example, the fact that an offer was made to the appellant for sex in the appellant's home, and it was also considered there may have been further 'pungency' (the word of the court) as a result of the offer of money for sex being made by a Caucasian man to an Aboriginal man in such circumstances. These matters were considered to extend beyond the relevance of the homosexual advance or the gay panic.

Subsequently, on 13 May 2015, on motion of the Legislative Council, the Legislative Review Committee was asked to review its initial report into the partial defence of provocation. The committee wrote to the individuals and organisations who made submissions to the initial inquiry, as well as to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and the South Australian Law Reform Institute, seeking further comment. No parties changed their views as expressed to the initial inquiry.

There was much lively debate in the committee and I have to admit that my views on this matter evolved and changed as the inquiry wound on, but the committee ultimately resolved that it would not be prudent to make further recommendations and findings until the resolution of the process of the retrial of Mr Lindsay on a charge of murder.

The court has now heard the second retrial and Mr Lindsay has been found guilty of murder—that was on 30 March—however, there is now a 28-day period, I am advised, during which he can, if he wishes, lodge an appeal, so that process has not been finalised and the committee awaits the result of that process. In the interim, I commend the interim report to the house.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (11:15): I wish to just add a few brief comments to the very efficient summary provided by the member for Little Para on the other side primarily to emphasise that it would be fair to say that, whilst I do not want to put words in the mouths of any member of the committee, everyone on the committee basically agreed that a nonviolent homosexual advance should not of itself be a basis upon which anyone should be able to claim and receive the benefit of a partial defence of provocation.

As the member pointed out, it is a partial defence in that it does not provide an absolute defence to a charge of murder, but it does enable that charge to be reduced to a charge of manslaughter. No-one found issue with the original intention, the fundamental intention, of the bill introduced by the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place.

The issue for the committee has been to try to consider whether the proposed legislation would have the effect that the honourable member in the other place was intending and whether any unforeseen difficulties could arise from the passing of the legislation as proposed by the member, however well-intentioned that legislation may have been.

I think it might be useful to put on the record the summary of what the High Court had to say. As has been pointed out, this matter has been to the High Court. It has now been back for another trial in South Australia. That trial was determined only a matter of days ago really and we are now in the 28-day appeal period between the determination, which was a finding of guilty of murder by the jury, and sentencing.

If an appeal is lodged then obviously there will be a further delay before the committee will make its final report because the further determination of the appeal will have to take place. If there is no appeal lodged then sentencing submissions will be heard just after the expiry of that period and we will be able to finalise our report, but we did determine that it would be inappropriate for the committee to come to a final conclusion whilst this particularly key case was still ongoing in our judicial system.

However, I do want to put on the record the summary that was issued by the High Court in *Lindsay v The Queen* reported in 2015, HCA, page 16. The High Court unanimously allowed an appeal from the Court of Criminal Appeal in South Australia and they quashed the appellant's conviction. The appellant was the Aboriginal man, Lindsay. They quashed his conviction for murder and they ordered a new trial and they describe it as follows:

The appellant, an Aboriginal man, was tried before a jury for the murder of Andrew Roger Negre. The appellant, his de facto wife and a friend met the deceased, who was not previously known to them, at a hotel. When they left the hotel, all four went to the appellant's home to have some further drinks. It was open to the jury to find that the deceased made sexual advances towards the appellant at the appellant's home and these culminated in an offer, made in the presence of the appellant's de facto wife and others, to pay the appellant for sex. It was also open to find that the appellant killed the deceased in a state of loss of self-control following the making of that offer.

The High Court goes on to say:

In South Australia, the partial defence of provocation under the common law operates to reduce murder to manslaughter. The trial judge directed the jury that it was incumbent on the prosecution to prove that the appellant was not acting under provocation at the time of the killing. The appellant was convicted for murder.

On appeal, a majority of the CCA [in South Australia] held that the directions given [by the initial judge] to the jury on provocation were flawed in respects that amounted to a miscarriage of justice. However, the CCA concluded that the evidence taken at its highest could not satisfy the objective limb of the partial defence of provocation—

I won't go into the details of what is the objective and what is the subjective limb, suffice to say that this is a quite complex area of law which involves consideration of a range of factors given various amounts of weight—

that is, that no reasonable jury could fail to find that an ordinary person, provoked to the degree that the appellant was provoked, could not have so far lost his self-control as to form the intention to kill or inflict grievous bodily harm and to act as the appellant did. The CCA majority held that provocation should therefore not have been left for the jury's consideration and it followed that the erroneous directions had not occasioned a substantial miscarriage of justice.

The Court of Criminal Appeal then dismissed the appeal and that was what then went up to the High Court. If you ever have the chance, I would recommend that all members in this place go along to see the High Court in action, because what they do is they hear these arguments for what is called special leave to appeal, and they are remarkably quick. They are not the ponderous, slow, lengthy, day-by-day cross-examinations that you often find in other cases in our lower courts. Rather, the High Court is the really quick place. If you want a really entertaining day, the next time the High Court is hearing cases in Adelaide, I would recommend you go along and have a look.

By grant of special leave, the appellant appealed to the High Court. The court unanimously allowed the appeal, holding that the trial judge was right to leave provocation to the jury. The High Court said there is a need for caution before a court determines as a matter of law that contemporary attitudes to sexual relations are such that conduct is incapable of constituting provocation.

That is, what was originally said by the original trial judge that in this day and age you could not possibly argue that a non-violent sexual advance in somewhat other circumstances to those that occurred here would be a basis to argue a defence of partial provocation. The High Court goes on:

The gravity of the provocation must be assessed from the standpoint of the accused. The High Court said it was open to a reasonable jury—

and aren't they all reasonable?—

to consider that an offer of money for sex made by a Caucasian man to an Aboriginal man in the latter's home and in the presence of his wife and family may have had a pungency that an unwelcome sexual advance made by one man toward another in other circumstances would not have. The assessment of the gravity of the provocation and its capacity to satisfy that objective limb of the partial defence were issues for the jury.

The High Court has made a very clear finding there and it is now up to the committee that has been considering this matter to await what happens on the further finding by a jury in this state that the appellant, the Aboriginal man, is guilty of murder. If that is appealed then we have to wait a bit longer, as I said, but if it is not appealed then there will be sentencing based on the finding of murder, having now settled at this stage, as far as we can tell, that the law of provocation as it operates in this state does take account of current social attitudes and cannot be used simply to excuse abhorrent behaviour on the basis of a non-violent homosexual advance in circumstances where other factors are not significantly at play. I will conclude my remarks there.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:24): I thank the member for Heysen for her comments and also her experience and expertise in these matters on the Legislative Review Committee. It is always a good morning on Wednesday morning to have these legal debates, from my position of extreme ignorance. This is obviously a moveable feast; it is ongoing. I look forward to coming back to the house with a final report into provocation. In the meantime, I want to thank the members of the committee and also the staff for working so hard on such a complicated area of law. I commend the report.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PROPOSAL TO EXPAND MOBILONG PRISON

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:25): I move:

That the 543rd report of the committee, entitled Proposal to Expand Mobilong Prison, be noted.

Mobilong Prison, situated near Murray Bridge and built in 1987, currently accommodates 368 medium and low-security male prisoners. This project will expand the capacity of the prison by 72 additional beds and will help to reduce the current pressures being encountered by the correctional services system due to an increase in prisoner population.

The project proposes nine modular independent living units similar to those recently constructed at the Mount Gambier Prison which the committee inspected last year. We found the units functional and appropriate and we were generally impressed with the layout from last year's visit. Each unit will accommodate eight prisoners in four bedrooms. There will be two bathrooms, a kitchen and living space per unit, encouraging independent living. In addition to the accommodation, the project incorporates:

- an additional officers' station with multipurpose interview and program training rooms;
- the expansion of the Education and Offenders Development Unit;
- the establishment of a dedicated videoconferencing suite, to allow for video links to court hearings and for other matters; and
- the expansion of the current car park for both staff and visitors.

The cost of the project, incorporating all the works, is \$10.74 million GST exclusive. Work is due to commence in late April with completion of the accommodation units by the end of July this year, and the remainder of the project by the end of September 2016.

I would like to thank those who prepared the submission and appeared as witnesses, and I would also like to thank the member for Hammond for appearing before the committee to give his views and represent his electorate—that was much appreciated. I would like to also thank my fellow committee members who sit with me on this committee, and the committee staff for their hard work. Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:27): I rise to support the 543rd report of the Public Works Committee for the expansion or the upgrade of the Mobilong Prison. I would like to say that the prison projects that come to public works are always met with keen interest, particularly for a couple of

members who seem to be very concerned with the prison upgrades but, more importantly, the number of prisoners who are being held, particularly in holding cells around South Australia. I would also like to note that the local member for Hammond's evidence on the project was first class and he is showing a keen interest in his electorate.

I think the 72-bed expansion is based on the existing system and, as I have said, I do have concerns that we continue to under-address the situation of prison numbers here in South Australia. Sadly, prisoner numbers are outranking the number of beds and the government continues to under-address the situation and it really needs to be putting a bit more focus on the capacity rather than just problem solving as we go along.

There were a number of questions asked of the department and I think most of them were around the safety aspect while the upgrade is under way. It is also about a long-overdue process or rebuild or a redevelopment of the Mobilong Prison that was once going to be a \$500 million proposal back in 2009, and yet we are now dealing with a \$10.7 million GST exclusive project. It is a far cry from what should be put in place; nevertheless, it is a project that I support as a Public Works Committee member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was just going to say, member for Chaffey, you seem to be suggesting that the member for Hammond had some inside knowledge of the workings of Mobilong.

Mr Pengilly: He may have!

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:29): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I was a little distracted during the final moments of the member for Chaffey's comments, but what I will say in this place is that I have willingly entered Mobilong Prison quite a few times and have willingly been allowed to leave—yes, I have always been able to leave.

I want to comment quickly on the 543rd report of the Public Works Committee on the proposal to expand Mobilong Prison. This will take the prison, that was built in 1987 at Mobilong originally for 160 beds, out to 440 beds. So, I have some concerns about the ever bulging fences keeping our prisoners in place.

I must admit I had some quite cordial conversations with the prisoners the last time I was there. It was a White Ribbon Day function. I always try to make it my business to have a chat. I always say to them, 'I don't want to know what you're here for, but how long have you got?' and things like that, and it can have some interesting responses. In saying that, part of the need to expand facilities across the state is because people are being held in police holding cells, and this will give nine modular units holding 72 extra beds. There will be a new officers' station with additional multipurpose interview and program training rooms and other facilities, including the car park which will come into play.

The construction commences this month and will finish in July of this year, so that will go pretty quickly. The total cost is \$10.74 million, which is \$740,000 more than what was paid out in compensation for the bungled attempt by this government to inflict a Yatala replacement 10 years ago that was announced in the state budget. It was a shameful way to deliver public policy and such a big announcement for my electorate, but also for the state, considering that I had no knowledge of it until it was in the paper on the morning of the budget, and the mayor did not know, but that went by the way and \$10 million was spent in compensation to the three players that had built up bids for that correctional facility for, essentially, a Yatala replacement and a new female prison.

Some of the concerns I raised at the committee were concerns about the road network being upgraded for better access to the prison, including Bremer Road and the full bitumising of that, and urging the government to take heed of upgrades to health facilities in the town. I have witnessed prisoners accessing health services in Murray Bridge, and I do not deny them that, but the government cannot impose more and more numbers and think that everything rocks and rolls along in the background.

Something I have been very proactive about with regard to this increase in prisoners, and certainly if there is a proposal to build a new prison in Mobilong at some stage because the land is still there, is that we need metroticketing to Murray Bridge. I say that because now that right out to

the boundary of The Rural City of Murray Bridge is a part of Greater Adelaide, as endorsed in the planning debate yesterday, I think it needs to be taken into that category.

I think we need to have a lot of forward thinking and if there is going to be a debate about a new facility in the future I want to be a part of it and the council of The Rural City of Murray Bridge wants to be a part of it.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:33): I rise to indicate my support for this particular matter. Prisons are an interest of mine. A few years ago I was the shadow for correctional services and I visited Mobilong Prison a couple of times. Picking up on what the member for Hammond had to say, the simple fact of the matter is that we are going to have to build a new facility in South Australia, sooner rather than later. I think it is embarrassing and somewhat difficult for the Department for Correctional Services people to have this question thrown at them and to not be able to answer because it is a political decision.

Clearly, the site of Mobilong Prison lends itself to an expansion, being close to Adelaide (an hour away from Adelaide). A number of current prison officers live in Adelaide and commute, or live in the Hills and commute, or live in Murray Bridge. It is a convenient place for a prison, gives good access to everybody who needs it, and from my experience it is a particularly well-run prison, and the opportunities for prisoners to better themselves by way of education or doing trades are good down there.

I have also spoken to a number of prisoners—I am yet to find one that is guilty, they all seem to be not guilty on most subjects, but that is how it is in the prison industry. We are continually adding to these prisons, whether it be Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln or, in this case, Mobilong. We are just adding beds. To some extent we are using container technology and it is fine, but I think longer term we will need another facility.

Yatala prison is a disgrace. It has been there for a century and is archaic; it smells worse than most other prisons. I would not think that officers who work there would really have great thoughts about going to work each day out on that site. Ultimately we will have to do something about a new prison in South Australia. I make the point out of today's media, where they are saying that the \$160 million on the O-Bahn will not make any difference to the time it takes people to get to work, that \$160 million would go a long way towards a new prison or something else, but it will not save a marginal seat. We support the Mobilong Prison extension, and I will watch with interest as it progresses.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:37): I thank all those who have contributed to this debate—the member for Chaffey, the member for Finniss and, in particular, the member for Hammond as the local representative for the area. I thank the committee: we are a good, robust, bipartisan committee, and I thank them for their good works and recommend this report to the house.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Fisher, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of the Hon. Natasha Stott-Despoja, our former parliamentary colleague, and welcome her to the House of Assembly. I also note the presence in the gallery of many people who are involved in the important issues addressed in this report, and acknowledge and thank them for their work and perseverance in effecting change. Member for Fisher.

Parliamentary Committees

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE INQUIRY

Ms COOK (Fisher) (11:38): I move:

That the 39th report of the committee, entitled Domestic and Family Violence Inquiry Report, be noted.

This report will be noted in the other place by the Presiding Member of the Social Development Committee, the Hon. Gail Gago, this afternoon. It is my privilege to present this report to the house

today in the presence of the heart of the domestic and family violence sector of South Australia, and welcome some interstate leaders also.

The federal Family Law Act 1975 defines family violence as 'violent, threatening or other behaviour by a person that coerces or controls a member of the person's family, the family member, or causes the family member to be fearful'. Across Australian states and territories definitions of domestic and family violence vary under a range of acts. Here in South Australia it is defined in the Intervention Orders Act 2009.

Different definitions across Australia lead to confusion for those affected by domestic and family violence and create potential gaps in legislation. The committee acknowledges and welcomes the agreement amongst Australian jurisdictions for a consistent definition concerning the definition of domestic and family violence through the national plan to reduce violence against women and their children 2010 to 2022. Under the national plan, 'domestic violence' is defined as:

...any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life.

There are common themes across these definitions. 'Domestic and family violence' describes a range of patterns of behaviours including threatening, intimidating, violent, controlling, abusive and manipulative behaviours that a person exhibits, usually against their partner, ex-partner or children in a domestic setting. In the majority of cases, the perpetrator is male and the victim is his female partner; however, anyone can be a victim of domestic or family violence.

The term 'family violence' emphasises the broader familial or kinship relationships in which this may occur. Effects of domestic and family abuse are long-term and intergenerational. Once a victim leaves the abusive situation, effects are likely to stay with them over their lifetime. It may affect their mental and physical health, their relationships with future partners, family and their children, and their financial, living and employment situations. This makes it a significant challenge for the victim to move forward positively with their life.

A child exposed to domestic and family violence experiences stress that is known to have a profound influence upon brain development. This in turn affects their future life chances through influences upon their capacity to learn at school, relationship building, personal, emotional management systems, and potential development of maladaptive coping strategies. This can leave children more likely to emulate the abusive patterns of behaviour conducted by their parents once they are adults themselves. In turn, this leads to an intergenerational transmission of abuse, inequality and harms with effects much broader than individual families.

It is estimated that across Australia, tragically, between 80 to 100 women are killed by their current or ex-partner each year. The Social Development Committee received 53 written submissions and heard evidence from 99 witnesses. This evidence came from individual members of the public, government, non-government organisations, police, justice and courts. I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who wrote a submission or presented to the committee for sharing their valuable and often emotional insights, their knowledge and experiences of domestic and family violence. It is through this that the committee has been able to generate 35 unanimously supported recommendations with the aim to continue to progress the fight to prevent and eliminate domestic and family violence in South Australia.

It is notoriously difficult to accurately estimate the prevalence of domestic and family violence as abuse goes under-reported to the police, and does not include individual acts of control, manipulation, threat and intimidation that frequently characterise these relationships. It may be not until an individual is actually no longer in that relationship that they can come to see the abuse that they have suffered. The committee recommends continued support under the national plan for the development of minimum national datasets and reporting frameworks to enable a better grasp of the extent of domestic and family violence. From this, resources can be targeted more effectively and programs and policies can then be developed upon evidence.

This inquiry drew into focus the need for more to be done to prevent domestic and family violence. Domestic and family violence is, in the vast majority of cases, descriptive of behaviour where a male perpetrator acts abusively against his female family member, usually a partner or

ex-partner. This is a gender issue. The abuse is representative of attitudes towards women and girls. Unfortunately, abuse against women is commonly represented in mainstream media and is often accepted in its lesser form by women, girls, men and boys. These attitudes and acceptance of gender inequality are a societal issue; however, the effects disproportionately and negatively affect women and girls.

Given the stakes, it is vital that these root causes of violence are urgently addressed. When abuse does occur, service delivery needs to be strategic, coordinated and targeted to respond effectively to the needs of people at their most vulnerable. Domestic and family violence rates are highest amongst our most vulnerable populations. Indigenous women are reported to be 31 times more likely to be subjected to domestic and family violence. Shockingly, 25 per cent of Indigenous women have experienced one or more incidents of physical violence in the last 12 months. This over-representation saddens me greatly.

Women from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds are also particularly vulnerable when they are subjected to domestic and family violence. These women may not have the knowledge of their rights in Australia or South Australia under the laws that could protect them. They may also have or perceive language barriers, cultural differences and lack support networks. Women and girls who have a disability, particularly those living in residential care, are more likely to experience more severe and longer episodes of abuse than those without a disability. They may become so accustomed to the abuse that they do not even perceive that their treatment is in fact abuse. This leads to further under-reporting.

They may not be properly listened to or know how to report their abuse therefore furthering their potential to trauma. It is up to us to empower our vulnerable sisters. Women and girls living in remote and regional areas may delay accessing help and support services due to fear of reprisals in often close-knit community settings. They may not wish to leave their support networks for safe accommodation in metropolitan areas.

Where victims have to leave their homes they may also have to move far away from their workplace and could face losing employment, and it has serious consequences and impacts on their families. Moreover, it is deeply disturbing that domestic and family violence is often initiated during pregnancy—that is, the first time a woman is exposed to an attack in her relationship is during pregnancy at a time when she is nurturing the child most often of the person who is attacking her.

The committee has formulated recommendations with these populations in mind. The South Australian government is committed in its response to violence against women. Here in SA we have led the way in service delivery with services such as the Multi-Agency Protection Service, Family Safety Framework and Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Services. These are recognised and applauded from across Australia and, in fact, throughout the world.

We should be so proud of these. We applaud them but we also must continue to commit resources and explore ways to further enhance and broaden their delivery. More can and must be done. Services that are shown to be effective in supporting victims of domestic and family abuse or that prevent the abuse from occurring should be given dedicated and secure funding to continue their work and enable strategic planning.

NGOs are at the forefront of this delivery. They are operating in a highly competitive and heavily scrutinised environment. They are known to be lean in their thinking, they give value for money services but they must retain their staff in order to do this. It is impossible to do it without adequate notice of funding continuing.

These services also must be evaluated with rigour and transparency in order to provide benchmarks, monitor progress and uncover areas requiring further specific attention. Moreover, mindful information sharing between agencies to ensure the safety of potential victims of domestic and family violence is critical. Similarly, rather than spreading funding across ministerial portfolios a central source of funding would enable a more strategic approach to tackling domestic and family violence in order to focus on safety first rather than housing first.

The committee recommends to secure this portfolio in its entirety under the Minister for Women. Currently there is inconsistency between different states and federal systems in definitions,

management and legislative frameworks that apply to domestic and family violence. The committee formulated five recommendations also to address this and suggests changes to framework and communication systems to attain better integration in response to domestic family violence issues.

As previously mentioned, some populations are more likely than others to experience domestic and family violence. Regional and remote court closures may have an impact upon domestic and family violence court services, and that is likely to impact upon the vulnerable women mentioned before. Similarly, women from Aboriginal and cultural and linguistically diverse backgrounds may experience difficulties in communicating their experiences and needs in the court setting and be put off pursuing the court process due to this. The committee recommends these issues be examined and addressed in both the commonwealth, Family and South Australian Magistrates courts.

Domestic and family violence occurs in turbulent and destructive relationships. Given time, often memories of bad times may pass and women might be happy to withdraw their complaint. It also may be that they are subjected to threat and retaliation if the case is pursued. In order to disrupt this, the process of court and evidence gathering must be streamlined. We recommend that the Evidence Act 1929 be amended to enable police body-camera evidence to be used and admissible in courts.

The committee also calls for the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to be amended to make it illegal to discriminate against a person on the grounds of domestic and family violence. This will make it easier to gather evidence and protect vulnerable people from confounding negative experience and decrease the risk of withdrawal.

The issue of domestic and family violence is gendered. The committee acknowledges that abuse can be suffered in all forms of relationships and kinship settings; I know all too well that one punch can kill. However, evidence received by the committee and national and international data indicate that this violence and abuse, commonly perpetrated by men against women, is sustained, relentless and lethal. While this may be seen as a women's issue, it points to the deep need to address attitudes towards women in order to prevent acceptance and actuation of violence. This is an issue of men and not women.

Effective culturally appropriate programs are required to re-educate and address the needs of men who perpetrate violence against women. Age and culturally appropriate programs must be put in place, targeting men and boys in order to target these attitudes before they become assault and abuse. As part of the national school curriculum, children are taught about the importance of healthy and respectful relationships. We must invest in this. It must be supported, continued and expanded.

The committee recommends that state funding only be granted to organisations, events, programs and functions that are committed to equal and respectful portrayal of women. The aim of this is to push the disrespect of women out of mainstream culture in the same way as we would expect with other forms of discrimination. Where abuse occurs, also penalties for domestic and family violence must be meaningful, succinct and consistently applied across jurisdictions.

We received evidence demonstrating the prevalence and effects of domestic and family violence in our South Australian society. This abuse takes a range of formats, from physical to psychological and emotional abuse, threats, control and financial disempowerment. Perpetrators display patterns of behaviour that intensify over time. Domestic and family violence occurs in a cycle. It has far-reaching, ongoing, intergenerational profound impacts on the lives of those affected. In its wake, lives are turned upside down for victims. The safest place, their home, is where this happens. Here in South Australia, since 2008, 23 women and two children have lost their lives. The numbers of those threatened or assaulted are considerably higher and substantially under-reported.

The recommendations of this committee take a holistic, systems approach to address the efficiency of mechanisms in place to prevent domestic and family violence and manage the aftermath where it occurs. Victims of domestic and family violence need support to balance the difficulties of the court and official systems and emotional burden of leaving an abusive relationship and potentially leaving the family home and support networks. Perpetrators also need support to see their behaviour

for the abuse it is and to address the underlying attitudes and experiences that have led them to act in the way they do.

Time expired.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:53): In light of the time, to be fair to my colleagues I will try to be brief, but I will speak to the 39th report of the Social Development Committee into domestic and family violence. I would like to note our ever-hardworking staff in the Social Development Committee and also the contributions of the members for Fisher, Torrens and Reynell, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. Gail Gago, the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Kelly Vincent.

This was quite an interesting inquiry and, being the only regional member on the committee, I was very keen that we got out into the regions; thankfully, we did—through the Murraylands, Riverland, Eyre Peninsula and the South-East—and we certainly had representation from communities in isolated areas. It is a very important inquiry to make sure that we keep our community safe.

As has been noted in the member for Fisher's contribution, a percentage of domestic violence victims are male, but I must say they are very much in the minority. In the main, sadly, women are the victims. Children are also the victims of family violence. I think some of the recommendations around perpetrator programs and educating our children at a young age, so that we can educate our youth at an early age to have that respect for their partners in the future, are the real key.

Sadly, what seems to happen at the moment is that so much work is at the crisis end of the debate. There are so many issues around emergency housing, especially in regional areas, where it is hard to have an anonymous emergency housing facility because quite often in the country everyone knows where everything is.

There are 35 excellent recommendations in the report, and I think the agency I was most impressed with during the inquiry is the Multi-Agency Protection Service. It is quite underfunded and runs on a shoestring, but spans across agencies relating to families, education, police and others. I really commend the work that they are doing to take out that silo mentality and actually get people working together to achieve the right outcomes for our society.

In fairness to my compatriots, I certainly applaud the report and hope that we get some great outcomes out of this to be delivered by both state and federal governments. I note that in Murray Bridge last night the police held a domestic violence forum. I could not be there because of parliament, but there is another forum I will be presenting at next month in Murray Bridge. I commend the report.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:56): I also rise today to speak about this report of the Social Development Committee into domestic violence. In 2014, I moved in this house that the Social Development Committee inquire into all aspects of domestic violence; to consider what our federal government's commitments are in relation to it; and to work through everything that we can do together in South Australia to prevent and end this terrible scourge that is causing death, disability and physical and mental illness, and having a deep and profound impact on current and future generations of Australians.

On becoming the parliamentary secretary and now the Assistant Minister to the Premier, it was no longer possible for me to be on the Social Development Committee. I greatly value the time I did spend on this committee, much of which was spent on this inquiry. I pay tribute to the work of those with whom I was on the committee: Dana Wortley (member for Torrens), Adrian Pederick (member for Hammond), Gerry Kandelaars MLC, Kelly Vincent MLC, and Jing Lee MLC. I also pay tribute to those who joined the committee post my time on it: Gail Gago MLC and Nat Cook (member for Fisher). I also thank those who provided administrative and research support to this committee.

The moving of this motion followed significant discussion about the possibility of this inquiry at many meetings of the Social Development Committee. I have also had numerous conversations over decades with extraordinary workers who work at the coalface of need in domestic violence shelters, outreach services and other organisations across South Australia, and unfortunately way too many heartfelt and personal conversations with colleagues, family members, friends, community

members, constituents and acquaintances who have their own history of domestic violence about the lasting impact it has had on their lives, confidence and wellbeing, and the lives of those they love.

The impetus for the inquiry was also of course underpinned by what we know about domestic violence and what relentlessly calls us to act. I will repeat those facts that continue to call us to act: the fact that one in three women is now subject to violence at some time in their lives, starting from the age of 15; that now more than one woman per week in Australia is killed as a result of domestic violence; that there is a spike in domestic violence perpetrated against women who are pregnant; that domestic violence has a profound impact on children who witness it, and in many cases constitutes child abuse; that women are most at risk of violence in the home from men they know; and that the most common location for physical assaults against women is in the home. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do apologise, member for Torrens, that it has just not been possible to call you on today. I know there may have been other members who wished to speak to acknowledge this very important report, but the debate will continue. We hope to have the opportunity to welcome some of your visitors back to the parliament for that discussion.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I welcome the student group from St Ignatius College who have just entered the chamber and who are, obviously, guests of the member of Morialta. Many of us have an interest in St Ignatius, so we welcome you to the chamber today. I hope you enjoy your time here with us and go home and tell your parents what a wonderful institution parliament is.

Bills

MAGISTRATES COURT (MONETARY LIMITS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First 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) (12:02): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Magistrates Court Act 1991. Read a first time.

Second 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) (12:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Magistrates Court (Monetary Limits) Amendment Bill 2016 reduces the upper monetary limit for minor civil matters in the Magistrates Court from \$25,000 to \$12,000. The intention of this legislation is to reduce court delays and the complexity of small claims in the Magistrates Court. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The catalyst for this Bill was a report entitled, *Statutes Amendment (Courts Efficiency Reforms) Act 2012: Review of the operation and impact of the increased monetary limit for Minor Civil Matters* (the Report) produced by the Office of Crime Statistics and Research (OCSAR).

In 2012 I introduced the *Statutes Amendment (Courts Efficiency Reforms) Bill 2012* (the 'Courts Efficiency Bill') into Parliament amending the *Magistrates Courts Act 1991* (the 'Magistrates Court Act') to increase the monetary limit of Minor Civil proceedings from \$6,000 to \$12,000. The Courts Efficiency Bill, however, was amended in the Legislative Council. Once passed, section 23 of the *Statutes Amendment (Courts Efficiency Reforms) Act 2012* (the 'Courts Efficiency Act') amended section 3(1) and section 3(4)(a) and (b) of the Magistrates Court Act and increased the monetary limit from \$6,000 to \$25,000. These amendments commenced on 1 July 2013.

Section 28(1) of the Courts Efficiency Act requires that I, as Attorney-General, conduct a review of the operation and impact of the amendments made to the Magistrates Court Act, as soon as practicable after the first anniversary of the commencement of section 23. OCSAR conducted this review, the results of which are contained in the Report.

The purpose of the increase was to keep in line with interstate jurisdictions and improve access to justice, by expanding the range of claims that could be made without incurring substantial legal costs that would otherwise outweigh the value of the claim. It was acknowledged that the enlarged Minor Civil jurisdiction may impact upon the ability of the parties to represent themselves, but it was felt that the increased access to justice and reduced cost of litigation outweighed this potential negative consequence.

Under section 3(2) of the Magistrates Court Act a Minor Civil action includes small claims, neighbourhood disputes and minor statutory proceedings. A neighbourhood dispute is defined as a dispute between neighbours, or the occupiers of properties in close proximity, based on allegations of trespass or nuisance.

When the Courts Efficiency Bill was originally introduced into Parliament on 1 March 2012 it was proposed that the monetary limit for Minor Civil claims would only be increased from \$6,000 to \$12,000. This increase was proposed in consultation with the Chief Magistrate in order to keep South Australia in line with other jurisdictions and to improve access to justice.

The Bill was amended in the Legislative Council. This included an amendment moved by the Opposition to increase the monetary limit for Minor Civil claims from \$12,000 to \$25,000.

We opposed these amendments at the time and voiced concern in the Legislative Council that the small claims jurisdiction shouldn't be overloaded with long and complicated matters that may lead to further delays. We advised the House that parties in a small claim hearing are usually not entitled to legal representation and this could often add an additional burden, which would only be exacerbated by dealing with more complex trials in a more informal setting if the limit was increased.

We also informed the Legislative Council that the Courts Administration Authority had advised that an increase to \$25,000 would also impact on the workload of court registrars dealing with minor civil claim directions hearings, as there would be an increase in the number of matters being listed. It was also put on record by our spokesperson in the Legislative Council that in most other states the small claims jurisdiction is limited to claims of \$10,000, and Queensland is the only jurisdiction with a small claim jurisdiction of up to \$25,000.

The committee was divided on the proposed amendments, but in the end the amendments were carried.

Between July 2014 and February 2015 OCSAR conducted a review of the operation and impact of the amendments made to the Magistrates Court Act by section 23 of the Courts Efficiency Act. The review was conducted using both quantitative and qualitative forms of data collection and analysis. The qualitative assessment was based on the collation and analysis of feedback from persons directly involved in the implementation and operation of the legislative changes. This included the judiciary, legal practitioners and representatives from the Courts Administration Authority. An online survey was also conducted for legal practitioners and a submission was received from the Joint Rules Advisory Committee (JRAC), which comprises members of the judiciary, Registrars, and representatives from the Law Society and the Bar Association. The quantitative analysis involved the statistical analysis of a range of administrative data collected by the CAA, including trends in the number of Minor Civil lodgements and time to finalise matters, between 2010-11 and 2013-14.

Following the commencement of section 23 of the Courts Efficiency Act, as set out in the Report, the review found:

- an increase in the number and complexity of small claim lodgements in 2013-14 (up 7.9% to 21,547 in 2013-14);
- some indication of an increase in accessibility to the civil justice system (with an increase in the actual number of small claims between \$6,000 and \$25,000 of in the order of 6.8% compared with claims for this amount range in the General Civil jurisdiction in previous years;
- a possible reduction in the median number of days to finalise a defended claim between \$6,000 and \$25,000 although it is recommended a further 12 months of data be considered before drawing such a conclusion; and
- an increase in the number of days from lodgement to finalisation for small claims since commencement of the Courts Efficiency Act (132 days in 2013/14, compared with between 109 and 118 in the three previous years).

A number of the respondents who provided feedback to OCSAR acknowledged that the monetary increase had broadened access to the civil justice system, but felt that the number of complex claims where the parties were unrepresented had also increased which was requiring additional time for the Registrar or Magistrate to determine the relevant issues. Respondents generally felt that the new limit of \$25,000 for Minor Civil actions was too high and that changes, such as reducing the limit, excluding specific types of claims, or providing more access to simple legal advice were necessary to ensure a balance between accessibility and efficiency.

The majority of respondents felt that an increase in the monetary limit for small claims from \$6,000 was warranted, but most had concerns about the \$25,000 limit. The most common concern was the increased complexity of matters that were now defined as Minor Civil.

It was anticipated at the time of the previous amendment that the lack of legal representation would be overcome by the Magistrate taking on an 'inquisitorial role', however respondents to the review advised that there is insufficient time when conducting matters to fill the gap in the vetting process left by solicitors. These views are consistent with the data analysis, which indicates that in 2013-14 there were 3,256 minor civil lodgements with claim amounts of more than \$6,000, which would have previously been dealt with in the General civil jurisdiction with legal representation.

As spelt out in the Report, JRAC supports my proposal to reduce the upper limit in the definition of a small claim to \$12,000. Based on the 2013-14 figures, a \$12,000 upper limit for Minor Civil would reduce the total number of lodgements by approximately 6%. While this reduction may appear small, it is noted that claims over \$12,000 are generally more complex and require more time to finalise. The impact upon the operation of the Magistrates Court (Civil) is therefore likely to be higher than the percentage reduction suggests.

I note that New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia, the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory all currently have an upper monetary limit for small claims of \$10,000. Tasmania has an upper limit of \$5,000, whilst Queensland remains an outlier with an upper limit of \$25,000. Thus reducing the upper monetary limit from \$25,000 to \$12,000 will bring South Australian back in line with other Australian jurisdictions.

The aim of this amendment is to reduce court delays by decreasing the number and complexity of small claim lodgements in the Magistrates Court.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Magistrates Court Act 1991*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 to reduce, from \$25,000 to \$12,000, certain monetary thresholds in the Magistrates Court relating to applications under the *Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995*, small claims, neighbourhood disputes and minor statutory proceedings.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Transitional provision

The transitional provision makes it clear that the monetary threshold changes will only apply to proceedings commenced on or after the commencement of the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

CORPORATIONS (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) (TERMINATION DAY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 March 2016.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:03): I rise to speak on the Corporations (Commonwealth Powers)(Termination Day) Amendment Bill 2016. This bill has been introduced by the Attorney-General to extend by five years—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you the lead speaker?

Ms CHAPMAN: I am the only speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The only speaker—well, that is more important again.

Ms CHAPMAN: I indicate that the opposition will be supporting this bill but, as I say, it is to extend the corporations scheme, which commenced back on 15 July 2001, for a further five years.

The expiry is due on 15 July 2016 and, accordingly, the government is progressing the bill at this time. In short, whilst the opposition is supporting the bill, it is of some concern to me—and I think ought to be to the government—that we are yet to receive the publication of the federation reform white paper of the federal government, and this will obviously include future proposals, options, and the like, for the federation of Australia.

South Australia as a state has a very important part in the current federation. We have an autonomous constitution. There is, of course, the Australian constitution, and we have in that responsibility for the Corporations Law, and we have since 2001 surrendered to the commonwealth responsibility on a periodic basis to deal with Corporations Law at a national level. It has been for good reason, and I think that it has largely worked and that it is important from the point of view of supporting a revenue responsibility, a taxation responsibility, of each of our jurisdictions.

Largely, as we know, the commonwealth on behalf of Australia collects income tax from its citizens. They collect company taxes and the goods and services tax, to name a few—the principal elements of the revenue that they collect on behalf of all Australians. We, of course, constitutionally retain the right to have income tax imposed on South Australians as a state entity if we wish. It is not usually something that we rush to, that people like to explore, but we have retained that legal power.

Members would know that in recent months there has been some discussion across Australia, and at meetings of ministers, premiers and the Prime Minister, about reform in the taxation area. Whilst there are pros and cons, and there has been some debate out there about tax reform, bear in mind that the Australian government, via the Australian Taxation Office, collects a number of principal areas of tax. Some they give back to us in grants under various agreements, and some they give back to us automatically, such as the goods and services tax, under a legislative formula.

Company tax is collected by, and now administered by, the Australian government and managed at that level, and, whilst a discussion is apparently about to start taking place about the federation structure, and indeed already out in the arena there are discussions about taxation reform, I would have thought personally it would have been prudent of this government to not advance this bill in a hurry, or, if they did, give it a short period of transfer, perhaps a year.

But we have got until July to make some final decisions on this. Whilst we will not in any way impede its passage through this house, I suggest to the government that they have a bit of a think about that. I think it would be prudent of this government to, in fact, hold the progression of this bill through the other place, which they have the capacity to do, until we have seen the federation white paper, until we have heard from the Prime Minister and the federal Leader of the Opposition as to what they will be promoting in respect of that and until they outline how they propose income tax is to be collected and/or administered in the future.

That in my view is what a prudent state government would do on behalf of the people of South Australia. However, they may do nothing; I just bring that to the attention of the parliament, and indicate, with those few words, that we do not oppose the passage of the bill.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (12:09): I will close the debate by thanking the contribution of the member for Bragg and the people who have been involved in preparing this bill for us. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (12:10): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 March 2016.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:10): It is with great pleasure that I stand to speak on the Local Government (Stormwater Management Agreement) Amendment Bill 2016. The opposition's position is that we will be supporting the bill. One of the most significant issues to be dealt with by the stormwater management teams is to sort out who is going to be responsible for the pipes and sewerage under the ground in metropolitan Adelaide.

What has happened historically is that nobody has taken responsibility for stormwater and, for the entire time I have been in the parliament, for example, we have had water rushing off the hills of Bragg down onto the plains, terrorising the people of Unley, and flushing into the area of West Torrens and almost drowning the constituents of the Treasurer.

Brownhill and Keswick Creek are branches of water which flow through the Mitcham hills and provide the lifeblood of a beautiful environment in those valleys. They flow down, some is captured through the bottom of the Glenside Hospital precinct into a stormwater catchment area under Greenhill Road, some of it travels under the old Victoria Park racecourse. There are some natural detention basins there which former departmental and Adelaide City Council personnel have been working together on to try to improve the catchment.

Unfortunately, through the ministers we have had who have tried to deal with this matter—and I remember the Hon. Trish White grappled with this at one stage. She wanted to issue regulations for people in the Unley district who were being flooded as a result of not being able to capture this water adequately. She tried to introduce some regulations to make it more difficult for landowners to have any complaint about this, and it was their fault if they built their houses 150 years ago through the creek lines and if the backs of houses through Unley were being flooded.

The state government's answer to all of this has been that we will establish a stormwater management authority, and some fairly eminent people have been appointed to this body over the time. It was worked on the basis that nobody was legally responsible for the infrastructure of these assets that had been built and managed historically by the SA Water Corporation, prior to that the Engineering and Water Service entities which were then government owned entities. Now they are independently corporate, whatever that means these days.

In any event, they established an authority which said that for the development of infrastructure in the future to deal with stormwater, we will have a system where it will be that we will put up a project, we will work out what we are going to do, and we will ask the federal government to put in a third, the state government to put in a third and the local government to put in a third.

We, out in Bragg—dealing with the valley that I have just talked about in the Brownhill Keswick Creek area, which is in desperate need of attention—went through the painstaking exercise through our local council of working out if we had an infrastructure solution to the stormwater problem. Our council would put in 4 per cent. Unley council, West Torrens council, Adelaide City Council and others were going to put in a lot more, depending on whether they were going to be a beneficiary of the water or whether they were going to need protection from the water for their constituents. This had been going on for 10 or 12 years now with report after report about what is to be done.

The member for Waite was involved in this. He sat on the fence most of the time and he really did not want to do anything in line with a number of recommendations which were to establish a dam, or multiple dams, in the Mitcham Hills catchment area so that we could slow down the flow in a major weather event and minimise the damage. Furthermore, which I thought was quite a good idea, it would give us an opportunity to capture this excess water before it rushed through and wrecked all the houses down in the Treasurer's electorate and washed them almost out to sea.

We were quite happy to work with a number of these options, but each time a proposal was put up, someone would complain about it—usually the member for Waite and his council, because they did not want to have any dams or detention basin facilities up in the Mitcham area. A number of alternative stormwater project options were put forward, including expanding the culverts through the Unley area, which brought some concern from residents in that area. Nevertheless, some other options were put up.

I just want to place on the record that, at all material times, the Burnside council has been ready, willing and able to participate in the opportunities for catchment and a contribution ongoing towards the infrastructure costs of whatever model is finally resolved, which have gone from about \$100 million to \$160 million for the options that have been considered over this period of time. Nevertheless, it still needs attention and we are always willing to deal with it.

One of the things I have presented to the government, which at this stage has had no response, is that, in whatever program is facilitated, we should expand the detention basin area in the north-west corner of the Glenside Hospital site (which is already a depressed area) for the purposes of catching water in a major water event, increase the culvert access under Greenhill Road, increase the detention basin underground capacity in the south-east corner of the Parklands (which no longer has the starting gates for the straight of the Victoria Park racecourse above it, but is now a wetlands area) and divert a significant amount of water.

I think I even had the Adelaide City Council onside with that option. They in the meantime had signed up with the state government to buy a whole lot of 'purple pipe' water, which was treated water being pumped up from the Glenelg treatment plant. That is pretty expensive water for reasons we will not go into today. It does give us a chance to divert water when we have these major events and to ensure that we do not just treat stormwater as a dangerous instrument and quite highly destructive to infrastructure, housing and even people's lives if it all comes down at once, but we have infrastructure improvements that give it the momentum to enable it to be actually used.

We had a major event in the Waterfall Gully area in about 2005-06 in my recollection. We had a one in 1,000-year flood. It was a disaster as far as expense went for the people along Waterfall Gully Road. I had announcements by the then premier saying, 'This is a great concern and Burnside council have got a lot to answer for.'

In fact, they then realised, via minister Conlon of the day, that in fact it was their road, their gully, their water, their park and their rocks that came crashing down into Waterfall Gully and they were responsible for cleaning it up. With red faces, they did in fact acknowledge that and did send up trucks, one after another, to rebuild the road and take out 11,000 tons of rock that had come rushing down that gully.

So we understand how highly destructive stormwater can be, but on this side of the house we also understand the importance of capturing it and using it before it rushes out to sea and kills all that seagrass in Gulf St Vincent, and becomes a danger both on land and in the ocean. We will be supporting this bill, and the member for Morphett will admirably go through the detail of it.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12:20): In 2003, as a relatively new member of this place, I was out, I think, at about half past four in the morning helping the good people of Glenelg North clean up after devastating floods in the Glenelg North area when the systems at the Patawalonga failed and all the stormwater came down through Brownhill Creek, Sturt Creek and the airport drain and met in the Pat. The lock gates did not work and the Pat overflowed, and hundreds of homes were severely damaged by stormwater. In fact I have vivid memories of catching a fish about three streets back from the Pat in one of the hollows in the drains there, once the floodwaters had subsided.

So for me, this issue of flooding in the metropolitan area is one that is very real, and my constituents in Morphett are very concerned about what their fellow South Australians are doing upstream to control the water. We know that as we have urban infill occurring more and more, open ground is being covered by houses and concrete and bitumen, and when the rain comes the stormwater has to go somewhere. It all flows downhill and it is all going to end up in the sea, and it is going to end up in and around my electorate of Morphett if we do not manage it in a very sensible way.

The engineering involved is expensive. It is something that we cannot avoid, though, because we do live in the flattest capital city in Australia. The flood maps around the metropolitan area are quite alarming to see, the depths of floodwater you get in some of the inner suburbs and around the Wayville showgrounds and Unley. You see the flooding in the Parklands every time there is heavy rain, and in the South Parklands there are hold-ups because of flooding. That is just the tip of the iceberg. If we see some serious rain events we are in deep, deep trouble here. Houses in

some council areas have to be built above the flood levels now because the councils are aware that this is an issue that will continue.

The bill we are discussing today amends the Local Government Act 1999. However, I have some concerns because we still have the South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act 1959 to 1970 in the statute book. I am not a lawyer, but I assume that because this is still on the statutes this legislation is still in force. It refers to the building of drainage works in the south-western suburbs, and it refers to the municipal councils of Marion, Mitcham, West Torrens, Unley, Brighton and Glenelg, and the district councils of Meadows and Stirling. We know that most of those do not exist anymore, so what is the particular legal status of this legislation?

Back in those days—1959 to 1970, which this act refers to—the issue of flooding was alive and well. We see in the act, in section 3, that the minister (meaning the Minister for Local Government) can undertake works in and around the Patawalonga, which means channels, drains, dams; they can dam the Sturt Creek, they can do a lot of things. How does this fit in with what we are discussing today?

What we need to come up with today is some definite long-term plan for a long-term problem, because the rain is going to come and the floods are going to come and we are going to have to manage the stormwater. Sure, we have wonderful wetlands around the place, but that will not manage all the stormwater we are seeing. We need to make sure that in the agreements being struck between councils—whether they are in detention or delaying the flow of the stormwater—it is something we need to have very clearly laid out, not just for this place but for the good people of South Australia who are building their homes in and around our suburbs and in those areas where there is potential inundation.

We need to make sure that the agreement we are including in this bill is going to be one that is going to allow the infrastructure that is going to be required that was first mentioned back in the South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act to be enhanced and reengineered so that we are not going to have the 2003 Glenelg floods repeated. We talk about bushfires all the time, but the other hazard we have in the metropolitan area is large-scale damage from flooding.

The people who are involved in those incidents know. In fact, there were a couple of divorces, and I am aware of one suicide, just from that event at Glenelg, as well as the hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of damage that was done and the hours and hours that my office staff and I spent battling with the insurers to try to get the payouts that these people were entitled to in that area. It took years, in some cases, for these people to be compensated for damage which was completely unrelated to their daily goings-on.

We need to make sure that any agreement we are entering into here is fair to all—not only fair to the organisations, the local government and the state government but also to the individuals. This piece of legislation will be reviewed, I am sure, at some stage when the pressures on stormwater re-use and harvesting are looked at.

There is a real need to recognise the fact that we can re-use stormwater and re-use sewerage water in South Australia, which is something we are a long way behind most countries on. We need to make sure that we are aware of the technology that is out there to harvest stormwater and put it into aquifer storage and recovery so we can continue to re-use it.

We have a deplorable situation at the moment where there are still millions and millions of litres of treated water leaving the Glenelg sewerage plant and going out to sea, and who knows what environmental effect that is having now. We did hear that some seagrass is growing back just recently, which is great news, but we are using a very, very small percentage of the treated sewerage water going out of Glenelg, and that is extremely high-quality water that could be used for many other purposes.

We have seen the \$60 million Glenelg-Adelaide pipeline put in—the big purple pipe—to take that treated water back up to Adelaide and for people to use it on the way, but what do we see? We see SA Water not just charging a reasonable cost recovery on this: we see them charging 75 per cent of potable price, and I understand that is going to go up to 90 per cent of potable price. So, by the time the councils put in their infrastructure to access that water, why would they? I know why I would like them to, but why would they? Why can't the government see sense on this? Why can't SA Water

be told that they will deliver that water, save for cost recovery—and I am sure it is not 90 per cent of potable price—to those people who want to use it on the way?

I personally would like to see that water going up the bit of the Torrens to the headwaters and then coming back down the Torrens, flushing the Torrens all the time, through wetlands, allowing people to take that water off wherever they need to for watering parks and gardens so that that water is not going out to sea. I do not know how the engineering of that would be done and how expensive it would be to do, but I think the environmental impact of what we are doing at the moment is something that cannot continue.

As for stormwater, there again, everybody, right from the individual property owners through to the councils and state government, has a responsibility to retain and re-use that stormwater if they possibly can—detain it on their properties so it can be led off at a slightly slower rate perhaps, so we do not get the flooding and high-flow rates we have seen in the past. We need to make sure that we are thinking with our feet as well as with our wallets on these sorts of things. We need to make sure that we are in step with the latest trends.

Talking about the latest trends, I had the pleasure of going to Singapore a number of years ago to talk to the Singapore Public Utilities Board with Delft Water out of Holland. The then minister for water for South Australia, Karlene Maywald, had been up there looking at some of the agreements that were being signed between Delft Water and Singapore Public Utilities Board, and also the National University of Singapore, about the handling of their stormwater in Singapore.

They have big concrete channels, or had big concrete channels, very similar to the Sturt Creek. After heavy rain, you go down through Elder and Morphett and just watch that water roar down through that concrete channel. That was happening in Singapore. With Flinders University, the Public Utilities Board of Singapore and Delft Water in Holland, they were converting their concrete channels into beautiful riverine parks with greenery; gone were the concrete channels. They have ABC up there—active clean beautiful water. It is an amazing thing to see the technologies there.

I mentioned Flinders University. I should actually emphasise the fact that Flinders University has been working on this gel technology to help filter stormwater, and it is being used overseas. We should be looking at, again, not just steel but all our other homegrown engineering developments here, so that we can make sure that South Australia is the leader in stormwater recycling and sewage recycling.

This agreement today will certainly go some way to hopefully ensuring that my constituents—the good people of Glenelg North and all those between Glenelg North and the top end of the Sturt Creek, Brownhill Creek and Airport Drain—are going to be protected from the threat of flooding, because if it does happen it is going to be a very serious event for us all.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (12:31): I have listened with great interest to the contributions made by the members opposite and thank them very much for their contributions and their support for this bill. I would like to thank the people involved in preparing the bill and I commend it to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (12:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL 2016

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 April 2016.)

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (12:32): It is a great time, as always, to be speaking in the South Australian parliament: the Supply Bill 2016. It seems to come round quicker and quicker every year, does it not, Deputy Speaker? The government is requesting \$3.444 billion to ensure that it can continue to pay the bills. This is obviously an administrative matter really, but it does give members of the house the opportunity, that only comes up two or three times a year at most, to reflect more broadly on things that government should and might be doing and to connect that back to the expenditure. I do appreciate the opportunity to have perhaps broader thoughts and musings than the normal restrictive nature of what might be discussed in this chamber.

As members would know, members who have listened to my speeches on supply bills and estimates, addresses in reply, etc., I try to be as positive as possible, although admittedly that does become increasingly difficult the longer I come in to this place, as I try to reflect on positive aspects with this hopeless Labor government. We will try, regardless, to cast a positive alternative vision for South Australia. Today I will discuss some of the things that I hope to be part of if privileged enough to be part of an incoming Liberal government after the 2018 state election.

Members would be aware that a few weeks ago the Liberal Party launched 2036, a clear, strong and credible platform outlining what we as a political party stand for. This is a foundation which aims to give us as a party a clear way of communicating to the South Australian public and key stakeholders in South Australia what we will stand for. It is a foundation upon which we can build policies going into the future. It is a positive document and a really good direction-setting document for the opposition moving towards the 2018 election.

Since the launch of 2036, it has been really good to see a number of policies released under that framework which aim to progress one or more of the nine key pillars which make up the 2036 manifesto. I want to briefly touch on three of those policy areas which the Liberal opposition has launched in the last few weeks and canvass some of what I think are the really positive aspects of these policy announcements that have been put out into the public realm.

The first is our rate capping announcement, and that is a very clear announcement by the Liberal Party. It is saying that if elected in 2018, if the government does not pass the legislation that we currently have before the parliament beforehand, we will bring in a cap on the level of rate rises that local governments in South Australia can set. At the moment, we have significant concerns, and it is a real cost-of-living burden for many households. Council rate bills are among the largest single bills that a household will receive in any given year, including things like water bills and electricity bills. Mortgage bills tend to be split up into quarterly or monthly bills, but often a significant bill shock is received by householders when they receive their council rate bill in August or September each year, and that is a significant concern for us.

I was proud to be able to lead a push for an inquiry by the state parliament's Economic and Finance Committee into council rate capping. That inquiry has not yet handed down its final findings, but it was certainly clear to me and my colleagues on this side of the house that there is a need to rein councils in with their unnecessary rate rises and to actually say to them, 'You have to be working harder to become as efficient as possible, to get back to basics and deliver the things that your community expect you to deliver in a high-quality way that is not too flashy, things such as the pavements, roads, rubbish collection, sporting ovals, parks and the local environment.' Get the basics right before the long arm of local government wanders into all manner of other areas.

Hopefully, the introduction of a rate cap, set by an independent commission based on an analysis of the cost pressures facing local government, will go some way to enabling local government to start thinking more about the cost pressures it places on South Australian households. That is a policy we have put forward following the launch of the 2036 manifesto and I look forward to the government perhaps supporting that in the current legislation before the parliament and, if not, seeing it introduced after the Liberal Party forms government in 2018.

The other policy, which we released a couple of weeks ago, was that we would legislate to allow ride sharing technology to be made legal in South Australia, enabling a whole range of small microbusinesses to take off, which can be the case and has been the case interstate and overseas, through people providing ride sharing services using apps such as UberX.

It has been really disappointing to see how slow the current government has been in taking up these new technologies and having a real position against ride sharing. I am pretty convinced that the younger members and the newer members of the government, people like the member for Lee and the member for Kaurana, are very much in favour of us moving towards a more modern economy, embracing new technologies and trying to encourage these activities, but it does appear that some of the old guard in the Labor Party are less excited about embracing UberX and may even have particular conflicts along the way.

It is good to see that the government is chasing the Liberal Party's policy announcement and has announced, albeit with perhaps a bit too much regulation and red tape surrounding it, this week that there will be a move to legalise UberX being used in South Australia.

Mr Goldsworthy: Catch-up.

Mr SPEIRS: As the member for Kavel reminds me, the government is very much chasing the opposition, and has been for most of this year, I think.

Mr Goldsworthy: Leading the way.

Mr SPEIRS: Leading the way, indeed.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we go on, I would remind the member for Kavel that we do have guests in the gallery today, the grade 7s from Woodcroft Primary School, who are guests of the member for Mawson. We would not want them to think that parliament is rowdy, would we?

Mr SPEIRS: Not at all.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We hope they enjoy their time with us today.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2016

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (12:40): It is good to see a school from the great southern suburbs, which I too represent. There may even be some students from Woodcroft Primary School—which I think is one of the largest primary schools in South Australia—who is in my electorate. They will no doubt be enjoying their time in parliament and following along with excitement the prospect of the Liberal Party forming government in 2018, when we will be part of transforming Glenelg, because that is the next policy announcement I want to discuss.

We announced earlier this week that if we form government in 2018 we will happily provide \$20 million as a contribution towards a transformation of Glenelg, specifically focused around the tourism potential of the Glenelg jetty, which has been touted as a potential economic driver for South Australia and South Australia's tourism industry. The tourism dollar is very important for this state, so it has been really good to see the Liberal Party get alongside the City of Holdfast Bay.

I work very closely with Mayor Stephen Patterson. He has only been in the job for a bit more than a year, and he has leading a professional and progressive council down there. It is great to see them get involved in state-building projects, such as the transformation of the Glenelg jetty. It is good to see the state Liberal Party getting involved in that as well, partnering with the council. Hopefully there will be some federal funding attracted to that project, as well as significant private industry investment.

That covers the three policy areas that have been flowing from the 2036 manifesto that I wanted to discuss today, but I want to go on and have a moment canvassing the state of South Australia's Public Service. This is an area that I have a personal interest in, having previously worked in the Public Service for several years before my election to this place. It is always good to be able

to stand up and share my reflections on South Australia's Public Service, our state's largest employer by far and a vital engine room for our state's social, environmental and economic direction.

Often the government try to portray the Liberal Party as somehow not supportive of the Public Service and the vital work that it does, but I can tell the house that we are supportive and we understand exactly what the Public Service needs to be able to do its job well. What we want to focus on is service improvements, delivering quality first-class public services which enhance South Australia's reputation as a great place to live and do business. We will invest in the Public Service. We will ensure that training and development opportunities are available to public servants, investing in the people who, through their diligence and their work, invest in this state.

The key question that I think legislators need to ask themselves, and those people in government or aspiring to government, is: what is the Public Service for? It is very much my view, and I believe the Liberal Party's view, that our public workforce in this state is one of South Australia's greatest assets. We are not just talking about our police officers, paramedics, teachers, nurses and social workers. Yes, these front-line workers are, in my view, the most important part of our public workforce, and their pay and conditions should always be protected. However, I also group a large proportion of the hidden Public Service workforce, the background bureaucracy, as being an important part of the engine room of our state.

There are clearly arguments about how large this backroom bureaucracy should be, and I personally would favour a re-emphasis on front-line workers, but there are still thousands of backroom jobs required to provide policy direction and project management for our state. Make no mistake that these people are also classed in the group I am referring to when I talk about South Australia's public workforce being one of the greatest assets this state has. In our 2036 manifesto, section 9 is entitled 'Running an efficient and stable government', and here we outline some of our beliefs about the Public Service. The first three of these are:

- The public service is one of our State's greatest assets, able to drive change in South Australia when given the freedom and respect it needs to unleash its potential.
- The public service should be free from political interference, with a premium placed on frank and fearless advice, with jobs won on merit, not as rewards for political loyalty.
- The public service can be a place of innovation, where people are encouraged and supported to come up with creative solutions to the challenges facing South Australia.

These are not platitudes. We do believe in the power of the Public Service. We believe it should be free from political interference and we believe in a return to the traditional tenets of the Public Service where frank and fearless advice is welcomed and rewarded, rather than being a career-limiting move.

The problems I have outlined in my regular speeches on the Public Service remain as bad as ever. Jobs for the boys and girls is really the *modus operandi* in the executive levels of the Public Service, and even positions below, in ASO7 and ASO8, where political mates are given pats on the back and a cushy position as a reward for handing out how-to-vote cards and choreographing fake Twitter accounts.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr SPEIRS: My contacts in the Public Service remain solid and I continue to hear stories of public servants feeling entirely compromised when asked to do work that would once have been the purview of Labor Party operatives but is now routinely extended to the Public Service. Government events are instructed to be held in marginal seats; data must be harvested and forwarded into government databases to be fed an array of propaganda in due course.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the member for Kavel need medical assistance?

Mr SPEIRS: He's got a bad chest.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He seems to be making a lot of groaning noises. I am finding it off-putting. How are you coping, member for Bright?

Mr Goldsworthy: I'm wincing at things.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Speaker Bishop has given rulings on audible grunting and groaning, and I may have to emulate that here today. I would like you to restrain yourself.

Mr SPEIRS: Public servants take direct instruction from chiefs of staff and political hacks instead of from their line managers, with governance by fear so entrenched that managers who are on contract are left feeling too exposed and vulnerable to push back against inappropriate requests.

Only last month, a public servant told me that he had arrived at work on a regular Monday morning to discover a new position had been created in his team, one that he did not know about until he arrived. A desk and computer had been set up in his area over the weekend and a new ergonomically-assessed chair had been put in place.

At 9.30am (not an early starter), after coffee with his mates at Blefari's and a few fake Twitter posts later, a former political adviser sauntered into the office. He had been made a director on about \$150,000 a year or maybe more—no process, no accountability, no thought that someone else in the Public Service might like to apply for that job, a job that did not even exist and was not needed on Friday afternoon.

No, this was a gift from a minister for the loyal service of a particularly unsavoury political geezer. He will now get to occupy a spot in the State Admin Centre, consuming valuable oxygen and flushing the toilet a couple of times a day while his colleagues wonder what he is there for. Perhaps he holds the secret of where the commas are to be placed in future cabinet submissions, or maybe he will spend the next two years faking Twitter posts and contorting himself into a safe seat somewhere before the 2018 election when he joins the throngs of inspiration opposite and gives one of those memorable maiden speeches where he pays unwavering homage to whoever got him there.

In closing my comments on the Public Service, I want to turn my mind to the role of political advisers and what they do in the modern Public Service. Like a particularly bad strain of myxomatosis, advisers have spread through political offices since the 1990s, multiplying at a catastrophic rate and providing, in my opinion, the biggest single challenge to accountable, intelligent, evidence-based public administration.

Advisers. Latin name: 'Adviserous horribilis'. Usually under qualified and overly confident, largely aged 25 to 35, characterised by having the log-in details of multiple fake Twitter accounts stored in the notes section of their iPhones. Their habitat is a murky half-world, a purgatory somewhere between public service and political office.

They read InDaily, drink at small bars, enjoy fatty and sugary foods and have the physical characteristics associated with enjoying fatty and sugary foods. Chameleon-like, they have the unique ability to change their skins, depending on the location of the safe seat they aspire to represent. They often interbreed, leading to a reduced gene pool, and are loved only by their mothers. While their day-to-day habitats tend to be open plan offices, enabling them to throw foam footballs to one another, every fortnight or so on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays they congregate in the shadowy benches of the Speaker's gallery to watch their favourite sport: question time.

They are, for sure, an interesting pest, an overabundant species, to use the latest vernacular from the environment department, and as observers of the environment department would know, whether it is corellas or fur seals, this government is loathe to deal with overabundant creatures.

I am not an advocate for slashing the Public Service, but I am an advocate for slashing the use of political advisers. As their title would suggest, these guys and girls come up with advice, but it really does not need to be good advice. Advice is a very subjective term, so it can just be advice. They will make changes for the sake of change, just to justify their existence and remind themselves that despite having dropped out of their arts degree to concentrate on student politics, they are geniuses, masters of political strategy, and so they tell themselves a hundred times a day that they are normal, with emphasis on that very subjective word 'normal', and lucky to have landed jobs serving the good folk of South Australia.

Advisers are a social species, particularly due to the increasing numbers of them. Back before they had government protection they were actually a threatened species, like the bare-rumped sheath-tail bat or the Gilbert's potoroo, both on the EPBC critically endangered list. There was one day not so long ago when there was only one adviser per minister—only one. Can you believe it?

How did government survive? Regardless, there are many more today and they have that status of abundance.

I will return to this subject in more detail in a while some time in the coming weeks when I will share with the house the views of Jennifer Westacott, Adam Creighton, Terry Moran and Professor Ken Wiltshire on the impact of advisers on government. Suffice to say it is a very poor impact.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not going to plagiarise their work, are you? Member for Mount Gambier.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:52): That is going to be a very tough act to follow. I rise to speak on the Supply Bill and note my concern for this wonderful state of South Australia. Even today there was an ABC news article talking about South Australia and the exodus of young people, particularly from the workforce of this state, and the economic impact that has. This should come as no surprise to those in metropolitan Adelaide because, quite frankly, it has been experienced in regional areas for nearly a generation.

I have spoken in this place before about what has been occurring in the bush and in regional areas will soon be felt by those in metropolitan Adelaide; that is, lack of job opportunities which will lead to young people moving out of South Australia. In the bush they move to the big city or the big smoke and take up opportunities there. When there are no opportunities in the city they will move out of the state.

What is quite frightening is that only 58 per cent of the population in South Australia is actually employed. This leaves fewer and fewer people providing for more and more. Because we are an ageing population I have great fears that when Holden closes those people in the 50 to 55 age bracket not able to secure employment will remain in South Australia on limited income. Sure, the pay-out might seem adequate at the start, but it is debatable whether over a period of time that will last into their 70s or 80s, with the average life expectancy now around 84 years.

I hold very grave fears for their future and for the young people of South Australia because, quite frankly, those who are leaving South Australia are the exact ones we need to remain in or come back to South Australia. Yet, over the last 10 years we have had a net exodus of 3,000 people per year leaving this state. Quite often they are the ones who have the exact skills that we need. Once they have left some come back in their mid 40s, early 50s, normally to care for an aging parent, and are quite dismayed at the lack of job opportunities and the fact that they are actually over-skilled for many of the jobs here in South Australia.

I fear that we are heading towards a state bank collapse type scenario. If you look at the key indicators of this state you can draw some correlation with that. The state bank to this state was like dropping a frog in a pot of boiling water. Quite quickly the frog jumped out, there was a massive reaction and we had political pain, which resulted in the Labor government being ousted and a large majority for the Liberal Party.

However, if you look at the indicators leading up to today, it is like the pot of water has slowly heated up to the point where it is actually boiling, but many people in this state just do not realise the dire situation. In 2017-18 our net debt will be \$13.5 billion. For the record, when the state bank collapsed that debt hit \$11 billion, so we will be in a worse situation. Some will argue that our population may have increased, but the real key point is the economic growth or lack thereof.

So economic growth in South Australia: 1.6 per cent in 2014-15, compared with nationally a 2.3 per cent growth. So we are growing at a very slow rate compared with the rest of the nation. We hear in this place the Minister for Trade get up and talk about how wonderful our exports are: they actually fell by 5.3 per cent on an annualised basis, compared with the previous 12 months, to \$11.62 billion. By the way, the government's target is \$18 billion by 2017. However, I fear this will go into the bucket of broken promises, like the 100,000 jobs forecast by the Labor state government.

Of course, we have the highest unemployment across Australia at 7.7 per cent, and it is the nation's highest. All of those factors are adding up to what I say is creating the environment for an economic collapse. I do not like coming here and saying that type of stuff, but I want to forewarn that, unless some things are taken very, very seriously, that is the situation that we will find ourselves in.

There is no point in having us point to something like Arrium, when the state government very late in the piece put in a requirement for procurement to use Australian standard steel. Why was not that in from the start? Why was that not in years ago when this \$2.1 billion investment was made in this state? I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to a question as detailed in the schedule I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today St Mary's College, who are guests of the member for Adelaide; St Ignatius College, who are guests of the member for Morialta; Woodcroft Primary School, who are guests of the member for Mawson; and the Yankalilla Country Women's Association and their distinguished acting treasurer, who are guests of the member for Finnis. I also welcome Olympic champion Dawn Fraser to our deliberations.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:01): I bring up the 22nd report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:02): My question is to the Minister for Health. In light of the AMA survey results released today, will the minister now scrap his plans for Transforming Health?

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:02): No.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Thank you, sir—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Rewarded for his misbehaviour.

STEEL INDUSTRY

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:02): Merely entitled to my right to ask a question in the house, sir. Can the Treasurer update the house on the support provided to the local steel industry, both in the past and in the future?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would the Treasurer be seated. The leader and the deputy leader are called to order, as is the member for Mount Gambier. The Treasurer hasn't said a word yet.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is called to order. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:03): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for his question, and I know his keen interest in this area. It was the member for Giles who first raised with the Premier the issue of cheap imported steel being dumped in the South Australian market and advocated for a change to the procurement policy for state government funded projects.

Shortly after, the state government through the Industry Participation Advocate mandated that all steel used on publicly funded projects must meet Australian standards and certification requirements. This policy gives local industry a competitive advantage against imports, as our steel manufacturers make some of the best steel products in the world and are supported by more than \$4 million of funding over the next four years to ensure that South Australian projects use as much local steel as possible.

This reinforces our commitment to the steel industry and, of course, to our state. However, even before we changed the policy and before Arrium faced its current problems, this government had an excellent track record on sourcing local steel for public projects. Take the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, for instance, a project opposed by those opposite, which saw about 3,800 tonnes of structural steel used. All steel used was Australian supplied and fabricated in South Australia. Approximately 25 per cent of the steel was sourced from Arrium (previously OneSteel) with a majority coming from SA company Brice Metals.

The River Torrens pedestrian bridge—another project rejected by those opposite—used about 877 tonnes of steel sourced from Australian manufacturers. Nearly 10,000 tonnes of steel used on the Northern Expressway project was Australian supplied, and 1,620 tonnes of the 1,670 tonnes of steel used in the construction of the South Road Superway project was supplied by South Australian companies. The remainder was sourced from overseas, but it was not manufactured anywhere in Australia.

The new Royal Adelaide Hospital, despite suggestions to the contrary, used as much Australian and South Australian steel as possible at the time, with all steel used on the project being supplied by South Australian contractors and audited to meet the Australian standards. This is despite the contract being signed years before our current policy and before the unfortunate circumstances now facing Arrium.

Moving forward, the construction stage of Stage 2 of the Convention Centre has the South Australian company Samaras Group, a great South Australian success story, working on the fabrication, supply and installation of about 3,000 tonnes of structural steel, of which more than 60 per cent was sourced from Whyalla.

The O-Bahn City Access project is sourcing as much steel as possible from Arrium, about 1,700 tonnes. Hansen Yuncken has advised that, where possible, all steel will be sourced from Arrium for the Flinders Medical Centre Transforming Health redevelopment, a project requiring more than 3,000 tonnes of steel. Any product not available from Whyalla will be sourced from other Australian mills or contractors.

It is important to note that there will always be a need for some steel to be sourced from overseas, mainly because we do not manufacture all types of steel in this country. However, this proves that here, in South Australia, we have and we always will continue to put our steel industry first.

As we continue building South Australia, the Industry Participation Advocate will be working with future contractors on the Northern Connector, the Darlington Upgrade project, the Torrens to Torrens project and the Torrens Rail Junction to ensure that as much local steel as possible is used.

The combined infrastructure spending of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland will total more than \$75 billion over the next four years. If these states showed the same discipline towards local procurement as we did, South Australia and Arrium would be big beneficiaries.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. The leader.

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): Thank you very much, sir. My question is to the Minister for Health. In light of the AMA's survey that shows that 79 per cent of doctors do not feel adequately consulted on the implementation of Transforming Health, how can the minister stand by his statement that it is being supported by 95 per cent of clinicians in South Australia?

Mr Pisoni: Because he makes it up!

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is called to order. And that reminds me that before the leader rose I should have called to order the member for Mitchell and warned for a first time the deputy leader, the leader and the member for Mount Gambier. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:08): Mr Speaker, there are a few things I can say about this survey. Firstly, the way it is being conducted is not what one would call highly scientific. It is not the way any reputable polling organisation would undertake a survey to find out the views of its members.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Funny that the Leader of the Opposition is not also mentioning that SASMOA was part of this survey. Funny that he should only mention the AMA and not SASMOA; I think that says something. But, nonetheless, that aside, no reputable polling organisation would undertake a survey in this way. You don't put something out and ask for people to contribute and expect you are going to get the results reflective of the views of the membership.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Mr Speaker, no organisation would work in this way, and in fact I would not call it a survey so much as a complaint box. Of course it is going to reflect—the results are going to be skewed in a particular way because of the nature of undertaking this supposed survey.

Having said that, change is always going to be difficult. Change is always hard and reform of this nature is always going to cause anxiety among people, and I understand that. If you have a look at any of the significant reform projects that this government has undertaken, initially they have encountered strong opposition. If you have a look at the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, I very well remember the howls of outrage, the cries that this was going to be the end of the world and the sky was going to fall in.

I remember the opposition to the footbridge. Similar once again: howls of outrage, the sky was going to fall in. It is not unusual when you are undertaking reform, as a reformist government does, that you get opposition. That is the mark of a reforming government that has courage, that despite the background noise you do what is right. The fact is we are undertaking reforms that the opposition, when they were last in government, never had the courage to undertake, because we are a courageous government.

If I say one final thing with regard to reform and people saying the sky is about to fall in, I very well remember in this house and in the wider public, with the changes to the Modbury Hospital and emergency department, the sky was going to fall in, this was going to be the end of the world and this was going to be a disaster. Well, Mr Speaker, what have we seen in the roughly four weeks since those changes? I acknowledge it is early days, but what have we seen? Two additional people being transferred from the Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin a day. Two a day extra on top of what was already—so that is about eight to 10 transfers a day. That is about two a day more than were previously being transferred—point No. 1.

Secondly, I should say that you have roughly 80 to 100 patients who continue to present and be looked after at the Modbury Hospital, exactly as I recall saying in this chamber would happen. The sky has not fallen in. Thirdly, if you have a look at the emergency department performance of both the Modbury Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital in the last few weeks, they are significantly better.

We will get runs on the board, and as we continue to get runs on the board with these reforms, the clinicians' hearts and minds will follow. There is no clinician in South Australia who is not interested in patient safety, who does not place that number one. As these reforms continue to improve patient outcomes, we will get that support.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. I call to order the members for Schubert, Morialta, Kavel, Davenport and Chaffey; I warn for the first time the members for Unley, Hartley, Schubert, Kavel and Morialta; and I warn for the second and final time the leader, the deputy leader and the members for Mount Gambier, Schubert and Morialta. The member for Elder.

AUSTRALIAN SWIMMING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Could the minister update the house on the performance of the South Australian Sports Institute swimmers during the 2016 Hancock Prospecting Australia Swimming Championships currently being held at the aquatics centre Marion?

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) (14:13): I thank the member for Elder for the question and acknowledge that this wonderful facility, built by this government and opened five years ago, is in the member for Elder's electorate. Since we opened that wonderful centre, for the past two years we have had the Australian Swimming Championships there. Just as they doubled as the Olympic swimming trials in 2012 before London, this year they are also the Olympic swimming trials for the Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro. It has been a terrific addition to our fantastic sporting facilities in South Australia.

As well as bringing in 500 swimmers, athletes, coaches and support staff, it has also brought in many other tourists. It will bring \$3½ million into the economy. The event started last Thursday. It will finish up tomorrow night. Tonight, the Paralympic team will be named; tomorrow night, the Australian Olympic team will be named, and it's terrific to have the spotlight of our nation on Adelaide for this wonderful event.

With the Hancock Prospecting Australian Swimming Championships, I want to mention a few SASI athletes who have done particularly well. Of course, Kyle Chalmers, a 17 year old from Immanuel College, won the silver medal on Monday night in the 100-metre freestyle in a personal best time, and he has met the selection time for individual Olympic Games selection. So, we all congratulate Kyle—he is of course the son of Brett Chalmers, former Port Adelaide and Crows AFL player—and wish him all the very best in Rio.

Other SASI athletes who received medals were Ethan Owens, who won silver in the 800-metre freestyle, which was a non-Olympic event, as well as Joshua Palmer, who has won gold in the 50-metre backstroke—a non-Olympic event—and silver in the 100-metre breaststroke. While Joshua did not meet the Olympic qualifying time, I am sure all will agree he put in an amazing effort in front of his home crowd.

A number of SASI athletes have also been finalists. Sally Hunter finished fourth in the 100-metre and 200-metre breaststroke. Abby Duncan finished fourth in the 50-metre butterfly. Liam Bekric was fifth in the 50-metre breaststroke (multi-class). James McKechnie was sixth in the 50-metre breaststroke, and Jesse Aungles finished sixth in the 100-metre butterfly (multi-class) and eighth in the 400-metre freestyle (multi-class).

I would also like to thank the former member for Balmain and, of course, greatest Olympian we have ever had, who was voted in 1998 Australia's best ever woman athlete: Dawn Fraser. I want to thank you for the inspiration that you are providing to another generation of swimmers down there. I know that each and every one of them appreciates having you poolside and spurring them on to even greater heights. I am sure you will be wishing them all the very best in Rio as well.

It's worth pointing out a bit of a trivia question. If you ever want to win a bet on who South Australia's most successful Olympian is, it's actually Dawn Fraser, because, in 1956 and 1960, Dawn was registered as a South Australian athlete because she was here with Mr Gallagher, who was at the City Baths at 'Bastard's pool'. I am not using bad language here. Charles Bastard was the owner of the pool, so everyone called it 'Bastard's pool'.

For that reason, Dawn Fraser, who has always been known for her ties to Balmain, was actually a South Australian athlete. She, of course, won four gold medals and four silver medals at the Olympics. For those two gold medals in Melbourne in 1956 and the gold medal that you won in Rome in 1960, you were registered as a South Australian athlete. No other athlete has ever won three gold medals, so it's nice to have you in parliament today so that we can acknowledge that great feat and thank you for the support you are providing to another generation.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I warn for the first time the members for Davenport and Chaffey. The deputy leader.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is also to the Minister for Health. Given the Royal College of Surgeons survey showing that 71 per cent of surgeons are now concerned with patient safety under the Transforming Health proposal, will the minister now cancel the downgrade of the emergency surgery at Modbury, Noarlunga and The Queen Elizabeth hospitals?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:18): These emergency departments aren't being downgraded: they are seeing exactly the same number of patients as they previously were. I am glad the deputy leader gives me another opportunity to talk about the wonderful changes between the Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals.

While it is early days—we have only seen these past few weeks—what have we seen? Two extra patients being transferred up to the Lyell McEwin. I well remember claims that the Lyell McEwin emergency department was going to be inundated. What have we seen? Lyell McEwin emergency department is in fact working better and getting its flow of patients through the emergency department better than it was.

Modbury Hospital continues to see 80 to 100 patients, looking after people who live in the north-east—people like my family—continuing to look after them in exactly the same way as it did before, admitting about the same number of patients as originally was the case, with two extra patients a day being transferred up to the Lyell McEwin Hospital. All the Chicken Littles running around, especially those opposite, with outrageous claims that the sky was going to fall in have all been disproven.

Of course, we still have more time to go, and I wouldn't be claiming victory yet. We still need to give these changes time to operate, but I do feel somewhat vindicated that these changes have happened. All the dire consequences that those opposite were talking about have not happened. I am confident that as we continue to roll out these important reforms we'll see exactly the same as we work through these reforms. Of course, we need to continue to work with our clinicians. It's important to have our clinicians informed, but I am very, very confident that as our clinicians see the benefits of these changes as we roll them out they will support them.

SCHOOL SOUNDFIELD TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house on how the government is supporting children with hearing impairment to achieve in the classroom?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:20): I thank the member for Little Para for his question and note his support not only for children with a disability but also for public schooling in general. Obviously, achieving in the classroom is much harder when students struggle to hear their teacher. I would like to answer this question not just for what is commonly understood to be a hearing challenge in a deficit of capacity to hear, but also auditory processing, which is a deficit in the capacity to make sense of what is heard and equally benefits from the amplification of sound and the minimisation of distracting, competing noises, which, of course, in many classrooms is a feature of the sound environment for students.

I am very pleased to announce that more than 48 schools and preschools across the state are about to receive government grants to install cutting-edge technology to better support students to listen clearly to their teacher. This technology, I should add, is not new to schooling in general. There are many schools that already have these soundfield systems installed, but we were able to identify some money to ensure that another 48 schools are able to install them.

The recipients of the minister's specialist technology grants for 2016 are 38 schools and 10 preschools, and they will receive a share of more than \$428,000 to purchase and install these soundfield technology systems in their classrooms. The grants are just another way of making sure that kids don't get left behind. It's particularly important in the early years when the sounds, the phonics, are being laid down in children's brains that they hear them clearly and they are able to use them to build both literacy in terms of being able to read but also literacy in terms of being able to spell.

These grants are being awarded to both government and independent schools. As well as a total of four schools and preschools being grant recipients in the Little Para electorate, I note a significant portion of the successful schools are from regional areas, such as the APY lands and the Upper Spencer Gulf. We were very careful in making the decisions over which schools would be chosen, to look at a percentage of Aboriginal students, being very cognisant of the limitations in hearing for far too many Aboriginal children and also lower SES schools, where unfortunately some problems such as auditory processing disorder, which can be quite easily masked and obscured for some years, have lower levels of diagnosis. With the support in classrooms being better for all students it means that those kids are going to get picked up whether they are diagnosed or not.

The soundfield systems are essentially a surround sound in the classroom. They amplify the teacher's voice via a wireless microphone. The teacher wears a microphone and there are speakers all around the room, and it also means that the teacher isn't having to constantly project his or her voice for students to be able to hear. It means that more of the space of the classroom is able to be used because children are able to hear the teacher from wherever they are sitting rather than needing to come in close if they going to be taking instruction or information from the teacher.

Clearly, as I've stated, the benefits flow to kids with auditory processing disorder and also kids with ADHD and autism spectrum disorder, who benefit from a quieter classroom and clearer and more directed information being provided to them. There is no harm done to any child by having these in their classroom but a great deal of benefit for children who really need them and, importantly, with or without diagnosis, every child in these classrooms is able to hear clearly and understand the instructions that they are being given.

The SPEAKER: I meant earlier to warn the member for Kavel for an interjection. The leader.

Members interjecting:

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): It was his 30th wedding anniversary yesterday, sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, we congratulate him.

Mr MARSHALL: Thirty years of bliss. My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister immediately suspend all capital works at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and initiate a full revision of the model and of the costings as demanded by the federal member for Port Adelaide?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:24): What we have done at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital—and I have said this before—is that we went to the clinicians with an original plan. Obviously, the original plan with regard to how we were going to fit services into The Queen Elizabeth Hospital that needed to go there was not going to work, and the clinicians pointed that out. What we have done is that we have gone back to the drawing board to work out how this will happen.

We will very soon be in a position to go back to those clinicians with a different plan. Even the Hon. Stephen Wade acknowledged last Friday at the select committee at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital that all the clinicians who gave evidence supported the changes in principle. They all

supported incorporating rehabilitation and the brain injury unit and spinal injury into The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There was not a clinician—in Stephen Wade's own words—who was objecting to what were trying to achieve.

Of course it is going to have implications for a number of clinicians as we put those services onsite in The QEH, and to some extent some clinicians' services are going to have to be displaced, but it is important that we do that in a way that is not going to compromise clinical care. It became clear that, to some extent, with the original plan on how we were going to do that, clinicians had a very strong view that it was going to compromise care, so we have taken that plan away and are developing a new plan.

Obviously, we are going to continue with our plan to move those services onto The QEH site, because it is very, very important that we do that; there are any number of reasons why you would want rehabilitation and brain injury and spinal injury not sitting on their own out on Hampstead Road, a long way from the closest tertiary hospitals. It is an important clinical improvement to actually have them on site at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Even the clinicians who have problems with the plan all support that—and that is not me saying that: the Hon. Stephen Wade said that in the course of the select committee. It is not often that I would take what the Hon. Stephen Wade said at face value; nonetheless in this case I am prepared to do it. So we are working through those changes, and I am very confident that we will be able to arrive at an outcome that will be acceptable to everyone.

KANGAROO ISLAND TOURISM

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Can the minister tell the house what the government is doing to attract more visitors to Kangaroo Island?

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) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her question. The government is committed to supporting regional communities—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It's true—and supporting increased tourism visitation to our regional areas is one of the ways in which the government is achieving this. The government has a role in providing the right regulatory framework (and I know that the Minister for Tourism would agree with this); we have to provide the correct regulatory framework so that the new development opportunities envisaged by the private sector can be properly assessed, bringing community and a whole-of-government approach to the table.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think the member for Kavel has been winding him up, sir. As I was saying, on 20 August 2015 the government declared a tourist resort at American River as a major development. This will establish an international standard tourist resort with a capacity of 336 guests, a staff village and a commercial harbour, which will include a ferry berth and a recreational marina. The proposal is to be designed with a view to minimising impacts on the sensitive coastal environment.

The commercial harbour precinct seeks to establish a vibrant town centre while maintaining the coastal village character of the town. The proposal involves a capital expenditure of \$34 million—and in a small community like Kangaroo Island that is a quite significant investment—and is expected to employ up to 100 staff. It will establish a significant attraction for overseas visitors, and that would significantly add to the tourism value on Kangaroo Island.

The major development process is the highest level of assessment in South Australia. The proposal has been reviewed by the independent Development Assessment Commission. Following input from the relevant government agencies and the local council, the commission has determined

that the proponent must produce a public environment report. This determination has now been provided to the proponent and will be released publicly.

Once completed, the report is then released for public and formal government agency consultation for a six-week period. Interested parties will be able to make submissions on the proposal. Together with the government's nature-based tourism strategy and our commitment to funding regional infrastructure, this development will provide jobs and increased visitation and help to grow the fantastic tourist destination that is Kangaroo Island.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Health. On what basis did SA Health advise the Public Works Committee in September 2015 that there had been extensive consultation with The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Hampstead clinicians on the redevelopment, given claims by the clinicians that they were not engaged until three months later, namely, in December 2015?

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31): I wasn't there at the Public Works Committee meeting. I am not privy to the advice that was provided. I am more than happy to get a report back.

YELLOWTAIL KINGFISH

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Can you inform the house about research to improve the production of yellowtail kingfish in South Australia?

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) (14:31): I thank the member for Newland for the question. The aquaculture and fisheries industries are very important to the South Australian economy, worth \$876 million a year and creating hundreds of jobs right around coastal South Australia. Clean Seas is Australia's biggest provider of yellowtail kingfish. It is growing a reputation, not just here in Australia, but around the world, as an outstanding fish, suitable for premium sashimi, which is particularly big in the Japanese market but growing too in the Chinese market. It is also a versatile white fish that can be cooked in a number of different ways and is very suitable for lots of different dishes.

I was pleased to join with Marcus Stehr last week in China when he joined the Premier's delegation of 300 people from councils and industry sectors from around South Australia. He was over there again working with importers in China to grow their market and convince them of the wonderful qualities of the kingfish as an eating fish. I was also there last November with Marcus Steer and another group.

It is tremendous to see the way that the fishing and aquaculture industries are working with government. As I told the house yesterday, it is really important when you go into markets like China to be doing it with the government, because we can open the doors that perhaps you cannot on your own. It is also fantastic to see the way that the different fishers over there from different sectors are collaborating together and going as one so that they can bring back their learning.

In terms of research, SARDI, along with Clean Seas and the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation, with funding from the Australian government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources' Rural R&D for Profit program, the New South Wales Department of Primary Industries and the New South Wales industry partner, the Australian Seafood CRC, and two aquafeed companies, are all working together on a program that will cost \$6 million over the next three years to work out more efficient ways of getting fish ready for market.

They are grown in the pens off Eyre Peninsula. What companies like Clean Seas worked out was that they thought they were wasting food. When they put the pellets into the pens, a lot of pellets just went straight through to the bottom, so they asked SARDI to do the research. They have tried a different regime of feeding techniques. I was down at SARDI at West Beach a couple of weeks ago

having a look at the kingfish in the tanks down there. What they do is lower the temperature to the sort of level that it would be at during winter, and feed the fish. They worked out that the fish were not eating as many of the pellets when the water was colder, in those winter months.

Clean Seas has taken that knowledge on board, they have adopted the research and the recommendations, and they have changed their feeding regime. They have since advised us that the change will result in a financial gain of approximately \$2 million on a 2,000 tonne operation over a full winter program. Again, it is a matter of us as a government working with the private sector on ways of saving the industry money, making sure that the quality of fish is at a premium for when they put it on the market, not just here in Australia but into those emerging markets throughout Asia and other parts of the world.

We will continue to do that as our primary industry department works side by side, hand in hand with industries right across South Australia to ensure that we can grow our wonderful industry that is worth \$18.2 billion for our food and wine, which is up \$1.1 billion on the year before.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will not interrupt the leader—

The Hon. P. Caica: Don't talk about money and tuna, Vickie.

The SPEAKER: —who is about to ask a question, immediately after I call to order the member for Colton.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): He was getting excited because you were talking about fish, sir. My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house why the new Royal Adelaide Hospital project director, who reported directly to the minister and the chief executive, resigned on the weekend?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:36): It is not for me to speak. It is not for me to answer on behalf of Judith Carr. She had her reasons. It is important to note the project director role: essentially, her role was of contract management between the SAHP consortium and the government. That is what she did. It is an important role, but it doesn't entail leadership of the entire project. There are many, many aspects of the project, of which this was one. Mr David Swan is acting at the moment in her place while we recruit someone to take over the role.

The SPEAKER: I warn for the second and final time the members for Chaffey, Davenport and Kavel. With a question like that, I don't think it is entirely unsurprising that both the Minister for Health and the Minister for Infrastructure would seek to answer it.

BETTER SCHOOLS FUNDING

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house further how Better Schools funding is supported across the state?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:37): I thank the member for this question. I know that she is a very big advocate for the adequacy of school funding in government and non-government schools. I have in recent months provided members of this house with information about how the Better Schools funding has been making a significant difference for students right across our state.

Every week I hear more and more stories from teachers, principals and parents about how the Gonski funding reforms are having a big impact in their schools. I think this is information that members of this house and the people of South Australia need to hear so that they know exactly what we are fighting for when we campaign for the continuation of the Better Schools funding model.

I would like to share a few more examples about how this money is being used in our state. Peterborough Primary School are using their \$83,523 in total funding so far to develop and put in

place an intervention and support program for year 1 and 2 students who are identified as being at risk, to support them in reading and maths. They have employed a specific teacher to implement this program, and it is already showing significant impact in terms of their school data.

A category 2 school, Elizabeth North Primary School, has received \$678,129 over the three years of Better Schools funding so far. This funding has been used to fund an intervention coordinator at the school, to provide intervention and oversee intervention programs for students requiring additional support, and the school is seeing the benefits. For example, last year, 95 per cent of the students who had attended literacy intervention programs had made progress in their reading levels. This year, there will also be a focus on testing and goal setting with maths intervention.

At Woodville High School, there are a large number of students who are at substantial risk of not completing their SACE due to limited literacy and numeracy skills, and for a wide variety of reasons. Woodville has seen the Better Schools funding as an opportunity to make a significant impact for these students and has invested its \$436,878 in funding thus far into programs such as QuickSmart and Levelled Literacy Intervention. Again, they are already seeing improvement in students' abilities, and this is backed up by achievement data, as well as students' and families' own reflections.

Woodville High School principal Meredith Edwards says that their experience suggests that, given just two years' intervention, even the lowest of performers are likely to be able to function as an average maths student. Woodville High School has also seen a significant improvement in SACE completion rates, from 76.3 per cent in 2013 to 89.8 per cent in 2015; that is just in two years.

Meredith Edwards went on to say that she and her school community view the Better Schools funding as 'a matter of social justice and inclusivity. We can only hope that in the interests of social justice the funding is ongoing.' I echo those sentiments and I would like to use those as examples to challenge the suggestion that has been made, both by the federal education minister and also, regrettably, by the Prime Minister, that funding is somehow irrelevant to outcomes in schools.

Further, the Prime Minister also floated the suggestion that perhaps the federal government had no further role to play in public schools in Australia, that it might be left to state government budgets, and that they would fund only independent and Catholic schools. To suggest that, on the one hand, funding is irrelevant to outcome and yet to suggest that the funding they have will be put to those for which, by definition, the majority have at least the capacity to pay tuition fees, is just a remarkable abrogation of responsibility.

Every dollar that has come in, in addition, through the Gonski funding has been used to lift literacy and numeracy, to increase attendance and to increase SACE completion, all of these absolutely essential outcomes, and any government of any political persuasion should take a good hard look at themselves if they think that those matters are not their responsibility and not their concern.

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

STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): My question is to the Treasurer. Was the Treasurer aware that foreign made structural steel was being used in the new Royal Adelaide Hospital project when he criticised the New South Wales government for using foreign steel in a rail project, and will he now conduct a full audit of the use of foreign made structural steel being used in government projects across South Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:41): I will answer the last bit first: no, we won't, because it won't serve any purpose. Two, as I said earlier, structural steel out of Whyalla has been integral in almost all of our infrastructure projects. It depends on a number of aspects: one, the availability of that stock and; two, the particular type of structural steel that is manufactured in Australia.

Where we could, and before Arrium was in the predicament it is in today, we were purchasing South Australian steel and Australian steel, overwhelmingly, and investing it in infrastructure that our opponents called a false economy spend. Whether it was the Adelaide Oval, the footbridge, the

NRAH, all of these infrastructure programs we have rolled out that members opposite have opposed, and now they are telling us we should have done this and that with that type of procurement.

Since Arrium has faced the problems that they are facing now with the unprecedented level of the dumping of inferior cheap steel on our shores, the South Australian government reacted. We reacted quite quickly and we did it in concert with Arrium. We came up with a policy that, one, wasn't protectionist but, at the same time, gave Arrium every opportunity to succeed.

I think every steelmaker in this country is not looking for a protectionist regime; what they are looking for is a level and fair playing field. What they are looking for is that, when the private sector is using steel on their projects and they are saying that it meets the Australian standard, when a lot of Australian steelmakers know that the cheap, inferior steel being dumped—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I said no. I answered that first. You should have paid attention.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No audit. I think our procurement policy has been very well received, not only by the commonwealth government and Chris Pyne, who thinks it is an excellent policy, but of course by the federal opposition. It is becoming a bipartisan approach to Australian steelmaking. There is only one group of people left who have not adopted it, and that is members opposite, who have come up with no procurement policy, no steel policy, no intervention policy for Whyalla, nothing. Indeed, yesterday, they were asking questions about the Minister for Regional Development and his visit to Whyalla, while the current shadow minister for regional development didn't even bother going with the opposition leader and the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. I have to say, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned for the second and final time. The member for Stuart is called to order, and the Treasurer is called to order for debating the answer. Is the Treasurer finished?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Mr Speaker, point of order: I ask that the Treasurer withdraw his comment. The shadow minister for regional development was in Whyalla with the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister for employment.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart will leave under the sessional order for an entirely bogus point of order, and he will leave for 45 minutes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In defence of the member for Stuart, I think I may have miscategorised, and I do apologise and withdraw, sir.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: Under standing order 127, a member may not make personal reflections on any other member. The Treasurer did, and he has signalled that he is going to actually withdraw that. The tradition of the house is the member so reflected upon must ask for that reflection to be withdrawn immediately, which is what the member for Stuart did, and I seek your ruling.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart presented it as a point of order, which it wasn't. The member for Stuart may seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Mr GARDNER: Sir, your previous rulings, and previous speakers, have relied upon standing order 127, the understanding that the objection must be raised at the time that it is heard, and then the Speaker usually asks the member whether he will withdraw what is said. If the Speaker has not heard the comment in question, he will ask the member who has made the comment whether that is

true. In this case, the Treasurer seems quite clear that he was going to withdraw it, and I seek that you reflect upon your decision and on previous rulings.

The SPEAKER: Alright, I think that is a fair point, and I withdraw the removal of the member for Stuart under the sessional order. My point was it was not a point of order; the appropriate course is to seek leave to make a personal explanation. But I agree with the member for Morialta: it seems disproportionate to apply the sessional order for that reason. The Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So, Mr Speaker, we have got a procurement policy in place that will maximise as much—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: given your now ruling, would you call upon the Treasurer to respond?

Members interjecting:

Mr Gardner: He suggested that he was about to; he didn't.

The SPEAKER: Does the Treasurer wish to—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I already have, sir.

The SPEAKER: You already have, okay.

Ms Chapman: On the record.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I did on the record. You weren't paying attention, you were busy plotting.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, the state government is now—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer's time has expired. The member for Napier.

AUSTRALIAN MIGRANT RESOURCE CENTRE

Mr GEE (Napier) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Minister, how is the South Australian government assisting newly arrived migrants in the Bordertown and Naracoorte areas?

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) (14:47): I thank the member for the question because, of course, our government understands the importance of supporting professionals, skilled labourers, families and young people in regional South Australia. An increasing number of migrants and refugees are starting life anew in the Limestone Coast. The migrant population in Bordertown alone is close to 500 people, and despite their difficult past and their difficult journey here, these new members of our community are making a significant contribution to the diversity and productivity of South Australia's South-East.

Our government stands ready to invest in community-led initiatives and partnerships that will enhance cross-cultural understanding in our regions. The Australian Migrant Resource Centre expanded its services to support our culturally and linguistically diverse communities in Bordertown, particularly those recently retrenched from local employment. I was pleased to attend the official opening of their new office in Bordertown, and engage with our diverse and talented migrants from Afghanistan, Iran and Nigeria, to name a few.

I also took this opportunity to speak with the management of JBS Australia's Bordertown meatworks. It employs more than 450 workers, 60 per cent of whom are migrants. JBS Australia has a clear plan about growing opportunities, and it will continue to work closely with the Australian Migrant Resource Centre to provide maximum support to its workers.

South Australia was built on the labour and skills of migrants, and undoubtedly they will play an important role in shaping the long-term future of our state. I am pleased to advise the house that

our government supported the Australian Migrant Resource Centre with \$120,000 for the provision of services on the Limestone Coast.

Further to this, we committed \$50,000 to assist with the cost of refurbishing its new office in Bordertown. The Migrant Resource Centre in Bordertown is more than just a place of providing employment and settlement services: it is a safe haven, a place where migrants feel understood, a place that instils confidence, a place that provides them with a sense of belonging. This is one of many examples of how a government is assisting migrants, and I congratulate the Migrant Resource Centre on the official opening of its Bordertown office.

FESTIVAL PLAZA CAR PARK

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Has the government now signed a contract with the Walker Corporation in relation to the Festival Plaza Car Park redevelopment, and, if so, what are the terms, including whether construction of the car park will start on 1 July this year?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:50): Thank you, Mr Speaker. Can I thank the deputy leader for her ongoing interest in this matter. As members would be aware, we are looking forward to the redevelopment of the Festival Plaza precincts. We are looking forward to the replacement of the car park—which is I think most people would agree well past its use-by date—and then taking the opportunity to improve the plaza infrastructure above it to make it a place where people can gather with some more enjoyable surroundings than what is there currently. I think that is as euphemistically as I can put it.

Ms Chapman: We just want to know if you've signed the contract, that's all.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, I appreciate the question that the deputy leader has asked.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

Ms Chapman: Have you drafted it yet?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Over the previous months the government has been working very closely with all of the stakeholders as well as the project proponents down in that area. Suffice to say it is a very complex project.

Ms Chapman: So the answer is no?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As I was saying, it is a very complex project. There are interactions not just with the car park itself—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader has been repeatedly interjecting. She is on two warnings. Please, no more. The minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. There are not only interactions with the rear of Parliament House and also directly opposite the Festival Plaza, but also SkyCity which has expressed an interest publicly as well in procuring some of those car parking spaces.

So, when we are looking at the document that the deputy leader refers to, being able to reach a legal agreement with the proponent for the delivery of this infrastructure, this isn't just about making sure that the government and the project proponent—as the deputy leader points out, the Walker Corporation—are satisfied that the project can proceed under the terms and conditions which are mutually agreeable, it is also about making sure that the other requirements of the other stakeholders and the other interested parties in the project are also satisfied.

So, while the government and the proponent, Walker Corporation, are working as hard as we can to ensure that we are agreed on all of the contractual terms, the reason why we have not yet

concluded those discussions is because some of those other discussions involving other parties haven't yet concluded to the satisfaction of either Walker Corporation or the government.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey.

MASS PARTICIPATION EVENTS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:53): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Minister, how is the state government ensuring that we attract mass participation events in South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:53): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for Florey for her question and acknowledge that she is heading down to Murray Bridge over the weekend for the South Australian Masters Games. She is still too young to qualify, but she will be down there as a spectator, I understand.

The Masters Games is a fantastic thing for local regions. This is the 21st South Australian Masters Games and it will bring about 900 people to the area. We know that one-third of them will come from interstate or overseas, mostly from Victoria and New Zealand, and more than half the participants will come from outside the region. So, it is a terrific way to show off the region. It is also a really brilliant way of keeping people active more often. We know that when you get a little bit older, it gets a little bit harder to get out and participate, but if you are in those sorts of team events in particular, it is a terrific thing to do.

I know the croquet club down at Murray Bridge have had a doubling of their membership since word got out that they were going to host the Masters Games. I mentioned to the member for Hammond before that maybe we could go doubles in the eight ball or the darts competition. I think that is probably our standard. I have asked Dawn Fraser if she would get with me in the relay, maybe the 800-metre relay.

An honourable member: She said no.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: She didn't agree to my terms. I wanted to go in the 800-metre relay. I said, 'You do 15 laps, I'll do one.' I'm sure you would still give plenty of people a run for their money, and I must acknowledge the great work that you did when South Australia hosted the Australian Masters Games back in the late 1990s. I was a journalist out there covering those and you did a tremendous job, along with Marg Ralston, of course, who was a former adviser of mine, a former sports editor of mine, and someone who did so much for the Olympic Committee here and running the Masters Games.

Mass participation sports are fantastic injectors of money into our economies. Just two weeks ago, we had the International Dragon Boat Races down at West Lakes, the first time Australia has ever hosted them. This might come as a bit of a surprising statistic to people, but have a guess how many people are involved in dragon boat racing in the world: 50 million people. It is a sport that started out in China and it just continues to grow.

Meeting up with a lot of the athletes down there from over 20 countries, it was terrific to see the camaraderie that they have. They are of all different levels of fitness, but what it did was just showed off how, by working together with people, you can get a boat to go a certain speed through the water. It teaches teamwork, it keeps people active, it keeps people involved, and it gives people a reason to get out of bed and be fit. From that point of view, it is just a terrific thing. That brought \$4 million into the South Australian economy. We had over 6,000 people come here for that event alone.

Of course, last year we had the Australian Masters Games here. We had 10,000 people here and more than \$4 million into our economy. The people there call it schoolies for grown-ups. They get out and they get into the pubs and clubs. When they are out there playing their sport, they take it seriously, but they have a good time after that, and that is a terrific thing. They go back to their respective states and to other parts of the world, and do you know what they do? They talk glowingly

about South Australia and the terrific time they had in Adelaide. It is the sort of thing that, when we invest our money into it, brings lots of people in and we get an immediate impact into our economy, but it is that goodwill that we get following from that that is terrific.

We are hopeful of getting the Australian Masters Games back here in a couple years' time, which of course would be terrific to have them coming back here. People loved it so much. In this year's budget, we put an extra \$35 million into tourism, because we know it is a great way to get more money into our economy from outside of our economy. It is a great employer in the regions and it employs 33,000 people. We want to grow that figure. It is worth \$5.6 billion; we want to get that to \$8 billion by 2020.

Time expired.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): Again my question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. What is the total price and the price per hectare that will be paid by IWS for the 20 hectares of land at Gillman to be purchased from Adelaide Capital Partners pursuant to the High Court settlement agreement?

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) (14:58): The situation I think is that, first of all, the arrangements between ACP and IWS, or Veolia as they are sometimes described, are matters that were negotiated between them. I would need to check on what it is that is in the public domain and is not in the public domain as far as their relationship is concerned, because those contractual terms are not terms that directly concern the government; they are terms which are between those two parties. But I will check as to what it is appropriate for me to say or for the government to say in relation to those terms which, as I emphasise, are not between the government and somebody else; they are between two completely separate corporate entities that are dealing with one another to resolve their disputes.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): A supplementary, if I may, sir.

The SPEAKER: You may.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, sir. Would the Attorney-General be concerned if the consideration paid by IWS to ACP is more than the price that ACP has acquired this land for from the government?

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) (14:59): Can I say this, first of all: let's find out whether I can answer your question first. I do want to put on the public record something which I think has been put on the public record before, but I will say it again. The price that might be payable for, for example, a single building block which is adjacent to existing services with sewerage, with water, with electricity and with road access might be X dollars per square metre because it's a very small block and it's already completely serviced, so there is no infrastructure burden whatsoever in relation to that block. Another piece of the property might be worth a different amount because of the cost of actually bringing services to that piece of the property.

I will find out the answer, and I am happy to give the answer to the parliament if it doesn't involve me stepping into commercial difficulties between two parties who are actually the parties to the contract—we are not—but I do emphasise, whatever the answer to that question is, comparing pieces of land there of different sizes, or with different proximity and access to infrastructure or facilities or whatever the case might be, is not necessarily comparing apples with apples. That said, I will attempt to find out an answer on the basis of legal advice as to whether me attempting to answer

that question—and I can answer it—is going to cause a commercial issue between those parties or third parties.

Ms CHAPMAN: A further supplementary, if I may, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Fisher.

HUMANITARIAN OVERSEAS SERVICE MEDAL

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house about South Australia's latest recipients for the Humanitarian Overseas Service Medal?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:01): Thank you to the member for Fisher. The member for Fisher pointed out to me that Judy Tapara, who is a former colleague of the member for Fisher in the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department and, indeed, even more importantly, a constituent in the seat of Fisher, is one of the recipients of the Humanitarian Overseas Service Medal.

The medal was established in 1999 to honour those who perform humanitarian service in a foreign country, in particular those working in dangerous environments during a humanitarian crisis. Recently, the Governor-General endorsed awarding the Humanitarian Overseas Service Medal as part of the Australian medical assistance teams sent to Samoa in 2009 and Pakistan in 2010. This included 12 South Australian healthcare workers who were deployed to Samoa in late 2009 to help deal with the aftermath of a devastating earthquake and tsunami.

At the time, South Australia made up a large part of the first response. In fact, I understand Dr Bill Griggs, Dr Stephen Christley and SA Health were able to organise a team within 90 minutes of receiving an urgent request for medical assistance from the Samoan government. The South Australian team were on the first flight from Australia and arrived into Apia only 24 hours after the tsunami struck. They performed often traumatic and complex patient care and provided crucial logistical support for other Australian medical aid. Their work was recognised by the Australian High Commission in Samoa.

All South Australian team members were outstanding in their professionalism and actions throughout their deployment, as were those who remained in Australia coordinating the continuing disaster assistance effort. Can I acknowledge the team who continued to work back in Adelaide, ensuring support was provided not only to the deployed team but to their families and loved ones.

We also honoured Dr Ben D'Souza from the Women's and Children's Hospital. Dr D'Souza was deployed to Pakistan in 2010 after large parts of the country were hit by torrential monsoonal rain resulting in flash flooding, loss of life and widespread displacement. The disaster was estimated to affect over 20 million people. Dr D'Souza arrived in Pakistan as part of the second medical assistance team and was primarily responsible for the development of a food product which is credited with saving the lives of many children. As with Samoa, a team was in place in Adelaide to support the mission and keep families up to date.

I would like to place on the record my appreciation of the outstanding efforts of all medal recipients, and those who supported their work back in Adelaide, to provide crucial assistance to the people in Samoa and Pakistan. I'd like to mention that, since the Pakistan deployment, South Australian healthcare workers have gone on to provide emergency aid to the Philippines in 2013, following typhoon Haiyan, and to Fiji earlier this year, following hurricane Winston. With the many challenges our world faces it is heartening to know that South Australia stands ready to offer such talented professionals to respond to those in need.

Grievance Debate

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:05): It is clear that Transforming Health is a dud. The people of South Australia think it is a dud, the veterans think it is a dud, even the doctors now think it is a dud. Even Mark Butler, the federal Labor president and best man to the Premier, thinks it is a dud; in fact, the entire state thinks it is a dud. The only people who do not think it is a dud are the health minister and the people of the Labor state government.

It reminds me of a scene from *Back to the Future*—'McFly! Anyone there?'—because this has gone far enough. A survey of doctors today revealed that a majority is opposed to the Transforming Health reforms: better care, 61 per cent disagreed; safety measures, 70 per cent disagreed; best care every time, 71 per cent disagreed; effective consultation—and this is the point that the government needs to take seriously—79 per cent disagreed or strongly disagreed that the state government had conducted effective stakeholder consultation. Almost 90 per cent of respondents said they did not feel they had an ability to influence the outcomes of Transforming Health reforms.

It has reached the point where extraordinary steps are now being taken by SASMOA and the AMA, who are sending out press releases saying that doctors are concerned that they have not been listened to and that they are concerned and afraid for the future, for their patients and the communities they serve. They are telling SASMOA that consultation has been inadequate, in some cases insincere—and this is a quote—and in some places 'completely absent'. There is significant concern that the government is quite simply trying to do too much, too soon in tackling this major reform.

I thought that here we might step back and have a look at how much they are trying to take on and where they are going. The new Royal Adelaide Hospital: a \$640 million blowout in the cost of that hospital as well as time blowouts. In my reading, I just could not believe the new spin. This is from the CFMEU state secretary, Aaron Cartledge, and I quote:

Realistically, the hospital is not late, it was the schedule which was early.

Oh, my God, that is the best bit of spin I have seen! You might need to hire him personally, minister, because that is absolutely fantastic. What you should have done was get back Rod Hook. You should have brought him back. When Judith Carr resigned, get Rod back. After he was sacked—and I endeavour to say that this might haunt some Labor people—Rod said something like, 'The people vote for competency of governments, which is more than just politicians.' Maybe those words will come back to haunt the Labor government, because the new Royal Adelaide Hospital has been a disaster and shows the competency—or lack thereof—of this government.

In fact, the press release today from SASMOA and the AMA said, 'Stop, think and reassess.' It is a plea from the professionals who are meant to benefit from this: stop, think, reassess. Of course, it is not just the doctors or the veterans who are saying that: it is also the federal member, Mark Butler. It is quite extraordinary to have the president of a major political party writing to his own party pointing out that the policies are dangerous and are something that needs to be put on hold.

From that, I would like to stress that the Liberals want to support our health system, but we do not want to see a downgrade to the emergency department at Noarlunga Hospital, or the emergency department at The QEH or Modbury Hospital, or the closure of Daw Park, the closure of Hampstead or the closure of the rehabilitation hospital at Semaphore.

VICTORY CHURCH

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey—albeit slow out of the gates.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:10): I am still recovering from what I just heard, sir. Florey is a diverse electorate with many wonderful opportunities for residents, and there are many churches in Florey. I would particularly like to mention Victory Church, which celebrated its 20th anniversary in March 2014.

Victory Church began life, in my electorate, in the old Home Hardware store on Nelson Road in 1998 after its fourth year as a congregation, under the leadership and care of Pastor Tony and Kath Rainbow. I have been lucky enough to witness the growth in this caring church community as it became too big for its Nelson Road site and moved boldly to a new site on Maxwell Road, Pooraka, near the Parafield Airport.

It runs many programs—for men and for women, for the over 55's, playgroups, marriage groups, parenting groups, counselling, Victory Kids and the KIDGO school holiday program. It was that particular program that led me to meet Kris Guglielmucci, who until recently played a vital leadership role in Victory Church's youth programs. A mutual friend, Mr Dave Garland, brought Kris

to the Florey electoral office for one of our Christmas community gatherings. Kris struck me as a passionate and enthusiastic man with a genuine heart for youth doing it tough in the local area.

Kris, with the support of Victory Church, had initiated an outreach program for some of the local high schools, to bring some food, fun and friendship to kids doing it tough. This was just one way in which Kris was actively involved, trying to change the lives of those who needed change the most. As a youth pastor and a member of the worldwide youth movement Planetshakers, Kris touched the lives of so many young people.

We spoke about getting together in the New Year to discuss ways of working together but it was not to be, because a freak accident cut Kris's contribution to the community tragically short. On 22 January 2016 Kris and his wife Lisa were running a youth camp in the Adelaide Hills with about 100 young people and 20 other church leaders, when a storm cell approached. Kris and another youth leader, Ashari Rainbow, were each struck by lightning. Whilst Ashari survived her terrible injuries, Kris ultimately passed away. It is a little known fact that in Australia the chances of being struck by lightning are about one in 1 million, but five to 10 people die and more than 100 are severely injured each and every year, so it is always a good move not to stand out in a big storm.

On 2 February 2016, along with more than 2,000 other people I attended the funeral service held to farewell Kris. Although a youth pastor based at Victory Church in Pooraka, Kris was also strongly associated with the Edge Church at Reynella. The funeral service was led by Tony Rainbow; it drew people from many corners of the world and was a demonstration of how Kris reached and connected with many people from many areas of life.

During the difficult times before and after the funeral, Victory Church held services dedicated to celebrating the life and impact of Kris Guglielmucci, opened its doors to the families directly affected by the events and provided counsellors for the immediate care of the youth camp attendees. The support offered by Victory Church to the community throughout this time is a great example of the importance of this community organisation in our local area.

Kris's family were understandably shattered. His wife Lisa and son Zeke gave wonderful accounts of their much-loved husband and dad. His parents Danny and Sharonne and a sister and brother also gave tributes to the big man whose hugs could change lives. Sharonne recalled how Kris loved to play his guitar, and his musical abilities were a lively part of the Victory Sunday services. Some years ago in 2009, I recall attending the opening of refurbished offices for Childhood Cancer, which was just across the road from the Women's and Children's Hospital. Danny and Sharonne and the Edge Church were, I think, involved with working with the Little Heroes Foundation at the same time.

Kris leaves behind his wife Lisa and their four young children. For them the loss is the greatest. My condolences go to Lisa and the children, and his parents Danny and Sharonne. I know they have been helped immensely by their church family. To Kris's wider family, and all his friends and colleagues at the Victory and Edge Churches, we give our sincere sympathy at this very sad time. I know he will be greatly missed and remembered by all who knew him. We all hope he will rest in peace.

SCHOOL BUSES

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:14): I rise this afternoon to provide to the house some further information, building on a grievance that I raised last parliamentary sitting in relation to school bus services provided by Link SA in the Barossa Valley and surrounds. Since my last speech I have received a further list of issues from concerned parents about conduct that they do not consider appropriate. Indeed, the subsequent media attention did bring a flurry of activity not only to my office but also to the college.

I also have reason now to question Link SA's accuracy in recording the number of students who catch the bus, which in turn is used to collect a government subsidy. I have seen two manifests, one from March last year and one from August last year, that are riddled with errors. They detail students who either have graduated or did not go to school during that period. In total from this sample manifest, 10 students are wrongly identified. The issue with this comes from the fact that Link SA failed to update its manifest on advice from Faith Lutheran College about student enrolments.

As Faith does not reconcile all manifests, there are serious questions as to whether Link SA is claiming subsidies from the government for students who no longer go to the college. The questions are further compounded when accounts reported to me state that drivers are not checking students off the manifest. Indeed, without doing this, there is no way that Link SA can accurately assess what the correct subsidy to claim is.

I am strongly urging the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure to conduct an audit of Link SA subsidy claims to ensure that there has been no fraud or wrongdoing in this case. I find this matter extremely serious. From everything that I have been able to understand, there is a shortfall in the reconciliation of these claims, and it is something that genuinely and seriously needs to be looked at in a holistic manner.

In addition to this, I have also received a large number of other complaints. I have heard a complaint and seen a video of a bus driver who drove the bus with the door open and failed to signal even when driving in a 90-kilometre zone. I have seen instances where a senior manager of Link SA has been driving behind buses, picking up students that the bus driver has left behind. I have heard of instances where children are not attending school, and cannot attend school, because the bus fails to pick them up and the parents cannot get them to school, having potentially already gone off to work.

I have reports of Link SA not responding to parent complaints or, when they do so, doing it in a pro forma manner that leaves little confidence about whether investigations have actually occurred. I have instances where parents are now actually trying to organise their own bus because they have so little faith in Link SA's ability to provide a decent service. Indeed, the day after my last speech on this topic in this place, the Kersbrook route leading towards Faith showed up about an hour late, leaving students stranded with only belated contact from Link SA to Faith, meaning we had students waiting on the corner of often busy high-speed roads, unsure of what was going on and no timely contact from Link SA.

I have also had contact from parents on a different route, whose children go to a different high school. They detailed to me in a very contemporaneous way issues around the conduct of a driver who continually swears at students and who drives erratically and too fast, especially when this driver is running late. This driver does not charge fares correctly and, indeed, sometimes does not charge fares at all and in other instances questions the authenticity of bus passes and tickets provided. From the last time I spoke on this issue to this time, with the added information, the sheer volume of complaints leads me to believe that there is a serious issue with the bus service that is being provided.

This is not something that I bring to the house lightly and I understand the gravity of what I have said in the chamber, but the students of the Barossa Valley need to have confidence in their bus service and they need to have a bus service provided by a contractor that will honour the duty of care that it owes to them.

ST MICHAEL'S COLLEGE

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:19): Deputy Speaker, you and members would be aware of the many times I have spoken about the outstanding schools in my electorate, and today I wish to speak of St Michael's College. On Wednesday 17 February, I had the pleasure of attending St Michael's College's academic assembly. As usual, it was an outstanding assembly celebrating academic excellence and the achievements of St Michael's class of 2015. It was also a celebration of all students who successfully completed year 12 in 2015.

All speakers, including principal John Foley, acknowledged that, whilst this assembly was recognising academic excellence, it was also recognising and celebrating the achievement of all the students of the class of 2015. Deputy Speaker, you know as we all do that, for those not as academically adept, successfully completing year 12 is in itself an outstanding achievement for these individuals and students.

Interestingly and thankfully, St Michael's 2015 year 12 cohort had an amazing 100 per cent successful SACE completion rate. Underpinning this success is the attitude and ethos instilled into and observed by St Michael's students, that is, 'do the best you can' and 'be the best that you can

be'. Importantly, St Michael's students will carry these attitudes and this ethos with them throughout their entire lives.

During the assembly we were not only presented with the students who had excelled academically in 2015 but treated to magnificent speeches by Principal Foley, 2015 dux Stephanie Laden, and a thought-provoking speech by Dr Neil McGoran, the CE of the SACE Board. We were also treated to an outstanding performance by St Michael's College Big Band One, and I congratulate band director Tim Donovan and all the wonderful young musicians.

Before I highlight the outstanding results of the class of 2015, I want to pay tribute and thank the St Michael's teachers and support staff for the work they have done and continue to do, not just those year 12 teachers but all the teachers and support staff who have helped build the solid foundation for these students throughout their time at St Michael's and which was the springboard for the outstanding results that were achieved.

Now, on with the results. I apologise to my Hansard friends, but I have them all listed here and I have to go rather quickly: Gabrielle Gonos, 89.6 ATAR score, five As; Isabella Marzouk, 90.45, five As; Lucy Cooper, 93.85, five As; Dominic Carzo, 94.4, five As; Shaina Blackburn, 94.5, five As; Luke Zille, 95.2; Joshua Smith, 95.2; Gabriella Owens, 95.5; Aleisha Zamperin, 96.2; Arora Nirbhay, 96.2, five As; Charlotte Billett, 95.6; Joanna Bulian, 96.7, five As; Emily Zott, 96.9, five As; Jacqueline Scaffidi, 96.9, five As; Olivia Papadopoulos, 96.9.

Joshua Jackson had an ATAR of 96.9 and five As; Beth Selby, 97.05; Samuel Cannata, 97.05 and five As; Joseph Luppino, 97.1; Claudia May, 97.25; Natalya Zupan, 97.4; Joshua Bilske, 97.4 and five As; Simon Pegoli, 97.45, five As; Jack Stewart, 97.55, five As; Bianca Brattoli, 97.55, five As; Jordan Evens, 97.7, five As; Esmeralda Stefanopoulos, 98.1 and five As; Sean McGowan, 98.4 and five As; Christopher Galimitakis, 98.4 and five As; Thomas Carey, 98.6 and five As.

Emma Foley is the principal's daughter, and it was wonderful to see the principal and how proud he was in presenting his daughter during this process. Emma got 99.2 and five As; Thomas Jacquier, 99.45 and five As; and the dux, Stephanie Laden, who made a magnificent speech, 99.9 and five As. That is an outstanding effort by the students of St Michael's but, as I said, to get a 100 per cent completion rate of SACE in year 12 for the 2015 students is in itself a remarkable effort.

When we had the Olympics, Sydney was lucky enough to have the chair of the Olympic Committee say, 'This is the best Olympics ever.' I know there was a reluctance by the college to say this was the best result ever, because it might put pressure on the class of 2016, but I have no doubt this was the best result ever for St Michael's, but, as opposed to putting pressure on this year's students, it is something they can aspire to match and meet.

I am blessed within my electorate to have so many outstanding schools. St Michael's is one of them, and I will continue to speak about all the outstanding schools, both within the public sector and the Catholic sector because they are all a part of our education system. As I said, I am very lucky to represent the seat of Colton and have so many good schools in my electorate.

ICE FORUM

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:25): Last night, I hosted a community forum at Blackwood High School on the issue of understanding the ice factor. As you know, there has been extensive media coverage focused on the increasing prevalence of ice use in our community and the damaging effects of this drug. Much of that attention has been fuelled by the statistics of the ever increasing usage of ice and stories of violent and aggressive behaviour triggered by the drug.

Beyond the media attention there are, of course, concerned parents, families, neighbours and local communities. The forum provided an opportunity for community members to come together and hear from experts about the real, non-sensationalised impacts of ice: its use, its impact, and the support services available for addicts and their families.

I am very grateful to all those who attended the evening. I would especially like to thank our guest speakers: Mr Roger Nicholas, Senior Project Manager at the National Centre for Education and Training on Addiction, based at Flinders University; Detective Chief Inspector Tony Cramer, the Investigations Manager at SAPOL; and Ms Sam Raven, Senior Policy and Project Officer at the SA Network of Drug and Alcohol Services.

We were very fortunate to benefit from their wealth of knowledge and expertise. They delivered excellent and informative presentations that covered the facts about ice; what the data tells us about patterns of use; the effects of using ice, especially the long-term cognitive impacts; the indiscriminate use of this insidious drug; and, most importantly, the availability of treatment services for individuals and their families.

I have spoken many times in the house about the damaging impact that drugs continue to have on our community and I have highlighted the importance of appropriate government responses. The overwhelming lesson from last night's forum is the need for increased community and government attention to this area, especially with respect to prevention and treatment.

Prevention has to be multifaceted. It needs to be approached on the home front, at schools and, of course, in our sporting clubs, community groups, neighbourhoods and by law enforcers. A key message from all speakers last night is that there is not enough focus on prevention measures, with little government support or funding in this important area.

There was mixed news on the treatment front. Treatment services for individuals and support services for their families and friends are readily available. However, Sam Raven, from the SA Network of Drug and Alcohol Services, who has extensive experience working in this policy area, including providing counselling to drug users, emphasised that treatment services do work and should be taken up by those who need it. She acknowledged that it is a long road to treatment, there will be hurdles, there will be setbacks, but treatment can and does work.

The challenge, however, is ensuring supply meets demand, in terms of treatment. Treatment services for family members are just as important as those services for individuals affected by drug use. It is an incredibly difficult and exhausting journey for family members, but their support is often critical to a successful outcome for someone seeking drug treatment. We need to ensure they have the support they need.

The federal government has committed additional funding in this area, following the outcomes of the National Ice Taskforce report. However, the sector is still woefully underfunded at a state level. There are simply not enough places available for individuals and their families who are seeking treatment. Unfortunately, after 14 years of a Labor government, we still do not have an alcohol and other drug strategy that receives direct funding.

Last night was an important step in starting an ongoing community conversation about drug use. It is evident that we have some incredible people working hard in this area to combat the spread of drug use, to understand addiction, as well as motivating behaviours to take drugs, and to provide services to help those affected by drug use.

It is important that we utilise their skills and knowledge, and work with them to ensure the next SA Alcohol and Other Drug Strategy for the period 2017-2022 is more successful than the existing 2011-2016 strategy. A funded strategy would be a good start, but we also need a government that is truly committed to delivering on its promises and not just grandstanding for another media bite.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:30): I take this opportunity to speak, albeit briefly, on the Social Development Committee inquiry into domestic and family violence. The committee, of which I am a member, inquired into domestic and family violence, sitting through many hours of evidence, examining the effectiveness of current national and South Australian domestic and family violence policies, programs, legislative frameworks and court processes. The reality is that domestic and family violence is, to quote from the summary in the report:

...one of the most prevalent, pervasive, harmful, yet relatively hidden and often ignored forms of abuse.

It is a violation of basic human rights that can have long-term and intergenerational, psychological emotional and financial consequences. It is disruptive to employment and education, and often results in social and economic isolation, homelessness and, tragically, in some cases, even death.

The abuse can be in the form of physical violence, psychological and emotional abuse, threats, control and financial disempowerment. Research reveals that children exposed to family and

domestic violence can result in them being more likely to follow in the footsteps of the abusive parent as an adult. It then becomes a vicious cycle where everyone loses; the family, the community and society.

It is significant that today, the day that the report was noted in this place, is Youth Homelessness Matters Day. Figures reveal that more than 45 per cent of homeless youth find themselves in that situation as a result of family and domestic violence. I would just like to quote from their website:

Although the majority of young homeless people have left home, it is rarely their fault. 70 per cent of young people experiencing homelessness are escaping a negative home environment, which is often fostered through an unsupportive, abusive, violent or broken home.

It is vital that we understand and recognise that domestic and family violence are significant factors that contribute to youth homelessness. Figures reveal that more than 45 per cent of homeless youth find themselves in that situation as a result of family and domestic violence. Throughout their lives, it can impact on their capacity to learn, build relationships, manage emotions and develop coping strategies.

We know that preventing, addressing and responding to domestic violence presents a challenge to the community—to our whole community. The committee recognises that there are unique consequences for different sections of our community exposed to this, in particular women from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, women and girls with a disability, women living in regional, rural and remote areas, and Aboriginal women.

We are faced with shocking figures that reveal that annually in Australia between 80 and 100 women lose their lives at the hands of their partners or former partners. That is one to two women every week who die, and more than seven women each month—women whose families are left behind with the heartache of knowing that it did not have to be that way, children without a mother or a grandmother, parents without their daughter, and siblings without their sister, scarred for life, often from knowing and not being able to do anything, or thinking they couldn't do anything, or not knowing and not understanding why it was kept from them. The damage is ongoing.

In South Australia since 2008, 23 women and two children have been killed. As a society, we must do all we can to prevent domestic and family violence. The state government is leading the way in responding to domestic and family violence with the multiagency protection service (MAPS), the Family Safety Framework, and the common risk assessment tool, all of which are achieving positive outcomes.

Key messages from the committee's investigation into the effectiveness of current services and program initiatives in South Australia are that more needs to be done to prevent domestic and family violence from occurring in the first instance, and that strategic, coordinated and targeted services delivery responses are needed to support the most vulnerable victims.

And while abuse can be suffered in all forms of relationship and kinship settings, evidence received by the committee indicates that violence and abuse is more often than not perpetrated by men against women. There is no doubt that effective and culturally-appropriate programs are necessary to re-educate and address the needs of men who are perpetrators of violence against women, and importantly men and women need to be united in the goal of ending domestic and family violence.

Time expired.

Bills

RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS NO 2) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:35): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

I am pleased to introduce the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous No 2) Amendment Bill 2016, which amends the Rail Safety National Law. The Law is contained in a schedule to the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012.

In December 2009, the Council of Australian Governments agreed to implement national rail safety reform, that created a single rail safety regulator, and to develop a rail safety national law, which a rail regulator would administer. The national rail reform aims are to:

- support a seamless national rail transport system;
- not reduce existing levels of rail safety;
- streamline regulatory arrangements and reduce the compliance burden for business; and
- improve national productivity and reduce transport costs generally.

The Rail Safety National Law commenced operation on 20 January 2013. The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator was established as a body corporate under the Law, with its scope now also enacted through legislation in all jurisdictions, except Queensland, which has recently committed to adopting the Law.

The National Transport Commission, together with jurisdictions and the regulator, developed the Law and are also responsible for identifying legislative amendments. Ministers of the Transport and Infrastructure Council are responsible for approving the Law and its amendments. This Amendment Bill was approved by the Council on 6 November 2015.

South Australia, as host jurisdiction, is responsible for the passage of the Law and any amendment Bills through the South Australian Parliament. Once commenced in South Australia, each participating jurisdiction has an Application Act that automatically adopts the Law and subsequent amendments into its own legislation.

During its first two years of operation, the regulator has successfully discharged its obligations under the Law including facilitating the safe operation of rail transport in Australia by providing a scheme for national accreditation of rail transport operators and promoting the provision of national policies, procedures and guidance to industry, further progress in the consolidation of national rail safety data information and education and training for safe railway operations.

This Bill constitutes the second amendment package to be considered by Parliament. The first amendment package commenced on 1 July 2015.

This Bill is an amendment package which is administrative in nature and will improve operation of the *Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act* by:

- clarifying that infringement penalties and court imposed penalties can be paid into the regulator's fund. This amendment provides clarity to the existing provision and is not a policy change;
- maintaining currency with relevant national systems for the delivery and assessment of competencies relevant to rail safety workers and providing for flexibility to recognise these different systems if changes are made in the future. This follows an amendment to the Commonwealth *National Vocational Education and Training Regulator Act 2011*, that makes the current Rail Safety National Law reference to the Australian Quality Training Framework redundant;
- allowing an authorised officer to secure the perimeter of any site for compliance and investigative purposes, but not explicitly to restricting access to rolling stock (a vehicle that operates on or uses a railway) separate to securing a site. This amendment will clarify that rolling stock may also be secured;
- requiring a third party to notify a rail infrastructure manager before carrying out any work near a railway that threatens, or is likely to threaten, the safety of the railway or the operational integrity of the railway. However, there is currently no requirement for a third party provider to comply with a reasonable direction given by a rail infrastructure manager. This amendment will help to allow a rail infrastructure manager to resolve matters at the local level by giving written advice to the third party as necessary to ensure safety. Section 199 of the *Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act* already provides the ability for the regulator to intervene, if circumstances require;
- resolving the ambiguity as to which period of time the regulator has to commence prosecution; and

- allowing a court to make an order directing a convicted person to pay (not exceeding one-half) of any fine to the regulator.

The Bill has the support of Ministers of the Transport and Infrastructure Council, and major stakeholders, including rail industry associations.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause provides that the amendments proposed in Part 2 of this measure are to the *Rail Safety National Law* (the *Law*) set out in the Schedule to the principal Act.

Part 2—Amendment of *Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

These amendments are consequential on the amendment proposed to section 117 of the *Law*.

5—Amendment of section 33—Payments into Fund

These amendments provide for all infringement penalties paid to or recovered by ONRSR and all portions of fines paid to ONRSR by court order under new section 260A to be paid into the National Rail Safety Regulator Fund.

6—Amendment of section 117—Assessment of competence

These amendments update references in connection with qualifications and competencies for rail safety workers.

7—Amendment of section 149—Securing a site or rolling stock

These amendments will allow for the securing not only of a site but also of rolling stock.

8—Amendment of section 183—Contents of non-disturbance notice

These amendments are consequential on the amendments proposed to section 149 of the *Law*.

9—Amendment of section 199—Power to require works to stop

These amendments will allow for a rail infrastructure manager, by written notice, to give reasonable directions to a person who is proposing to do work which may threaten the safety or operational integrity of the manager's railway. The other amendments to the section are consequential.

10—Amendment of section 218—Period within which proceedings for offences may be commenced

This amendment clarifies that the relevant period within which proceedings for offences against the *Law* may be commenced is the latest of the various stated periods.

11—Insertion of section 260A

This clause inserts a new section.

260A—Payment of portion of fines to ONRSR

This provision empowers a court that convicts a person of an offence against the *Law* to order that a portion (not exceeding one-half) of any fine imposed as a penalty by the court be paid to ONRSR.

12—Amendment of Schedule 2—Miscellaneous provisions relating to interpretation

This amendment inserts clause 15A into Part 3 of Schedule 2 to the *Law* to clarify how an offence against the *Law* is created.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Bell.

**ASER (RESTRUCTURE) (FACILITATION OF RIVERBANK DEVELOPMENT) AMENDMENT
BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:36): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the ASER (Restructure) Act 1997. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The new Riverbank is already becoming an Adelaide success story and is changing the way our State is seen interstate and overseas.

The redeveloped oval has been a triumph, with visitor numbers not seen since the 'Bodyline' over half a century ago—in times of economic change it has galvanised South Australians around a common view of what makes our State great. It has showcased all that is good about our State to the world.

Now, we have the opportunity to extend this project's success to the Festival Plaza.

When the Festival Centre turned 40 it was described as 'so Adelaide'—its origami-like silhouette represented an early, but tentative, engagement with the Torrens Lake and reinforced the role of Elder Park as a place of public gathering at the tail end of Adelaide's 'kilometre of culture' stretching along North Terrace.

When completed in 1973, the centre was the nation's leading multi-purpose arts centre and it quickly became the heart of successive festivals. Now, along with neighbouring rotunda and gently sloping banks of the Torrens, it is the natural home and congregational point for the arts, leisure and cultural activities—including multiple international standard festivals and performing arts companies. It continues to be a national icon for South Australia.

Last year the government embraced an opportunity to extend the successful outcomes of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment to the Festival Plaza—in a proposal developed with Walker Group Holdings Pty Ltd which had previously been granted rights as the government's preferred partner for the integrated redevelopment of the plaza site.

In March 2015, the government approved the Walker proposal and committed to a \$180 million budget to realise this ambitious and exciting project. Concept visuals were released to positive public feedback at this time, and the Riverbank Authority was tasked with further detailing the design, engaging with stakeholders and taking oversight of the project.

In short, the project envisages a complete redevelopment of the Festival Plaza and Station Road precinct as a world-class space featuring:

- a sweeping multi-purpose plaza uniting the footbridge, the theatres, casino, railway station, North Terrace and through to Elder Park
- a public realm constructed from the highest quality materials and including public artwork, water features and natural plantings, plug-and-play facilities and interactive spaces for young and old alike
- restaurants, cafés and bars, active ground-floor retail and a Kurna cultural space that will bring life to the plaza day and night
- a major redevelopment of the Elder Park frontage of the Festival Centre that will underpin its connections to the Riverbank
- a premium office building of up to 24 stories, built to be highly energy efficient and offering floor-plates with the potential to attract major national and global anchor tenants to the State
- a new parliamentary garden and a >1,500 space underground carpark with electric car charging facilities that will support the casino rebuild and the growth of the Festival Centre, and
- seamless connections between the footbridge and the railway station through an at-grade walkway beneath the proposed casino expansion.

The new plaza will be a place of discovery and encounter, a veritable *Wunderkammer* of curios and quirks, delights and diversions—showcasing the best that South Australia has to offer day and night.

The concept designs have been subjected to consultation and further development by architects Ashton Raggatt McDougall and landscape consultants Taylor Cullity Lethlean in collaboration with the Adelaide Festival Centre's architectural consultants Hassell.

One of the more interesting ideas that emerged from this dialogue that has been incorporated in the finalised design is a 'Walk of Fame' to commemorate major artists who have performed or associated with, the Festival Centre.

We are now approaching the final stages of the detailed design process, which is being auspiced by the Riverbank Authority, and will be moving to rapidly conclude final legal arrangements with Walker to commence major construction works at the site.

To do that, it is critical that the enabling legislation I present to parliament in this bill is passed expeditiously.

This bill, which makes minor amendments to the *ASER (Restructure) Act 1997*, represents the quickest and simplest way to provide the authorisations necessary for construction to commence.

By way of reminder, the Adelaide Station and Environs Redevelopment (ASER) was a significant redevelopment in and around the railway station undertaken in the 1980s involving the integrated development of land around the railway station, including the casino and the convention centre.

The ASER Act was put in place by the former government to create specific arrangements for the ongoing management of the mature development site. The Act allows for individual leases to commercial interests on the site and shared management of common facilities and services.

Of particular importance, the Act governs a number of areas of public realm relevant to the Festival Plaza upgrade including Festival Drive and Station Road.

The bill will amend the ASER Act to enable the plaza upgrade to proceed by:

- enlarging the development site to allow for the casino expansion and plaza upgrade
- providing for the temporary suspension of ancillary property rights, such as rights of way, to allow works to proceed
- providing for restructuring of leases and ancillary property rights in the area following completion of the project, and
- renaming the Act as the Riverbank Act.

Supporting the legislation is a detailed map, already lodged with the General Registry Office and available to members on request, which illustrates the subject land to which these special powers will apply.

It is important to note that the ancillary property rights which this bill will allow to be subject to temporary suspension during construction, are 'non-occupation' rights and there will be no derogation from a party's rights of occupation or rights to conduct its business.

The legislation is essential to allow for the redevelopment project to proceed on time and for the government to fulfil its contractual commitments to Walker Group Holdings Pty Ltd for the upgrade. In addition, the legislative changes will also support the mooted casino expansion by SkyCity Entertainment Group Ltd should it proceed.

Subject to the passage of this bill, the estimate for the total build time is 24 months, with the new car park to open in the second half of 2017.

To provide members with a fuller context, I would now like to explain some details about this exciting project, how it came into being, what consultation has occurred to date and what will occur next.

Firstly, it is important to point out that Walker became the government's preferred partner for this project through an open and transparent procurement process. This was conducted by the government in the term of the last parliament in accordance with statutory procurement requirements, and, following the outcome of the election (when this was a publicly known fact), was carried over to a proposal which the government agreed to in March of last year.

Walker is a highly suitable partner for a project of this nature. Its business model includes a focus on flagship properties in premium locations which it offers to major funds as part of a packaged investment opportunity. This allows it to amortise return on investment across a portfolio of prime assets. This business model means that Walker is highly engaged around the quality of the asset as a driver of its potential and is prepared to make outlays that few other Australian property developers would commit to.

The negotiated arrangements will see Walker make a substantial contribution to the public realm, and invest in a larger overall development, in return for exclusive development rights over the subject land. Importantly, the commercial terms include an incentive for Walker to secure a national or global anchor tenant by allowing for a 10,000 sqm increase in the net lettable floor area of the office tower.

It is important to note that, while Walker will have exclusive development rights, the company is not guaranteed a development approval unless its designs meet the high standards set by the State's independent Development Assessment Commission, which will assess the development. As with all major developments in the city, the commission's decision will be informed by the Government Architect's robust and widely lauded design review panel process. Walker, just like any other development proponent, will have to run the gauntlet of the assessment system at arms' length from the government.

Government investment in the precinct of \$180 million (already committed) will be far exceeded by private sector investment of an estimated \$810 million, assuming commitment to the casino expansion is able to be secured (this is the subject of ongoing discussions). There is also a significant jobs dividend, both during construction and ongoing, in the order of 500–1000 ongoing roles in the redeveloped precinct.

Walker's contribution will be in the order of \$460 million, subject to a final decision on the floor space for the office tower. Economic analysis by Renewal SA indicates that for every \$1 of taxpayer spend; private investment in redevelopment of the precinct will be approximately \$5 if the casino expansion also goes ahead. This is a win-win scenario for the State.

Further analysis of the proposal is detailed in the government's submission to the Public Works Committee and the report no 544 of the committee handed down on 22 March this year.

The integrity of the process by which Walker became the government's preferred partner and the value-for-money proposition that this project offers cannot be seriously questioned.

While this project does not contemplate full redevelopment of the Festival Centre, it represents a significant proportion of this and will provide a platform for further upgrades in time.

Secondly, it is important to outline the extensive consultation process that has led to this point.

With the approval of Walker's initial proposal and concept designs, Cabinet tasked the Riverbank Authority to undertake consultation with key stakeholders and the public with a view to settling a final design for the site.

The Riverbank Authority developed a set of 'place principles' for the site that will see seamless integration with the wider Riverbank master plan. These then informed engagement with key stakeholders.

Extensive consultation has been undertaken including with the Adelaide City Council, the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, the InterContinental Hotel, SkyCity Entertainment Group Holdings Pty Ltd, staff of the State Heritage Council, the Kaurna Nation Cultural Heritage Association and other Kaurna community groups and elders, the Joint Parliamentary Services Committee, creative and arts communities and members of the public.

Public forums were held on 13 August and 2–3 September 2015, helping to inform the place principles developed by the Riverbank Authority and critique and improve iterations of the concept design.

Interest groups represented at these invite-based sessions included members of the arts and creative sectors, city-based entrepreneurs, city residents and university students—helping to gain a holistic appreciation of how the space would work for people of all ages and a better understanding of how arts and cultural activities can be 'threaded' through the space.

In addition, dedicated consultation has been undertaken—complying with section 23 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988*—with Aboriginal community bodies and also in accordance with the *Heritage Places Act 1993* with staff of the State Heritage Council (both of which will inform the formal development assessment process). Liaison with Kaurna elders continues to be close as site works proceed with particular attention on the removal and relocation of the Indigenous public art pieces impacted by the construction works.

Throughout this process Arts SA and the Festival Centre Trust have been key partners in influencing the design and manifold project details. For example, Arts SA has conducted a comprehensive audit of public artworks and, through the Minister for the Arts, will be assisting in liaising with artists (and the estates of artists) in relation to their moral rights under the federal Copyright Act as works are progressively de-accessioned, relocated or recommissioned.

Both organisations will continue to participate in the proposed project governance arrangements as works unfold—ensuring that matters of particular interest, such as venue spaces and services, can also be identified and addressed.

In addition, Renewal SA and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure have undertaken consultation with various parties specifically in relation to this legislation, including those parties who occupy ASER buildings being:

- SkyCity Entertainment Group Limited
- the Adelaide Convention Centre
- the Adelaide Railway Station

- the InterContinental Hotel, and
- the Riverside Building.

An extraordinary meeting of the ASER Management Committee (which comprises the facilities managers for each building) was briefed on details of the proposed bill on 23 September 2015 and ongoing liaison will be maintained by Renewal SA with this group on the progress of the redevelopment as it proceeds through its regular monthly meetings.

Liaison with all affected parties will be ongoing as construction and staging plans are settled. In short, all stakeholders are supportive of this legislation proceeding.

Thirdly, it is important to address arguments put by some that this represents an alienation of park lands to commercial interests. Nothing about this project represents anything extraordinary in terms of the institutional zone in the park lands.

All along North Terrace, what was once open park lands has been developed to support a range of public and private interests. All of this is entirely consistent with the park lands legislation and with the long-term patterns of use of this part of the park lands.

Two universities, a hospital and new health care precinct, an office building, a convention centre, a gym, a zoo, a cemetery, two railway stations, a school and soon to be another, two major sporting arenas, a wine centre complex, an organic nursery and plant recycling depot, an aquatic centre, golf, bowling and cricket clubs, boating houses, several kiosks, a road safety school, an art gallery, museum and library, two restaurant complexes as well as restaurants featured in other facilities, and, of course, the Festival Centre itself all operate on former park lands on a wholly or partly commercial basis and with a mix of public and private ownership.

And that is not to mention the many private festivals and sporting events, operating on a wholly or partly commercial basis, that also use the park lands on temporarily during the year.

All of these have been developed in the park lands by governments of varying political persuasions as well as the city council itself.

Indeed, the institutional and like zones are acknowledged in the development plan, park lands strategy and the Adelaide Park Lands Act itself as suitable for development of this kind. The real reason for this zone being classified as park lands is so that if and when built structures are decommissioned without replacement, the land itself cannot be sold off and should therefore be restored to open park lands absent any other more intensive use.

This government, in decommissioning the 5.5 ha former Thebarton water depot in the west park lands, chose to invest in restoring these to open park landscapes with an urban forest of 23,000 trees growing to create a welcoming space for residents of the inner west. Similarly, the decommissioning of the former bus depot on Hackney Road has been returned to park-like uses under the custody of the Botanic Gardens.

This project, which will see office space available for parliament, ground-floor retail and exhibition spaces and a major private investment in our premiere public space is a no brainer and will ensure that neighbouring areas of open park lands abutting the Torrens riverfront are vibrant, well-used and attractive.

Indeed, we in the government would argue it is entirely consistent with the values expressed in the national heritage listing for the park lands which reflects Colonel Light's original vision for this uniquely Adelaide asset.

Lastly, it is important to outline the project governance arrangements and work underway for the long-term management of the redeveloped site.

This is a complex redevelopment, with many stakeholders, commercial and non-commercial interests and legal issues at play.

Actual construction for each component of the redevelopment is likely to be practically and technically difficult given their scale and complexity, the location of the development sites and the nature and importance of surrounding buildings. This is further complicated because the tenants of the surrounding buildings enjoy rights which will be affected.

An experienced project manager (Mott MacDonald) has already been appointed to manage construction.

Separate development agreements are in the process of being finalised with Walker Group Pty Ltd. At the same time, the government continues discussions with SkyCity regarding the potential casino expansion—and we are hopeful these discussions will result in a positive outcome that can be announced in due course.

Importantly, passage of this enabling legislation is crucial to enable the government to finalise the legal arrangements with Walker that will ensure major works can commence.

Development approvals are being progressively secured for the redevelopment. SkyCity received their development approval in February 2016 with development assessment of State components of the redevelopment

scheduled for April and Walker's components for May. The final concept designs will form the basis of the formal development assessment for the major works required to deliver the project.

Preparatory works have commenced on the site in anticipation of these important formalities.

Ongoing oversight of the project will be provided by the Riverbank Authority, with project management services provided through the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. A steering group including representatives of the Festival Centre and other key stakeholders will provide a vehicle to manage the intimate details of the construction process and ensure tight control of the budget outlays for the project.

For example, while the proposal has been costed based upon high quality finishes, similar to the quality of Adelaide Oval's public realm and North Terrace, as construction proceeds the project steering group will be charged with considering any changes to material selection and plantings that could help to contain overall costs.

There will be ongoing liaison with all parties, but particularly with the ASER-affected parties whose ancillary rights may need to be suspended at various points during construction. This liaison will be managed through ASER Management Committee.

In addition to facilitating this extraordinary project, the bill will rename the ASER Act as the Riverbank Act. This will set the seal on the government's vision for the precinct and foreshadows later work that will settle a finalised management structure under the oversight of the Riverbank Authority.

The government expects to revisit these matters, following discussions with the Riverbank Authority about the optimal structure for management of the precinct into the future—and the legislation needed to support this.

This is a pivotal opportunity for parliament to give the green light to what will become one of this State's iconic assets in years to come—a compelling destination of choice for our citizens and visitors alike and the centrepiece of a revitalised arts, cultural and leisure precinct embracing the riverbank at the heart of our city.

What's so exciting about this project is how it ties together more than 40 years of history at the Festival Centre—a legacy the final concept designs showcase and build upon. The new plaza will be a distinctive place that renders a unique account of the people, cultural life and character of Adelaide—a place that will stay in the memories of all who visit it.

Adelaide has established a world-class reputation as a festival city, and it is right that as 'Mad March' continues to grow each year the question of what cultural 'vibe' we want to project becomes a matter of public debate—as it has in the aftermath of this year's festival season.

That's why the decision we take now, to pass this legislation and put this project into its production-stage, is so important. It will be a milestone for our State.

This event-ready space will be the platform for the many more successful festivals to come, a place with a broad canvas able to host the grandest extravaganzas, but also with nooks and crannies that can provide developing artists with audiences and opportunities all year round.

The design is bold, innovative and will do us proud—and can be delivered within budget, on time and alongside major private sector investment all South Australians can welcome with open arms.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

The measure will be brought into operation by proclamation.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *ASER (Restructure) Act 1997*

4—Amendment of section 1—Short title

This clause proposes to amend the short title of the Act to the *Riverbank Act 1997*.

5—Amendment of section 6—Enlargement of Site

It will be possible to enlarge the Site under a proposed amendment to section 7.

6—Amendment of section 7—The casino site

The Governor will be able to extend the area of the casino site by notice in the Gazette. An indication of what may constitute this area is indicated by a deposited plan. The Governor will, despite any other provision, be able to make variations to any regulation under the Act that defines any boundary under the Act.

7—Insertion of Schedule 1

Amendments are to be made to the *ASER (Restructure) Act 1997*. These amendments will be effected by the insertion of a new schedule to the Act. A detailed explanation of the provisions contained in the schedule is as follows.

Clause 1 sets out 2 definitions that are relevant to the operation of the schedule. The *designated area* will be the whole of the Site together with 2 areas adjacent to this Site that are identified by a plan deposited in the General Registry Office. A *designated project* is a project, scheme, undertaking or works, to be undertaken within the designated area, declared by the Governor, by notice in the Gazette, to constitute a designated project.

Clause 2 sets out a scheme that will allow the Governor, on the recommendation of the Minister, by notice in the Gazette, to suspend or modify specified classes of rights or interests that exist in, or in relation to, any part of the designated area. However, the Minister will only be able to recommend the suspension or modification of a right or interest if the Minister is satisfied that this action is reasonably necessary in order to facilitate or support the undertaking of a designated project. A notice that suspends a right or interest, should (insofar as is reasonably practicable and subject to avoiding an adverse impact on any aspect of a designated project) endeavour to grant a substitute right or interest. The Minister will be also required to revoke a suspension or modification if or when it is no longer reasonably necessary in connection with a designated project, subject to some specified qualifications.

Clause 3 will authorise the Minister, or a person authorised by the Minister, to exercise various powers for the purposes of, or in connection with, a designated project. However, a person exercising a power under this clause must, insofar as is reasonably practicable, minimise the extent of damage to any building, structure or other built form and minimise disturbance to any other person who is lawfully occupying any part of the designated area.

Clause 4 sets out a scheme that will allow the Minister to create or grant 1 or more rights or interests in relation to any part of the designated area for any purpose associated with a designated project. These will be permanent rights and interests and the Minister will be able to modify permanently a right or interest of a kind referred to in clause 2(1). The Minister will be required to take reasonable steps to ensure that a right or interest under this clause does not adversely affect to a material degree the viability of any business conducted on the designated area by a person lawfully occupying any part of the designated area at the time that the Minister takes action under this clause.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Bell.

SUPPLY BILL 2016*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:38): Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and I resume my comments. Previously I have spoken about some of the doom and gloom or the dark clouds hovering over South Australia. However, there are also many opportunities, bright green sprouts, if that is the term they use, but certainly in the South-East there are opportunities that we would like to pursue in partnership with the state government.

Before I get on to those opportunities, I want to talk about a couple of conditions that are affecting more the Upper South-East but certainly the South-East as a region, and I am talking about drought. I call on the state government to do more for drought-stricken farmers in South Australia, and this is on top of the federal government's recent announcement that the funding for rural financial counselling services will continue for the next three years with a \$47 million commitment through to 2019. There are areas and farmers in the South-East who really do need this support. There are farmers who have had two years without rain resulting in a 90 per cent crop loss.

If I compare what South Australia is doing compared to Victoria—and the South-East is very close to the Victorian border—it is a stark contrast. What Victoria has done is given a 50 per cent rebate on council rates for farmers affected by severe drought, and also they are working on an \$80 million extension of the Wimmera Mallee pipeline connecting drought-stricken farmers in the south-west of Victoria to much-needed water sources.

Meanwhile, across our border, some five kilometres away, our farmers are fighting the same drought with limited assistance. I will note and give credit that the state government did spend

\$500,000 (half a million dollars) on drought relief measures, but that pales in comparison to the Victorian government's \$27 million drought package, which was announced in 2015.

While we are talking about that, the second issue I would like to talk about is co-funding of mobile blackspot phone towers. In the first round, there was \$100 million from the commonwealth government. People might be quite surprised to know that I travel 15 minutes outside of Mount Gambier and we are in a dead zone for a good 30 kilometre stretch towards Millicent, and then heading up towards Adelaide there are many more blackspots along the way. I know the state government knows this, but I would implore them to put some money into the next round of blackspot mobile phone towers.

What we will find is that there will be a big uplift in the number of towers in South Australia compared to what we had last time. Just for instance, in the first round of \$100 million, we received 11 towers, Tasmania received 31, and Victoria 110. People might think, 'Why the difference? New South Wales received 144.' It has to do with the co-contribution that those governments saw fit to make to this federal government initiative.

We put in no money and got 11 towers. At the other end of the scale, New South Wales put in \$24 million and they received 144 towers. Even Tasmania put in \$300,000 and tripled the number of towers in South Australia. So, I call on the state government to make a co-contribution to the second round of blackspot mobile phone towers. It is only a \$60 million commitment from the federal government this time, as opposed to \$100 million, but we have many blackspots in our regional areas that need attention.

Last year, the state government came down to the South-East and held its country cabinet, where a number of issues were raised. Out of that, a very glossy response was tabled. If you took the photos out of it, you would find that it might fit on four or five pages, but nevertheless we have 20 pages, predominantly filled with photos.

I just want to talk about a couple of issues that I would love to see in the upcoming state budget, because it is hampering growth in the South-East. A key issue identified, 'Increased electricity supply will enable industrial expansion in the region.' Well, that is true. You did not need to come down to Mount Gambier. I could have told you that up here. In the response, it quotes:

SA Power Networks has identified some forecast system limitations in the South East region over the 2015-2020 period. To address this, SA Power Networks is investigating a number of solutions...

It does not describe what those solutions are, when they are going to happen and for what regions, so it does make it difficult for our community to forward plan, not knowing where those developments are going to go.

It will come as no surprise to minister Hunter in the other place that we have ongoing concern about the South-East drainage network. For those who do not know, the state government does put in \$2.2 million. It costs \$8 million a year to properly fund those drainage networks, yet infrastructure is now getting older, more dilapidated and, of course, overgrown, so the drainage network down in the South-East needs an injection of money.

The minister is well aware of this but, to date, has set up a citizens' jury which came back with a very clear message that the state government needs to fund these drainage networks. Of course, unlike the bicycle laws which were implemented, and others that the government agrees with, as soon as they get a determination they do not like, 'We now need to find another way for you the community to fund that extra \$6 million.'

Obviously, in terms of community medical services, the health minister's response to Country Health's incompetence—I do not think there is any other word—in finalising contracts for two of our orthopaedic surgeons has been deplorable. These contracts took two years to get in place, past the expiry of the contracts. I know the professionals involved have questioned the advice that the minister is actually getting. It was pleasing for me to see in a written form the minister coming out and questioning some of the advice he has received over the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Transforming Health debacle which is unfolding as we speak.

Access to mental health and drug and alcohol services is needed in the region. We saw a great collaboration last Wednesday where the federal government, the state government and the

local council cofunded a set of traffic lights, which has been an ongoing burden on our region for 13 years. When all three levels of government come together and work collaboratively, things can happen, and I call on the government to do that with mental health and rehabilitation services for our region.

One of the biggest concerns with this state government response was the key issue of the community being concerned about the prospect of coal seam gas mining in the region. I stand here as the local member saying not one person has come in to my office and not one person has spoken to me about coal seam gas mining. It is certainly not an issue in my region.

However, if they are talking about shale gas mining in the region, then yes, that is a major concern, but the issue I have with this document is they cannot even get their terminology correct. This would have gone through three or four departments, and the issues have been very well documented around shale gas deposits.

I said I would finish on some positive notes for the South-East, and we have lots of opportunities. I was in a meeting last week with the owners of a wood pellet mill. Wood pellets are basically taking the residue out of the forest, all the scrap, grinding it up and pressing it into a hard wooden pellet which is used for commercial and domestic heating. This company has an agreement with the Japanese government for a long period of time to take every wood pellet they can produce.

I have spoken to the Minister for Forests just today about this opportunity for a \$100 million to \$150 million infrastructure spend in the South-East, which would be fantastic. Biofuel, again, is taking waste from the forests and turning it into a fuel that can be burnt for commercial or domestic electricity purposes and heat. The proponents are doing feasibility studies right now on that.

The biggest opportunity that the South-East has is an upgrade to our airport. This would not only allow us to get freight out of the South-East. Currently, a lot of fresh produce—crayfish, etc.—goes out through Melbourne, either the port of Melbourne or, for non-containerised products, through the port of Portland, which boosts their economic stats but does absolutely nothing for South Australia's economic stats.

An airport upgrade has long been talked about. Plans are in place which have been developed and which would aid tourism opportunities and the market. It would help the South-East, particularly Generations in Jazz, which has interest from Queensland and Sydney to fly students direct to Mount Gambier for the James Morrison Academy. Of course, Generations in Jazz is three weeks away, Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Close to my heart, yes; I will be down there.

Mr BELL: Any lobbying you can do, Deputy Speaker, I would be eternally grateful. In terms of a forestry hub, there is good talk around a federal-state collaboration. I think we are starting to get to the theme of this, that we need the state the government to buy-in to these opportunities. If the state government continues to just sit there and say, 'It's the federal government's fault, let's blame the federal government', this state and our regions will go nowhere. Forestry hubs are another example of the great co-contribution which could occur in the South-East.

Lastly, there is a laminating line—taking on the big guys on the eastern seaboard—that would make laminating products for domestic and commercial kitchens, housing operations, that type of stuff. There are proposals to investigate a laminating line at one of our biggest manufacturing plants down there. With that, Deputy Speaker, I conclude my remarks.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:52): It is my great pleasure to rise and to speak on this important Supply Bill. South Australia is a great place with a great future. I think Adelaide is one of the great cities of the world. I think our regions are second to none. Our people are hard working, they are innovative, they are industrious, and they should be rewarded.

Unfortunately, our state is not travelling as well as it possibly could. The people of South Australia and their opportunity have been let down by a tired, 14-year-old, dysfunctional government, those opposite, who have not put the right policy settings in place to deliver a prosperous future for the people of this state.

By contrast, in recent weeks, Deputy Speaker, you may be aware, I launched 2036, a manifesto for our state, which charts a course back to prosperity for South Australians. We talk about our values, we talk about our principles, our foundation, in nine areas which good government is based upon. We talk about our values, but most importantly we also talk about our reform agenda—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members are reminded we are to hear the leader in silence—that's both sides of the house. I will have no hesitation in booting people out. I want to hear everything the leader has to say.

Mr MARSHALL: —and those opposite would do well to read 2036. Those opposite would do well in particular to take a look at chapter 1, because in the framing of this year's budget—and let's face it, that is what we are here to talk about today—they need to concentrate on getting the right economic settings in place to chart a course back to prosperity for this state, because, quite frankly, we are not doing well.

We have got stagnant growth in South Australia. We have capital and young people deserting our state. We have our next generation giving up hope and, of course, we have the highest unemployment rate in the entire nation. We have had the highest unemployment rate now for more than 15 months. We have the highest trend unemployment rate, we have the highest seasonally adjusted unemployment rate, we have the highest youth unemployment rate, and, importantly, we have the highest underutilisation rate. Interestingly, I was reading earlier—in that wonderful journal *The Adelaide Review*—an article by none other than John Spoehr, who does not always reflect my personal belief. However, he has an interesting reflection on underutilisation which I would like to quote. He said:

In any case, we have to face the fact that the situation is much worse than the headline unemployment rate [here in South Australia]...The ABS labour force underutilisation rate provides us with a more complete picture of the health of the labour market. When you take account of underemployment (those who would prefer to work more hours), South Australia has an alarmingly high labour force underutilisation rate of 17 per cent (19 per cent for women)...

This is a full 20 per cent above the national average in South Australia, so things are not going well after 14 years of dysfunctional Labor government. However, all is not lost: 2036 charts a course back to prosperity. In particular, it talks about the economic policy settings that this government needs to get right: tax, regulation, capital investment. They are the three things I would like to talk about as we discuss and debate the Supply Bill in this chamber today.

First, in terms of tax, there is no doubt that we are too highly taxed in South Australia. However, it is not just taxes; it is also, of course, increasing costs, fees, levies and charges which are put onto not only households in South Australia but also the productive component of our economy, the small business sector, the people who are out there putting their lives and capital on the line to create opportunity and employment here in South Australia.

With last year's budget, this time last year when the government was putting the final touches, the fine detail, into its budget, it said it was going to bring down a jobs budget, it was going to bring down a jobs budget for the people of South Australia. It is interesting, because there were a number of measures and we actually supported some of those. There was an attempt at tax reduction; finally, after 14 years, there was an attempt at tax reduction. However, interestingly, this so-called jobs budget (and if ever there was misnomer it was last year's jobs budget) actually provided a downgrading of the employment forecast for South Australia.

In other words not even the government, not even the Treasury modelling, thought that this was actually going to work. When the government first brought down the employment growth rate for this year it said that we were going to grow our economy, grow our employment in this state by 1.75 per cent; by the time it brought down its jobs budget it had diminished to 1 per cent. It had almost halved between the original forecast and the time it brought down its jobs budget to address the unacceptably high unemployment rate in South Australia.

But it gets worse. The Mid-Year Budget Review came out in December, just a few days before Christmas (the government tries to sneak these things out so there is no great scrutiny and observation by the people of South Australia). It brought it out, and guess what happened then?

There was a further downgrade to the employment growth rate in South Australia. What was it finally? It was 0.25 of 1 per cent. It is a rounding error. That has been the culmination of this government's poor policy settings.

We have a very high taxation rate in South Australia and we have a very high unemployment rate in South Australia, so you can imagine our alarm, when the budget came down, that the government actually said that rather than reducing payroll tax, the tax on jobs, its plan, on 1 July this year, is to increase payroll tax on small business in this state. It almost beggars belief.

Let me explain this to the chamber. Currently no business in South Australia with a payroll of \$1.2 million and below pays payroll tax, not one. On 1 July that threshold goes from \$1.2 million down to \$600,000. We have the highest unemployment rate in the nation, and we have had this for 15 months, and the government's solution is to jack up the tax on the small business sector. That is how inane this government's taxation regime is.

Of course, there is stamp duty relief, which is factored into the forward estimates, but is it coming for the remainder of this financial year? No. Is it coming next financial year? No. In fact, the next time we will see any stamp duty relief in South Australia is going to be on 1 July 2017. Yet we are in the middle of a dangerous jobs crisis right now and the government's response is, 'Don't worry, in a couple of years' time we are going to do something about it.' Give me a break, and give the people of South Australia a break! What you need to be doing is bringing forward that stamp duty relief now and making sure that we can keep payroll tax lower in South Australia, not jacking it up on 1 July.

Let me also tell you that one of the other big hits to the people of South Australia is this government's sneaky tax, the emergency services levy tax increase that was perpetrated on the people of South Australia without warning after they formed government following the 2014 state general election. This is a massive \$360 million dollar hit to households and businesses in South Australia. Again, part of the Liberal Party response outlined in 2036 is to reinstate that rebate and remove that additional tax of the emergency services levy, because that \$360 million would be better off in the pockets of ordinary South Australians. It would be better off in the pockets of small business in South Australia, because they will go out and spend money and create sustainable long-term jobs in this state.

What is the government saying about tax? Let me tell you what our Premier is saying about tax at the moment. He has been out quite a bit lately. He has been out offering himself in the national press, and the centrepiece of his taxation policy is to increase the GST. His idea to increase employment here in South Australia is to suck \$3 billion out of our domestic economy each and every year going forward. That is his tax plan. He has taken it to the people of South Australia. He has taken it to the people of Australia at every single opportunity. He wants to tax the people of South Australia an additional \$3 billion per year.

Of course, he was castigated by his own federal counterpart, Nick Champion, who went out there and said that this would be an absolute disaster. Let me tell you, federal ALP criticism of this government is coming thick and fast at the moment, because they know that this is not a good government whatsoever. We should not be talking about increasing taxes; we should be talking about reducing taxes in South Australia, and reducing the costs on families and businesses here in this state.

That is why again, with our positive plan outlined after we launched our foundation 2036 document, it was the Liberal Party which went out and said that we would put a cap on council rates in South Australia. Why? Why do we want to do this? I will tell you why. Because the Liberal Party believes that by lowering costs on the productive component of the economy, by lowering costs on families, we will stimulate economic activity and we will create long-term sustainable jobs. The Liberal reform agenda works and the government would do well to read chapter 1 of 2036.

One of the other important things which is covered off in our manifesto about growing the size of our economy is deregulation. This is not in the DNA of those opposite. They love to regulate; they love red tape. They love to introduce more rules and costs on business, but it is not actually working. That is why the Liberal Party said, in our manifesto, that we would establish the first state-based productivity commission, not to trim red tape, but to actually deregulate in South Australia.

This is what we believe in. We need to pull away that costly regulation that costs jobs, especially at this time of very high unemployment. Again, that is why we have been out there, in contrast to the Labor Party, releasing our positive plan for deregulation in South Australia. That is why, only a few weeks ago, it was the Liberal Party that went out and said that we need to have a different set of rules regarding the adaptive re-use of some of our older buildings in South Australia.

I was delighted when the government said, 'Yes, we support that and we will support that.' That is a good response, because we want to deregulate. That is why we were out there saying that we would like to deregulate ride sharing here in South Australia. At the moment it is completely illegal. It operates in 400 cities around the world, but Labor in South Australia knows better. They think that this should be a highly regulated area. We came out, after the publication of our very positive 2036 foundation and said that we should deregulate this area; we should allow people to have choice. We should create jobs in South Australia. We went out with it. I commend the government. They have now said that they will move to allow ride sharing to be legal in South Australia.

But let's take a look at the way they go about doing it. Their first course is to increase fares and increase levies on consumers and operators in South Australia. This is before we even know what the impact on the taxi industry is going to be. This is before we even know whether Uber is going to come into the market. The first point and the default point of Labor as per usual is to increase taxes, increase costs, increase regulation, and that is what is strangling our economy in South Australia.

The third area that this government needs to focus on is capital investment. We are at a time of extraordinarily high unemployment in South Australia. Simultaneous with that, the government is massively slashing their capital investment budget in South Australia. It is almost impossible to believe, but it is a fact. I have some stats here for you, Deputy Speaker, because I know that you like numbers; you are a very numerate person, one of few on that side of the house.

In 2009-10, the state government's budget for capital investment was \$2.1 billion. It went up in 2010-11 to almost \$2.3 billion. In 2011-12, \$2.1 billion, and in 2012-13, \$2.1 billion. You are starting to see the picture: we have had capital investment in South Australia well above the \$2 billion mark on an annual basis for an extended period of time. When the unemployment rate started going through the roof, what was the government's response? 'Let's cut back on capital investment. Let's cut back on the sort of thing that would create productive infrastructure in this state, which would create long-term sustainable jobs.'

In the 2014-15 year, the budget went down to \$1.2 billion, so it went down. When the budget came out this year, the Treasurer, after sustained attack from those of us on this side who said, 'What are you doing? At a time of high unemployment and extraordinarily low interest rates, surely now is the time for some of the productive infrastructure that we need here in this state. You are not out there competing with the private sector now.'

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Never cost less.

Mr MARSHALL: As the member for Stuart says, it would never cost less than what it is right now. The government's response was to say, 'We won't let it go below \$1.3 billion.' 'We won't let it go below \$1.3 billion'? This is a 40 per cent reduction on where it had been over the previous five years, but they would not let it go below \$1.3 billion. Of course, when the Mid-Year Budget Review came down, that promise went out the door as well, because they cut their capital expenditure budget by a further \$85 million. This is the ineptitude of this government. I think what it does is highlight the difference between those of us on this side of the chamber and those of us on that side of the chamber.

On this side of the chamber, we believe in lowering costs and lowering taxes on business. We believe in reducing regulation and we believe in investing in long-range productive infrastructure for our state. Those opposite increase taxes, increase charges, increase fees, increase the regulation and, at a time when we need it most, cut back on capital expenditure. It is impossible to believe, but that is the situation. The culmination is where we are at the moment, when our next generation is really struggling to see a future in this state.

The National Australia Bank Monthly Business Survey was published yesterday. South Australia is identified as having the lowest-ranked business conditions in the nation. Is anybody surprised? It is hardly even reported, because month after month, quarter after quarter, it is the same situation. Last week, the Sensis Business Index came out: lowest-ranked small business confidence and conditions in the nation again. This is the problem for South Australia: the confidence level is at an all-time low.

Not only should those opposite be reading the very important and informative chapter 1 of our 2036 document but they should also take a look at chapter 9. Chapter 9 deals very specifically with some very important areas, called 'Running an efficient and stable government'. Let me tell you, running an efficient and stable government has been well beyond the capacity of this government for an extended period of time. We are laying out our reform agenda in all its colourful glory (81 pages) for those opposite to read and adopt if they wish, and 9.4 is important, because we do need to be fiscally responsible. I will just read two small parts of this for you this afternoon, Deputy Speaker:

While balancing the budget should always be a top government priority, we also believe that debt can be a useful tool for improving prosperity when it is used for investment in productive assets, which will create jobs and grow South Australia's economy.

Another small section states:

The State Liberals will balance the State Budget to ensure taxpayers' money is being spent on the things that matter to everyday South Australians, while reducing the State's debt over the long term.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: That is 9.4, which is one of my favourite areas of the overall document. We do need to live within our means in South Australia, that is a fact, but when you look at the budget that we have going forward it provides, at the moment, for a surplus. A lot of that surplus has not been dealt to the pages by a prudent government, it has been, essentially, delivered with this massive windfall gain which is GST to the state.

Let me just remind you that the GST which is coming into the state this year, over last year, goes up well in excess of half a billion dollars. In fact, we have just had the latest Commonwealth Grants Commission update that next year our GST is going to go up by a further half a billion dollars. So, in the last two years we have seen the annual increase in unencumbered GST dollars into the state go up by a billion dollars.

We say: yes, we do need to deliver surplus budgets, but they do not need to be massive surplus budgets at this time when we have the highest unemployment rate in the nation. We need to balance the need for prudence, in terms of our financial management, with the needs of South Australians. At the moment, they are giving up hope, but there is hope: 2036 charts a very positive course towards our bicentenary in South Australia, but action on it cannot start in 2030 or 2032, it needs to start right now, it needs to start with a budget that is going to be handed down in June, and it needs to start by the putting in place of economic policy settings which are going to drive long-term prosperity and, importantly, sustainable jobs growth in this state.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is looking at me, and the others leave the chamber.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (16:12): They are all leaving. Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I do notice you were looking to the other side for a contribution, perhaps, before, and I thank you for looking at me. One thing that has caught my attention in the 12 or so months that I have been in this house is that, when it comes to matters of supply and financial matters, we barely get a contribution from those opposite.

Those opposite make wonderful contributions on many matters, and I look at the member for Ashford, who is here right now, who always makes very good contributions on a lot of social issues, as does the member for Hammond, but the collective government and their members when it comes to matters of supply (bills related to supply) you barely hear a squeak. You have to ask yourself: why is that? The reality is that they are embarrassed by their 14-year record; they are embarrassed by their financial record; they are embarrassed about the way the state is going at the

moment; they are embarrassed by the highest unemployment in the land; and they are embarrassed about the peak debt.

The Supply Bill is critical to the machine of parliament. In the absence of supply, of course, there would be no parliamentary authority for budget expenditure. That is why we on this side do not oppose the request for another \$3.444 billion to be transferred from the consolidated account of the Public Service, but I do want to make some comments about the government's fiscal performance.

Almost a year ago, I spoke on the very same bill. At that time, the government sought \$3.2 billion from consolidated accounts and I spoke then, as I will now, on the government's fiscal performance. What is a very stark and frightening thing for all South Australians is that little has changed in 12 months. The comments I made last year are still applicable today, almost verbatim, and I feel like inserting them into *Hansard* like many on the other side, but I will not.

In the last 12 months, the government has not made any definitive improvements to the economic conditions of South Australia; that is in 12 months, but of course this is what we have come to expect after 14 years of state Labor. This government has had plenty of time and plenty of opportunities to deliver improved outcomes for South Australians. It has been 14 years of tired, hard Labor. The people of South Australia want to know, what does their government do all day, and what is their government doing to turn around the fortunes of this state.

We consistently hear from the Premier about the precarious position of this state, the need to be patient as we transition from the old economy to the new economy, and Mr Premier, we wait. We saw the announcement yesterday about the Labor government embracing ride sharing in South Australia which is, of course, a position that moves us to a new economy, but only on the back of the work of the Liberal opposition in this area. The Liberal Party, in this last 12 months, as we head into the halfway mark of the term, is driving the agenda. We are the ones who are transitioning and forcing the government to follow us to come into the new economy and get out of the old economy.

So I ask the Premier these questions: when will we actually start turning the corner? When will we see a move to the new economy? When will we see the creation of jobs and a declining unemployment rate, which is, of course, the most important thing we should all strive to be doing. When will we see an improvement to the cost of living for households, and when will we see a change in the state's balance sheet?

The Commonwealth Bank State of the States report published in January 2015, ranked South Australian seventh on economic performance out of eight states and territories. In 2016, a full 12 months later, lo and behold, we are still in seventh spot. Not much to show for that 12 months, and the state also now ranks seventh on retail trade and eighth on dwelling starts; and, of course, we know that dwelling starts and housing construction are strong lead indicators of economic performance.

The state's unemployment rate continues to remain too high. The SA Regional Labour Force Data for the year ending February 2016, reports that the unemployment rate of 7.3 per cent remains unchanged since February 2015; so in 12 months, no change to unemployment. The number of unemployed has increased in this 12-month period from 62,600 to 64,100, and the unemployment rate amongst 15 to 24-year-olds has increased from 14.9 per cent to 15.4 per cent.

One thing that these stats do not show is the amount of people, and the amount of young South Australians who are not looking for work, and, of course, the amount of people and young South Australians who have left the state because they cannot find work. They are not even in these statistics. Our unemployment rate is the worst in the nation and we should be ashamed at this and we should all be doing all that we can to revert these figures.

We have the highest unemployment, youth unemployment and underemployment rates in the nation, and the outlook does not make for good viewing. Each week, South Australians open their morning papers or turn on the evening news and learn of more job losses. Since 2013, the state has been hit with job loss announcements at Holden, Arnott's Biscuits, Aldinga Turkeys, ACI, Caroma Industries, Arrium, BHP, United Dairy Power, Fairfax Media, Unibooks, Santos, and the list goes on, and that only includes the big name industries.

Of course, there are plenty of mum and dad small businesses and local operators, and Jim's Mowing franchise owners who are all going out of business in this state, mainly as a result of loss of confidence in the market. As unemployment grows, households are also being hit with extraordinary increases in cost of living pressures. Last year, I noted that utilities in South Australia had become some of the most costly in the world, with water prices rising 227 per cent since 2002. Twelve months later—and we are working on this 12-month cycle—the only thing that has changed is how much water prices have increased since 2002, not decreased.

The last figures show that South Australia's average water bill has now grown 241 per cent between 2002-03 and 2015-16. Not only has the Labor government overseen the highest rate of unemployment in a decade, their tenure has resulted in some of the highest utility prices in the world. South Australia also has the most expensive power in the National Electricity Market, and I think the member for Schubert alluded to these points yesterday in his contribution about how in some areas government policy has deliberately spiked up the price of power for South Australians. In February this year the Australian Energy Market Operator released data showing surging electricity prices in South Australia for the next two years.

Increasing utility prices is particularly bad news for the state's job market and makes our manufacturing and manufacturers less competitive. Business looking to invest in new job-creating opportunities in Australia look elsewhere due to the high cost of doing business in our state, and existing businesses are struggling to survive. Hit with a triple blow of massive increases in the emergency services levy, exorbitant water prices and the crippling electricity prices they just cannot survive in the current market.

Of course, as we know, from 1 July this year small businesses will be paying payroll tax from the new threshold of \$600,000. The supply chain costs that our businesses face mean that their ability to compete nationally and internationally is severely hamstrung by this government, and I urge those opposite and those who are in charge of the Treasury benches to do all they can to relieve these cost pressures on our businesses to do their bit to help our manufacturing base which is so dear and near to so many of us.

It is little wonder that business confidence in South Australia continues to decline. BankSA's latest State Monitor survey, published on 3 March 2016, shows that business confidence recorded a 5.3 points drop since the last survey was conducted in October. The news was worse in our rural regions where business confidence fell 8.1 points. The subdued outlook amongst South Australian business owners constrains investments and limits willingness to hire more staff, and all this feeds into the growing unemployment, and, of course, the growing unemployment feeds into an issue of tax receipts for the state and that then cripples the ability of the state to provide services to the public.

The time for action is now. There is an opportunity for this government to heed some of the advice that the Liberal Party on this side has been talking about now for quite some time. There is an opportunity to create jobs, and we must encourage businesses to invest their economic potential, but to achieve this we need an active and industrious government. We need a government willing to make the tough decisions, we need a government willing to listen and to respond. South Australia's small business sector remains a significant driver of South Australia's productivity.

Improving operating conditions for these businesses is critical and, as a start, we should be lowering taxes and a reduction of red tape is essential. The Treasurer must extend the payroll tax rebate for small businesses, and the major infrastructure investment must be forthcoming to soak up job losses and, dare I say, use of steel from Arrium.

We need a government with a vision, and that is why the state Liberals have released its 2036 document. It is a wonderful document and, of course, one that I do urge those opposite to read, because 2036, of course, is more than a date: it is a destination. It is a message to South Australians letting them know that there is a better way, a Liberal way.

But, of course, amongst all of this is we do have a problem, and for too long this Labor government has been running budget deficits, putting further pressure on state debt. Total non-public sector debt will reach \$10.5 billion in 2015-16 and is expected to peak at \$13.5 billion once the new Royal Adelaide Hospital comes on line.

This high debt means, of course, increasing interest payments by this government, and at the moment we are paying \$520 million in interest on total non-financial public sector debt in 2015-16. That is more than \$1.4 million of taxpayer money paid each and every day in interest—\$1.4 million daily is paid in interest. And, of course, this high debt means that there is an opportunity cost—the opportunity cost of not being able to invest, invest in services, invest in infrastructure and invest in jobs. If this government cannot live within its means and run a continued budget surplus over the cycle then state debt will continue to grow with little to show for that debt, and that is the scourge that we leave to the next generations.

Of course, this is an opportunity in this bill to talk about matters of supply and what has and has not been done. I come to some issues in my local electorate, and they really fit around the government failing to deliver critical infrastructure projects. The second edition of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure's Road Management Plan released in February 2015 states:

Main Road, Blackwood is an important arterial route through residential and commercial areas and serves a number of key roles. It provides a key road link for residents of Belair, Glenalta and Blackwood. In particular, the road forms an important commuter link between the Adelaide Hills within the Mitcham area and the Adelaide Plains, including the Adelaide CBD. Additionally, the road links to other suburbs and townships within the southern Adelaide Hills.

Two-way average annual daily traffic volumes on Main Road vary from 20,400 vehicles within the commercial precinct to 17,300 along the northern sections of Main Road, with the exception of the first section near Belair Road, which accounts for about 6,000 vehicles.

Despite these findings and recommendations of the Road Management Plan, first released in 2006, the government has failed to make a genuine infrastructure investment in Main Road or any other Mitcham Hills traffic corridors identified in the plan. Since 2006, DPTI has delivered only speed limit reductions to 50 km/h, some new bicycle lanes and upgraded bicycle infrastructure (dare I say, painted lines), a new pedestrian crossing near Russell Street in Belair, two pedestrian refuges, upgraded and new midblock treatment, and some upgrades to intersections along the study corridor. This is a very short list of projects over a 10-year period, and the project list is, of course, short on substantive funding.

In fact, this government has failed to allocate funding to any of the major projects outlined in the Road Management Plan, including, of course, the Blackwood roundabout, which many residents in my area, and of course in the member for Fisher's area as well, know is a piece of infrastructure that well and truly needs to be invested in. The Blackwood roundabout is considered one of the worst in Adelaide. The Road Management Plan notes that there were 48 reported crashes, including six casualties, on the roundabout to the year ending 2014.

Whilst the number of crashes has declined following the speed limit being reduced from 60 km/h to 50 km/h, the Blackwood roundabout is still over-represented in crash statistics. The Road Management Plan reports that all unsignalised intersections within the Adelaide metropolitan area are ranked based on the number of casualty crashes that have occurred in the last five years. Blackwood roundabout is ranked at 10th as an intersection, let alone as a roundabout.

The Blackwood roundabout, in conjunction with Main Road, is long overdue for government investment. Mitcham Hills residents and the residents of Davenport deserve better. They deserve a government that will respond to the needs to the community and deliver infrastructure projects that increase safety, decrease risks and improve traffic flows. South Australians deserve infrastructure projects that deliver community-wide benefits. South Australians deserve to be listened to, not continually force fed projects that receive significant community opposition.

This government, as we know, does not listen. It has not listened to the community in so many areas, and of course the Blackwood roundabout and funding for roads in my area are other areas where the government has failed to listen. In this speech I will not even go into the government failing to listen to the community in regard to Transforming Health and, of course, the closure of the Repat. Despite the tabling of the largest ever petition in parliament which opposed the closure of the Repat, the government continues to stubbornly ignore the wishes of South Australians on so many fronts.

I have no doubt that the Liberal Party, when in government, will listen to the people. After 14 years of Labor, we have been listening and we have been hearing. We will listen and we will deliver projects that the community wants and projects that the community actually needs. We will fund, of course, the \$20 million for the first stage of the Mitcham Hills road corridor upgrade and improve road safety to reduce peak-hour bottlenecks. We will reverse the government's \$90 million ESL grab. We will not close metropolitan hospitals.

We are here and we will do all that we can to reduce costs of living to ensure that families and households can meet their bills. We will do all that we can to support small businesses, as we know they are the drivers of our economy. We are committed to creating jobs by investing in South Australia, and we are committed to reducing, of course, the cost of living for our households.

I will finish with those remarks, but it is time for this government to step up and deliver on its rhetoric of a vision that actually fulfils its commitment to a five-year strategy, which it has, of course, across all its portfolio areas, and there are many. It is time for them to really look back and say to themselves, 'Are we doing the best job that we can?' Many in the community say, 'No, they are not.'

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (16:29): I think we have had an interesting time listening to many speeches today, and I would just like to remind the house of the power of language and the influence it has on thought and action. When we decide to speak in a certain way, it influences our actions and our thoughts. No surprise, I will be speaking in support of the Supply Bill, and I will confirm the progress and the work and commitment by our state government in this state.

Through these challenging times of changing economics and business, and the models that we find ourselves navigating our way through, situations that we are ultimately being confronted with see us joining together in South Australia to work together to find solutions through these somewhat difficult and challenging times. I have noted with interest that many of the speeches from those opposite have been a good avenue to blame government for perhaps lack of action and lack of commitment, but can I say I work quite closely with the small business community in my area and I engage with them on a one-on-one basis through various forums.

From a recent meeting I had with them came the comments from all of them that it is actually a shared responsibility to progress South Australia, to progress the economy and to progress business, so they did not see that it was just for the government to be doing this. It was not our role alone: it was something for government, business and the general broader community to join together in to progress this wonderful state. As one of them said to me at this business meeting, 'I am South Australian through and through, and I am committed to ensuring that this state succeeds not just for me but for generations to come.' I think that is a very important point to make.

For today's purpose though, I am going to wholeheartedly focus on some significant and important achievements that have occurred in my particular electorate. All of these achievements are based on community building—community building activities in which the state government has joined in partnership, in the main, with local council to bring to the community those particular projects that the community are really wishing to have in their area.

There have been a number of these, and these particular activities, in recognition of building community, build both a civil and well-functioning society and create a network of understanding, a network of interaction and tolerance, and positive activity and positive change. I think that is what we really need to focus on. It is very easy in challenging times to focus on the negative, and that is human nature, but to rise above that and focus on the positive and focus on what we can actually achieve by pulling together is certainly a highly-evolved attribute that we need to cultivate.

I will highlight the financial partnerships and also commitment by the state government in a number of the outdoor spaces and a significant festival now heading towards its third year, early next year. The degree to which the City of Marion engages with the community is exceptional and is demonstrated through the council commitment to engage and empower the community and take them along for the journey, along with the story.

One such project has been the Edwardstown play space and courts. Over a period of time, we have seen next to the Edwardstown football oval, which also has the only outdoor velodrome accessible to anyone who wishes to use it, some dilapidated courts and a rundown play space. Over

time, I have campaigned with the people in the area to ensure that we renew those courts and renew that play space.

With the contribution from the government, not so long ago the mayor and I opened the tennis courts, which also double as basketball courts and can be used for soccer. Next to them, there is a wonderful play space that has what is called a 'natural play space'. The children can come along and play in the water with a water pump. They can play in the sand, and it is really interactive with snakes and ladders, balance beams and climbing frames. There is a chalkboard, which is a wall that people can write on, and chalk is supplied for them to write with. Co-located next to that is a barbecue area and a shelter. This area has become so popular—because I quite often stop to say hello to people who are using it—that word has travelled. People are coming from the Hills to use this play area. It is a wonderful addition and regeneration of that space.

Another area that is really worthy of mention is a part of my electorate that did not have any community park for quite some distance, and generally people could not even walk to one, particularly the aged. Over time, the council has, with a commitment from the government, set about purchasing a number of housing blocks, and now we see the Jervis Street Reserve Community Park taking shape.

I was at the sod turning for that just recently, which was an amazing event, with community people turning out and celebrating the fact that this land was going to be transformed—and is being transformed as we speak—with the community also having their input right down to children in reception and a childcare centre that are co-located not far from this area.

It is an amazing vision to see what will take place in this area. It will not just be a park. It will have an oval, some quiet places, a bike track, swing areas, nature play, a water pump, and sand play. It will have somewhere for older people to play drafts, checkers or something like that, where a table will be set up as well, and there will be a barbecue area. It has been well received by the local community and something that has been sadly lacking for some time. It is positive news, and good news is on the horizon. I am looking forward to its opening in the near future.

Another open space, which is highly valued in my electorate and very visionary on behalf of the council, is the skate park. Our state government delivered close to \$1 million in support of this skate park in recognition that bringing together people of all ages is such an important thing to do. It is co-located next to the Oaklands wetland, an area that is a recreational plaza.

It is a place where people can come with skateboards, BMX bikes and scooters, and there are obstacle courses and a mini basketball court, and next to it are grassed areas and seating. It is an area that attracts all ages. It encourages people to exercise and talk together and interact with each other. On Thursday nights a youth community group holds a sausage sizzle and they talk to the youth and interact with them on that particular dimension as well.

The value of the investment in this area cannot be underestimated. It acknowledges that these open spaces are of such importance to create community, cohesion and positivity and to create a sense of well being of being outdoors and they also support people's health.

Just to diverge a bit from these open spaces, I want to focus now on what has been well received in our community, and that is the Al Salam Festival, also known as the Peace Festival. The Al Salam Festival had its origin through the Islamic Society of South Australia, which is a group based at the Park Holme mosque in my area.

I was very humbled by a suggestion they made a number of years ago. They wanted to bring together people from Muslim and non-Muslim backgrounds in a safe option, where non-Muslims can ask Muslims about how they do things, why they do things, why they dress like they dress, why they have certain customs. I certainly was a huge supporter of this.

We saw (and I am sure that many of you have attended) the inaugural festival last year and the second one at the beginning of this year. This has been so well received in our state, where we value the richness of multiculturalism and the energy and dynamism that it brings to the state. I thank the state government for the support it gives to this group, and the ongoing commitment it gave when it started out with the inaugural Al Salam Festival just over 18 months ago, of over \$15,000 per annum over three years, taking them up to 2018.

I am sure we will see that this festival will endure for years and years to come. It has been a real privilege to be involved so intimately with this particular group, as they work through assimilating themselves—and that is what they want to do. They just want to live in harmony and peace with the rest of us here in South Australia. I commend them for their work.

Just as an aside, the other thing this group does is they have a drive where, for a week or so, they will actually invite their neighbours—who they do not necessarily know and who may be non-Muslim—in for dinner. That has been a really successful program as well. I think they are a wonderful, marvellous group with a lot of energy.

We have heard a lot, from the other side, about the state government not investing in or turning a blind eye, or whatever you want to say, to South Australia. I do not think we can go past what has happened at the Tonsley precinct, the old Mitsubishi site. The state government is transforming Tonsley into Australia's first innovative district, helping to create a vibrant, diverse and internationally competitive economy for our state.

Tonsley's industry-attraction efforts are focused on high-value manufacturing businesses across four key sectors: mining and resources; clean technologies, including sustainable building products and services; renewable energy; and health and medical technology and assistive devices in software and simulation. It is an incredible place to go and visit, and I suggest to those of you who have not been that you do yourselves a favour and go down and have a look.

There is Flinders University campus, which is very active and has the New Venture Institute in there, and there is the TAFE campus as well, with all sorts of things going on there. It is an incredible sight to see, and I think it has really gathered momentum and is still gathering momentum. We recently saw the opening of the state drill core library there, a well-renowned facility that people in mining and geology highly value, and access either online (from what is available online) or book to go through to look at particular core samples of South Australia's geological findings that have been kept over the years. It is an incredible precinct. It is visionary, and I think it is something all of us in South Australia should be very proud of.

Finally, I think that small business really is a driver of South Australia. Small to medium-sized business is something we need to value, and we do value and support it. I spend a significant amount of time speaking to people in small business supporting them, talking them through things, listening to their stories—and there are so many good news stories in the small business sector. This is what we need to focus on, those that are actually achieving really good things, and look at how they can then support other people in small business to achieve as well.

There are many of those people with that energy who are already doing this, and who want to do this. To name just a few in my area, there is ec.group, the only carpet manufacturer in South Australia. It is a growing business and is to be commended. We also have MIMP, a communications company, which is growing and doing amazing things connecting people in the outback. It is incredible work it is doing. There is also a company called Silver Fleece which sources Australian wool and is about to start manufacture (just as one example) of the Australian test cricket team jumpers—a huge achievement for South Australia.

So I say to those of you who want to speak negatively about South Australia and what is happening here, you need to have a bit of a hard look at what you are saying when you talk about this. The types of words you speak can be quite damning and negative, and we need to be talking up all the people who are doing really good things in this state. As leaders, we need to make sure we get that message across, that we are there, we are supporting them and with them. Certainly things can be tough, but we can do this.

It is not about one group of people or one person or government, it is about everyone getting together—and it is not just me saying that, that is being said by people in the community. With that, I support the bill.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (16:44): I rise today to speak on the Supply Bill, as we do each year, preceding the announcement of the state government's budget proposal. The government is asking for \$3.44 billion to ensure it can pay the bills until the budget is passed. Sadly, I believe the state Labor government has not spent South Australian taxpayers' money wisely in the past, and sadly, the results are showing in poor performances on the national stage.

Speaking on the Supply Bill gives me the opportunity to talk about our positive plan to lift South Australia off the bottom of the ladder, a position SA finds itself in after 14 years of a state Labor government. Earlier today I spoke as an old scholar at Brighton Secondary School about leadership. I stated that I believe that to take a leadership role you must first and foremost care. You must care for the community, care for the team or care for the group that you want to lead. That is why I am here. I care and I want to help my community and our state off the bottom of the ladder and into a more prosperous position.

I also spoke to the students about creating a vision when you are in a leadership position. That means establishing a connection and communicating with your community team or group, and communicating begins with listening. I have spent a lot of time listening to my community. That is why I am proud to have had a significant input into the vision our party has launched. Our 2036 vision document is available online, and I encourage all South Australians to read it.

I went on to tell the students at Brighton Secondary School that communication does not end with listening. You then need to take people on the journey you have envisaged, and that is what we as a party, behind our leader, Steven Marshall, are doing with the 2036 document. Our values and beliefs are outlined in 2036, and our policies for building a better South Australia are being hung from the framework of this 2036 document.

I will talk a little bit more about some of the policies and visions that we have already released shortly, but I also want to touch on why we have got to this point, that South Australia sits at the bottom of the table, and why we need a Marshall Liberal government to take us forward. While I do not want to be negative, there are a few unavoidable points that must be made.

I mentioned being a leader and that firstly to be a leader you must care for your community and then you must communicate, which starts with listening. My community has made it clear to me, as I have listened to them, that what they want the most is opportunity. They do not want handouts, they do not want to be carried; they want the opportunity to stand on their own two feet and be the master of their own destiny. This begins with a job. The first line in the Marshall Liberal team's 2036 manifesto to all South Australians states: 'We believe you deserve every opportunity to have a stable job in a growing economy.'

So where has the Weatherill Labor government placed us on that front? We are at the bottom of the national unemployment table. South Australia has cemented itself at the bottom of the ladder when it comes to unemployment over the past few years. We have been battling it out for quite a while with Tasmania, and our results have been incredibly poor. We have the highest unemployment rate of any state in the nation and the highest underemployment rate of any state in the nation.

Underemployment is important in this context, because underemployment talks about the people who want to work more, but cannot. You are deemed to be employed if you work one hour a week. We have people out there who are working a couple of hours a week, one hour a week, whatever it may be, but they want more. That is underemployment, and we have the highest underemployment rate in the nation. Sadly, I must add that we have the highest youth unemployment rate in the nation as well.

Last month, our unemployment rates skyrocketed from 6.8 per cent to 7.7 per cent, to be the highest in the nation. It is just unacceptable. As we break it down a little bit more, last month, in the figures for February, the unemployment rate in Adelaide Central and Hills went from 6.4 per cent in January to 6.8 per cent, in Adelaide North we went up from 8.9 per cent to 10.2 per cent, in Adelaide South we went from 7.1 to 8.4 per cent (and, of course, I have a great interest in Adelaide South), and in the South-East we went from 6.5 per cent to 7.1 per cent.

We now have almost 70,000 South Australians unemployed and looking for work. South Australia's unemployment rate skyrocketed, as I have pointed out, in February, and it really sent a shudder through our state. As we look further around the state and to the regions, sadly, the news there is quite grim as well, and in Port Pirie in particular. Over the last five years, the unemployment rate has risen from 5 per cent to 12.9 per cent, which includes a 2 per cent jump in the last 12 months.

Port Pirie has an unemployment rate of 12.9 per cent. That is the highest rate of any South Australian region, almost three percentage points higher than the Murraylands and more than three

times the unemployment rate of Port Lincoln and Ceduna. The Weatherill Labor government just is not doing enough and people are questioning the local member, the Minister for Regional Development, when it comes to this high unemployment rate as well. If you look at the graph over the journey, the unemployment rate at Port Pirie is growing higher and higher, and it is alarming.

I mentioned before South Australia's triple whammy: the unenviable position of having the highest unemployment rate, the highest youth unemployment rate and the highest underemployment rate. There is also a concern out there, as we look at the ABS stats, that in South Australia, because of our poor performance when it comes to employment, people are giving up looking for work because it is proving just too hard in South Australia. When you have figures that point in that direction, you know things are not as they should be.

I mentioned youth unemployment, and this is something dear to my heart. I fear for the young people of South Australia who want to stay living in South Australia and want opportunities in South Australia, but they are just not being presented with them. The youth unemployment rate in January 2016 was 16.2 per cent. It is alarming when we know what is on the horizon: we know there are tough times in Whyalla with Arrium at present, Holden's closure is coming, and just yesterday 180 jobs went from Optus.

This government has failed to diversify and it has failed to create opportunities for the people of South Australia to gain work. When we look at where job opportunities come from, they come from business. Just recently, the Sensis Business Index put out its quarterly survey of 1,000 small and medium businesses, and South Australia was in a very poor state. Forty-five per cent of businesses think the economy is slowing compared to just 6 per cent that believe the economy is growing.

The member for Elder talked about being positive, and I am all about being positive and supporting businesses that are keeping their head above water, making a go of it and trying their hardest. I am there supporting them, but when these figures come back and say that 45 per cent of businesses in South Australia think the economy is slowing and just 6 per cent believe that the economy is growing, you cannot hide from the stats. Confidence amongst the Adelaide business survey plummeted 14 points in the March quarter to end at +1, way behind the national average of +35. Again, South Australia is lagging in the key indicator that is there to grow jobs for this state.

South Australia's jobs crisis lies at the heart of these worrying figures. I will talk more about the Marshall Liberal team's 2036 document, but the plan there is to immediately cut business taxes to allow business to grow and create more jobs, invest in new job-creating infrastructure projects and provide immediate relief to families and households who are struggling under spiralling cost-of-living pressures, which includes the ESL that I will talk more about later.

Jobs are a real worry, there is no denying that. The figures and the facts provided by the ABS and the Sensis Business Index that I talked about when it comes to business confidence in South Australia indicate that we are not in a good way. They are just the facts and there is no hiding from the facts.

Recently, the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies released a report at the Adelaide University, an economics issues paper. This is another great concern of mine, because we talk about the problem with jobs in South Australia, again having the highest unemployment rate in the nation, the highest underemployment rate and the highest youth unemployment rate, sitting at the bottom of the table. We have been dwelling at the bottom of the table for months and months, and well over a year or two now, along with Tasmania, and not finding a way forward.

We have now had the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies release this paper, and they described a concern that I have, and that is South Australia's population exodus. They described it as a 'State Bank-style population exodus'. We all remember what happened with the State Bank and we all know what happened to South Australia afterwards: people took off because opportunities were all on the eastern seaboard. Further in this report, the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows that SA is losing more than 3,000 people interstate per year on average since 2005-06, with its population growth in the slowest of the states on the mainland. South Australia's population grew by 350,000 (almost 27 per cent); less than Victoria, which was 46 per cent, and less than half the rate of the nation as a whole, which was 55 per cent. So, we really have some issues on this front as well.

Young people are leaving South Australia to find more opportunity interstate because it is not being provided here. It is pointed out in this report that young people are leaving South Australia and they say it is the failure of the state government to address the important issue which is severely hurting the state's economy. Jobs are the key to this. We need to do more to improve the unemployment issue in South Australia, to grow more jobs and create more opportunities for our young people. That is why, in our 2036 plan, we have earmarked innovation and the supporting of small start-up businesses as the key to growing jobs in the future.

Those numbers are disappointing, and I know they hurt all of us in this chamber, but the disappointing thing for me is, after 14 years of Labor, nothing is happening, nothing is changing and we are still stuck at the bottom of the ladder and have been there for quite a while. While I do not have time to go through all nine chapters of the 2036 document, I do want to skip forward to health. The first point of chapter 3 of the Marshall Liberal team's 2036 manifesto to all South Australians states:

We believe you are entitled to world-class, accessible and effective health care which supports your health and wellbeing.

So, where has the Weatherill Labor government taken us on their Transforming Health agenda? Let us just have a look through a few things here because, like our unemployment figure and like our jobless rate, this government has really disappointed all of South Australia.

If we look at the Noarlunga Hospital first, we know that 29 beds will be closed in June of this year as part of the Transforming Health plan. Closure of Noarlunga's medical ward will mean that anyone needing to stay for medical reasons will be transferred to the Flinders Medical Centre, which will get just 16 beds. So, 29 beds at Noarlunga will turn into 16 beds at Flinders. You do the math. That does not stack up. Concerns for the people of the south; concerns for people who use the Noarlunga Hospital.

The Repat is another grave concern for all South Australians. A petition has been tabled in this parliament, and a bigger petition has never been seen by this parliament. The closure of the Repat would see the loss of significant expertise in ageing and veteran's health, including the delivery of the PTSD service Ward 17 (the post traumatic stress disorder ward). The Weatherill government's current plan to rebuild Ward 17 at Glenside is a downgrade of the services offered.

Ninety per cent of the Repat's patients are community patients. Closure of the Repat would have serious negative long-term impacts for the health of the community. Adelaide's public hospital system is already overstretched, particularly at the Flinders Medical Centre—as I said, there are issues there with Noarlunga shuffling more patients to Flinders, so increased pressure added to Flinders—and it will not be able to absorb the Repat's current workload as well.

The net loss at the Repat is 160 hospital beds and 170,000 outpatient attendances per annum. Two thousand transfers from the Flinders Medical Centre each year go to the Repat and 25 per cent of orthopaedic and urological elective surgeries performed in Adelaide's public hospital system are done at the Repat. There have been no announcements of the future locations of many of the Repat's specialist services, including orthopaedics, ophthalmology, urology, and others, and it really is disappointing. Closing the Repat means abandoning \$46 million worth of capital works at the hospital in the past 13 years.

The crisis in Transforming Health just continues. We know the federal Labor president, Mark Butler, came out and attacked the state's Transforming Health policy and was very scathing of what is happening within Transforming Health. That is the president of the Labor Party attacking his own side, the South Australian Weatherill Labor government, for what they are doing with Transforming Health.

We know about the trouble-plagued EPAS system and the serious flaws of trying to get this electronic record keeping system into the new RAH, the problems and turmoils that have gone on with that, and of course we know that the floors in the hospital cannot actually hold filing cabinets, so we do not know where these files are going to be kept. They cannot get the EPAS system working and there are grave concerns about that as well.

Recently we have had the pathology stuff-ups which have caused incredible distress to men and their families who were told that they had prostate cancer, and then that they did not have prostate cancer; and that they had to go back for more treatment when, in fact, they did not have to go back for more treatment. It is a series of profound failures of practices under SA Health, led by the Minister for Health doing a deplorable job, and South Australians rightly are frustrated, confused and, more than anything, disappointed.

We know the \$600 million over-budget spend that has already taken place on the NRAH project; again, a poor example of financial management. The cost blowouts are a shocking indictment on the Weatherill government's management, and that figure does not include the mounting costs associated with the EPAS system that I was referring to a few moments before.

Just last month, a survey from the Royal College of Surgeons showed that 84 per cent have major concerns and do not support the implementation process of Transforming Health; 71 per cent indicated that they have concerns with patient safety; 81 per cent indicated their concern for patient access to surgical services; 74 per cent indicated their concern with training of our future surgeons; and 49 per cent support the principles of Transforming Health—so 51 per cent do not even support the principles of Transforming Health. They are shocking figures, and that is the Royal College of Surgeons, who have no faith in what the minister is doing.

The big one today: the AMA and SASMOA survey came out, which found that 71 per cent do not believe that Transforming Health will deliver the best care, first time to South Australians; and 79 per cent of this survey's respondents felt that the consultation process had been poor and the minister is badly exposed on his repeated claim that Transforming Health is clinically led. That is what we hear from the minister—that this is all clinically led—yet when you hear from the clinicians themselves, they say they have not been consulted.

So we can hear those on the other side who say, 'Oh, we feel this, and this looks good and this looks good, and you've got to stop talking things down', but when these sorts of numbers come out and 71 per cent do not believe that Transforming Health will deliver the best care, first time for South Australians, and that comes from the AMA and SASMOA, the government should be alarmed. It has every reason to be alarmed, and South Australians have reason to be alarmed. The handling of the Transforming Health program and progress has been absolutely abominable, and South Australians have every reason to feel disappointed and let down.

I referred to the Marshall Liberal Plan and the 2036 vision for South Australia a number of times earlier in this speech. I stated that the 2036 vision document was the framework and that our policies will be hung off that. I would like to take this opportunity to elaborate, although I only have a few minutes left, on some of the policies that we have released already. I would like to talk about the council rate capping policy, which I think is a beauty, and one that will help people with the growing cost of living that everyone is feeling.

It will cap council rate rises, and an independent regulator through ESCOSA will set these rate rises so that councils will still be able to do the work they need to do, but people will not be gouged, and people will not have to pay excessively high council rates which add to the cost of living. We know that it is one of the biggest bills that comes to any household, and it also adds cost to businesses, so that is a great policy. And that is what my community tells me; I talk about listening to the community, and they tell me that they want councils doing the basics well, and that is what we like.

I do not have time to talk about high electricity prices (South Australia has the highest in the nation) and water prices, where the base price is controlled by the Treasurer, are a huge inhibitor to families and businesses, and we have called for an inquiry to get to the bottom of why our state has the highest water prices in the nation.

Uber is another great policy that we put out, and very quickly the government jumped on board, which was great to see. This policy will bring some excitement to South Australia: legalising ride sharing services has the ability to strengthen the South Australian economy, create jobs across a number of sectors and heighten innovation across the state. It also has great connectivity for people within South Australia.

Ride sharing is a great opportunity to increase competition, give customers a broader range of choice and services, and improve transport reliability and customer service. We know it has happened in all the other states; it is been rolling out there. We came out with the policy and the state Labor government jumped on board, although it has put a lot of regulations in place that are being debated at the moment, but this is our policy, which shows that we are offering great leadership from opposition, and the government is following. I do not have long to talk about the Glenelg Jetty project, but it is another exciting project that really could generate jobs, generate tourism and bring a lot of excitement to South Australia as well.

I have talked about the ESL hikes, and we know that they have been inflicted on South Australians. We will reverse \$90 million of ESL hikes that have caused heartache and pain to all South Australians, and then we have our jobs stimulus plan. There is plenty there to do, plenty to be seen and plenty to be rolled out in conjunction with our 2036 document. The Marshall Liberal team has a great plan for South Australia's future, and I think it is bright, but it does need the Marshall Liberal plan to get us going forward.

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Kavel.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (17:05): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I am pleased to make a contribution to the Supply Bill legislation. I do not need, perhaps, to describe what the Supply Bill looks to provide the state. I think that has been adequately covered by other members who have spoken to the bill, but it does provide an opportunity for members to really speak on a wide range of areas for which the government has responsibility.

I want really to reflect for a time on what this government has achieved over the past 14-plus years it has been in government. What have we got for 14 years-plus of a Labor government here in South Australia? Well, I will tell you what we have got. We have got the highest unemployment in the country, we have got the highest taxation in the country, we have got some of the highest electricity prices in the country and we have got some of the highest water prices in the country.

The Member for Mitchell touched on that in his contribution just previously; however, that is what we have got after 14 and a bit years of this Labor government, and that is just for a start. I will be talking about some other glaring examples of mismanagement and the like in my contribution. I would like to try to look at some of the positives that, perhaps, the government may have achieved in its 14-plus years.

There has been a lot of positive talk and discussion in the community about the redeveloped Adelaide Oval, and I agree: it is a good place to go and view cricket matches and football games. It is a very good facility, but how has the government paid for it? Everybody talks about how great the facility is, and I agree it is good. It is spectacular as you drive along King William Road to look into the ground. It is quite a spectacular view. However, how is that paid for?

People do not focus on what the government did to cover the cost of the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval. What the government did was that it sold the South-East forests after many years of hammering away at this mantra of 'no privatisation'. How long have we listened to the mantra of the Labor Party hammering away at no privatisation, and the Treasurer is nodding in agreement.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Point of order. Sit down, member for Kavel.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, ma'am. I was not nodding at the member's remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I think you were encouraging him to keep going, as we all were, because you were having trouble saying the word, weren't you?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I would like to ask: what action is it when a member moves their head in a sort of a vertical manner up and down? If that's not nodding, what is it?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is unparliamentary, ma'am, to reflect on members in the house—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's right; I agree with you. I upheld the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —whether they are present or otherwise.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have upheld the point of order, and I would ask the member for Kavel to come back to the substance of his contribution.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Give me a break! What happens in question time every day of the blooming week? However, we heard for years 'no privatisation' under a Labor government, so what do we see? We see the South-East forests sold from underneath those communities down there and, if you talk to the member for MacKillop and the member for Mount Gambier and the federal member for Barker, they will tell you that it has been a complete disservice to those communities in the South-East to sell that state-owned asset from underneath them. That is a thing we should remind the community here in South Australia about: that that is what took place. After years of the Labor opposition saying, 'no privatisation', they privatised those forests to pay for the Adelaide Oval redevelopment.

So, you cannot believe what they say. The community cannot believe what the Labor Party tells them, because they tell them one thing and do exactly the opposite when it suits them. I do not want to be too negative and use other descriptive words—things like 'lying to the community'—but if I have to, I will. Really, when we look at things and critically, objectively assess what this government has provided to the South Australian public over 14 years, the negatives far outweigh the positives.

Let's have a look at things the government has dealt with over recent months. The Gillman land project: if there was ever an example of how to mismanage something, that is certainly it. All these baseless promises and projections were put out there and spun up into something that sounds pretty good. The Treasurer is at it again.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kavel, you have been pulled up before on reflecting on members. I remind you that you are on one warning already. I would hate to cut your contribution short. I draw you back to the substance of your contribution.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I don't want that to happen, Deputy Speaker. Talking about Gillman, if there was ever a project that was spun up by the spin masters on the government side of things, that was it. What do we see? There have been so many variations when we have asked questions here in parliament about the Gillman land deal. The Deputy Premier gets up, and we have had so many different positions and—

Mr Williams: More positions than the *Kama Sutra*!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I'm not going to say that. Nuancing the issue—talk about jumping around like a cat on a hot tin roof! There has been a judgement brought down about the government's maladministration in relation to that Gillman land deal—and the list goes on.

However, what is really at front of mind for the South Australian community is the construction of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Transforming Health initiative. This is really quite a serious problem that the South Australian community is facing. We look at the new RAH, and again, if there was ever an example of how to mismanage a project, there it is: over budget, over time. The minister has to come continually into the house and go out and talk to the media publicly on pushing back the completion date.

I do not want to exaggerate things, but pretty much on a fortnightly basis there has been a completion date rejigged, to the point where, I cannot remember the title of the person, but a senior person who has been overseeing the construction of the new RAH resign just recently. If there is ever an indictment of frustration, I think that is probably it by that person in their resignation. It is a continual series of problems.

The last sitting a couple of weeks ago we highlighted the fact that there is a flaw (and this is a bit of a pun) in the construction of the floors of the hospital, because the engineering specifications are not sufficient to be able to handle a few filing cabinets full of patient records.

Do you know why? It is because of the failed EPAS system. Again, if there was ever an example of how to mismanage another project that the government has responsibility for, then EPAS is certainly up there. We have Gillman, we have the construction, we have EPAS, and what are they going to do? They are going to have to do construct a temporary facility to house the hard copy patient records because EPAS has failed.

You would really hope that the government could get something right sometime. You would really hope they could, but they cannot, particularly in relation to the provision of health services. It is quite frustrating. I have constituents contacting my electorate office on a daily basis, telling my staff and me how frustrated they are. Even Labor-voting constituents are saying, 'You know, Mark, we are so frustrated.' They are so frustrated with the level of ineptitude from the Labor government in really being able to roll out anything that is meaningful to the community.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: He is taunting me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is unparliamentary to be taunted.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I know.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't you taunt him.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: We have got EPAS—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Kavel! I am sure the Treasurer won't have a frivolous point of order, will you?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, ma'am. I could never possibly taunt the master of political debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That was frivolous. Okay, off we go.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: If that is not a taunt, then I don't know what is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I said it was frivolous. I am incredibly displeased with the Treasurer, who may have to be called to order.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Goodness! We have EPAS in a shambles. We have the construction of the new RAH being pushed out all the time. We have doctors protesting en masse in relation to the transferring of the care from the existing RAH site to the new RAH site, and that takes me on to the big kahuna, being Transforming Health. What a shambles that is! Seriously, what a shambles Transforming Health is!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: This is your Gettysburg.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Deputy Speaker, please, come on. This is not a joke.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It's a compliment.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: No, it's not—it's not at all.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer is called to order.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Talking about issues with Transforming Health, we do not make this stuff up. We are getting letters from clinical specialists, professors, AMA surveys—you name it. We and the government are getting letters from the federal president of the Labor Party highlighting his concerns. What is going on there? What is going on there amongst the ranks of the Labor Party, where we have a federal president and a federal member of parliament breaking ranks, complaining and raising concerns with the Transforming Health initiatives?

That, to me, is a pretty serious breach of discipline within the Labor ranks. To my way of thinking, we know that the member for Port Adelaide is part of the hard left of the Labor Party—we know that—and my take on things is the hard left of the Labor Party is getting sick and tired of the dominant right faction ruling the roost within the Labor Party.

That is my take on things, that we are getting an uprising of the hard left against the dominant right faction within the Labor Party, and they are sick and tired of it. So he is writing a letter to the Minister for Health, who we know is part of the hard right within the Labor Party's factional system, complaining about what is going on at The QEH. This is clear evidence that Transforming Health is not working, because we are seeing senior Labor Party members breaking ranks.

We do not see that very often, but we have witnessed it. I have seen it over the years. When there is trouble and there are big concerns about what somebody might be doing, something that goes against the grain, there is a breaking of the ranks within the Labor Party. We have seen it over the years in previous terms in relation to workers compensation, and things like that, and other issues that obviously raise enormous concerns within the ranks of the Labor Party, and obviously Transforming Health is one of those.

We share those concerns and the community's concerns. We have done some surveys out in the electorates on this Transforming Health initiative. We are getting a massive response to it. Today in question time we highlighted a recent survey by the AMA. I just want to quote from it, if I may. AMA President Dr Janice Fletcher said, and I quote:

There is significant concern that the government is quite simply trying to do 'too much, too soon' in tackling this major reform with its reconfiguration of hospital services at the same time as the move to the new RAH and the introduction of the EPAS patient administration and medical record system...

During question time we asked the minister how he can substantiate claims that 95 per cent of the medical profession's clinicians support Transforming Health when the survey from the AMA and SASMOA clearly differs.

If you are out in the community, who would you believe? Would you believe the medical professionals or would you believe the spin that is coming out from the government? Well, I can tell you who I think the vast majority of the community believe. They believe the medical professionals, because they are the ones that people go to for their healthcare services. They are the medically trained, skilled professionals who go to university for at least eight years. Specialists sometimes study for more than 12 years, because they do their medical degree and then there is a whole lot more specialist training, and another four, five or six years, perhaps; so they are at university for the best part of 15 years. Then they come out and become medical specialists, and they know what they are talking about in relation to Transforming Health.

It is a hell of a mess. The government has got themselves in a hell of a mess over Transforming Health. We see the cost-cutting and reduction in services at the Modbury Hospital. I have spoken about that in this place on numerous occasions. My constituents are affected by the reduction of services at the Modbury Hospital. My home district (even though it is not in my electorate any more because it was redistributed out) will be affected, because the Modbury Hospital is the biggest public hospital that is closest to my home district, so those residents will be affected by the reduction of services at Modbury and being pushed out to the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

In question time today, in answer to a question, the minister said that there have been only two transfers from Modbury to the Lyell McEwin per day. Well, I can tell you, wait until—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Two more.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Two extra, okay. Wait until the flu season hits, wait until winter starts to grab hold of us and the flu season hits. I bet there will be hell of a lot more, significantly more than two additional transfers from Modbury to the Lyell McEwin. The minister was trying to spin it today that it was just a minuscule number; when the flu season hits and the winter months come in it will be significant.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: A point of clarification, to give the member the opportunity to make a personal explanation. I understand he said that the president of the Labor Party had written

to the opposition. I believe that the letter in question was not addressed to the opposition, but the member stated in his remarks that it was.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think his exact words were, 'we have letters from'. That does not mean it was written to him.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I am happy to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: How he got it, though, is another question.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I am happy to correct the record—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: If that was what the—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —Treasurer thought I said, that the letter was written to the health minister—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Who is it addressed to?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The letter from the federal member for Port Adelaide is addressed to the Minister for Health; however, the opposition certainly has a copy of it, because I have it here.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are not sure how you got it, but that is another story. Who wants to speak now? The member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (17:26): I enjoy the debate on the Supply Bill because it gives the opposition the opportunity to speak on many things which we do not often get the opportunity to speak on in this place. It allows us to canvass a wide range of government initiatives and policy areas, and point out the real problems facing South Australia.

I want to dedicate a fair bit of my comments today to things that pertain particularly to my electorate, but I will also be talking about some things that are more statewide. I will not necessarily be putting them in any particular order, but when I came into the chamber the member for Kavel was talking about the government's decision, some years ago now, to sell the forest in the south-east of the state and the use of the money to pay for the upgrade to Adelaide Oval. That always was a dog of a decision, and history has proven the stupidity of that decision.

From memory ForestrySA, when it controlled the ownership of the forest in question, was returning to the coffers of the state up to about \$40 million a year. OneFortyOne Plantations, which now has some sort of ownership of those forests, ownership for a bit over hundred years, is, I can tell the house, making substantially more than that. In fact, it is my understanding that it is making substantially more than double that and probably treble that, just because of the way it is managing the forest.

However, one of the downsides to that management is that it is logging the forest at a much greater rate than was previously done by ForestrySA, but the additional log that has been harvested is being exported as whole log. It is not being processed, and virtually all the processing in the Green Triangle region, which includes much of the western district of Victoria, was being done in and around the city of Mount Gambier. It was a great industry, it has been a great industry and a very important industry to the local economy, but now a substantial portion of the resource, the actual log that is grown in the forest, is being exported as whole log.

Why on earth would a state that has a struggling economy, that is looking under every stone and rock to try to find something to drive economic activity, go through a process of flogging off an asset—which I accept was certainly being underutilised—rather than utilising that asset to its potential, and creating or enhancing an existing part of the economy in the South-East? It is a great shame, and it will always be a great shame that the Labor Party in South Australia had such a short-term vision. That short-term vision applies to many of the actions of this government, and we are

now seeing what is happening to the city of Whyalla and the pressure they are under in the city of Whyalla.

One of the really stupid decisions that this government has made in the last year or two was the land deal out at Gillman. It has been under a cloud ever since it was first proposed as a land deal, and this government has a long history of making pretty stupid land deals. I mean, look at the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. Look at what has happened there, and all the promises and all the rivers of gold that were going to flow from that.

We now have this so-called deal out at Gillman that was going to deliver thousands of jobs, was it? One of the projects that the government claimed underpinned that deal was a project to build an oil and gas hub—I guess a depot to service the oil and gas industry in South Australia, and that is not a bad idea. That is not a bad thing to have, but why was it proposed to build it at Gillman? Why was it not proposed to build that at Whyalla? Wouldn't Whyalla be a more suitable place to build a service centre for the mining industry, which by and large is in the north of the state? Whyalla would be a lot closer to the mining industry per se.

The government did have one proposal to support the development of an explosives manufacturing business, I think it was, at Whyalla, and I supported it. I think I was probably the shadow minister at the time and I supported that. I do not know that much has happened but—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You were my favourite shadow minister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes, absolutely. Part of the problem we are seeing at Whyalla today—part of the problem—is that the local economy is not diversified, and the government has to wear a fair bit of the blame. Having been in power for most of the last 40 years in this state, and for most of that time basically having only one seat represented by a Labor member outside of metropolitan Adelaide, being the seat of Giles, it beggars my imagination as to why the Labor Party has failed to develop the economy of Whyalla, to guard it against the risk of damage to the whole of that community if something happened to the steel industry, and that is what we are seeing.

We are seeing a huge risk facing that community because the government of South Australia over a very long period of time has actually failed to diversify that local economy, and there have been plenty of opportunities. I would have thought that seeking to direct the development of an oil and gas hub to a place like Whyalla would have been much more sensible than the dodgy deal that has been happening with regard to the land at Gillman.

It is the long-term development of the state where this government has continued to fail, continued to falter and continued to fail the people of South Australia. This is why the people of South Australia are living in the state with the highest unemployment and where the propensity of young people, who are educated locally, are flooding out of South Australia to get the decent jobs that they have been educated to undertake.

I am very well aware of this, because I have two daughters who are both very well-paid professionals. They both work in industries that are present in South Australia, but neither of them—although they did all of their education here locally—have ever worked for a paid day's employment in South Australia, much to the chagrin of their mother and, probably because of that, to the chagrin of myself. However, that is not an uncommon circumstance in South Australia and I think the government is certainly culpable.

Let me move on to a couple of things pertaining more to my electorate. I think it was the member for Kaurua who had a motion on the books—I am not sure whether it is still on the *Notice Paper*—about praising the government for the Southern Expressway and some words about the people of South Australia never ever again having a one-way highway built in this state. Ignoring the fact that it was a brilliant idea when it was constructed, and it was constructed by a government that was left with huge debts and no money to do very much, we provided an incredible service to the people of the south at the time.

Notwithstanding all of that, we have something not dissimilar happening in my electorate. The people of Penola have been promised a bypass, and there have been discussions ongoing in that community for over 20 years about building a bypass, particularly for heavy transport, around

the town of Penola. I congratulate the government, and it was previous minister Conlon who struck a deal with the then mayor of the Wattle Range Council, the late Don Ferguson, and promised to fund, I think, up to \$12 million towards the construction of the bypass.

Unfortunately, that money has been expended but we only have half the bypass. We have a bypass which goes halfway around Penola. It does connect a couple of major roads which come in from the west of the town to the road to the south of the town, which goes onto Mount Gambier, but you have to go back into town and continue up what was always the main street, the main thoroughfare through the town, to get to the north of the town of Penola.

As luck would have it, the commonwealth government and my colleague, the member for Barker, Tony Pasin, secured \$9 million to put towards completing the Penola bypass. The only reason he secured that money was because there was commonwealth money available to be spent in river communities to compensate river communities for the loss of water and therefore the impact on economic activity in those communities.

This government—and there was \$25 million involved—decided to not take up the offer of that \$25 million. The reason it did that is, and it was quite open, it said, 'That would have an impact on the GST payments to South Australia and therefore we would lose some GST money and we do not want to be spending anybody's money in regional South Australia, we want to be able to spend it all in the city of Adelaide where our electors are, and if we get it in GST rather than in this grant that is where we will spend it.'

Then, as I said, the member for Barker, Tony Pasin, secured \$9 million of that money to complete the bypass around Penola. There is one thing about this government: they are consistent. They would not forgo \$1 of GST because that would mean that they are spending money outside of the electorates that are represented by Labor members and they would be spending money in other parts of South Australia. That is the only reason the Penola bypass has not been completed, because of GST.

This brings me to another point I want to raise. We see the Premier and the Treasurer playing this blame game against Canberra, and they are playing pure base politics. They are saying that the Prime Minister and the federal Liberal government should be doing this for South Australia and should be doing that for South Australia. What they never say is that every dollar that is spent in South Australia by the commonwealth, if they do fund some of these pie in the sky schemes, some of these things that the Premier and the Treasurer are telling the people of South Australia are absolutely essential, of course we will lose GST payments.

The Treasurer knows full well, I do not know whether he understands but he does know that there is a thing called horizontal fiscal equalisation and he does know that, at the end of the financial year, every dollar that is spent by the commonwealth in South Australia is tallied up and the formula that is used to work out our share of what commonwealth funds we should be getting is brought to bear and our GST payments are adjusted. That is how the GST payment system works.

We have seen it, and I will remind the house that this is what happened with the desal plant. What did we get? A \$220 million grant from the commonwealth and our GST payments over the next couple of years were reduced by \$212 million because of that very project. The net gain for South Australia was only \$8 million.

Madam Deputy Speaker, that is the connection I make between the fact that we have this ridiculous situation where we have got only half a bypass around the town of Penola and the fact that we have the Premier and the Treasurer of this state being disingenuous with the people of South Australia when they lament that the commonwealth is not doing enough. The reality is that if the commonwealth spent more money in South Australia it would be obliged under the state/commonwealth financial agreements to reduce our GST payments. Now, that is something.

I talked to a senior South Australian businessman recently about this reality and he was quite surprised. He had never heard about it. I think it is something that this side of the parliament should be bringing to light much more regularly, such that every South Australian understands that the Premier and the Treasurer spend so much of their life talking absolute nonsense.

With regard to health, the member for Kavel, as have many of my colleagues, talked at length about the transformation of health here in South Australia and the building of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, and all of the problems that have been created yet again by dumb decisions. I mean, the decision to build a new Royal Adelaide Hospital was one of the dumbest decisions this government has made, and that is a big call because it has made plenty of them.

However, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is, what is it, the third most expensive building constructed on the planet, and this is for a new hospital in little old Adelaide. Madam Deputy Speaker, what a mess, and hopefully I will have time to come to the impact that is having in my electorate. I see that the bureaucrat that has been running the project to construct the hospital has resigned and we are importing another bureaucrat, from Canada no less, to take over the management of that.

I am only going on what I read in the newspaper, and as much as anybody in this place I understand that newspapers do not always get it right, but I am taking it at face value that the person who is being brought in to run this project actually resigned from their previous position in Canada because there was a change in government. Now, I find it fascinating that a project to construct the third most expensive building ever constructed on the planet is going to be managed by somebody who—and I am pretty sure I am drawing the right conclusion here—is incredibly partisan. They are so partisan that, when there was a change of government, they could not stay in their previous job. That is what the newspaper report said.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: About who?

Mr WILLIAMS: This Canadian bureaucrat that you are—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: She worked with the conservatives.

Mr WILLIAMS: I don't care who she worked with.

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I don't care. I question the reason behind why she was employed. Anyway, getting back to this dumb decision to build the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, the project has blown the budget.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, is it going to be 12 months' delay? The CFMEU says that is not really a delay, that there was a problem in actually signing the completion date. That was a ripper! Because this project is sucking so much money, I am having trouble with health services being delivered in my electorate, and we have all seen what happened in the Keith community a couple of years ago. We all saw what happened at Keith.

I have not read John Hill's book, but I was interested to read an article on it that suggested that he mentioned that one of the major mistakes he made was with regard to the Keith Hospital. But from my reading of it, and again from the newspaper article, in his mind the mistake was not that it was a wrong decision but that he did not realise the backlash that was going to occur from that community. It is outrageous that we had a minister for health who had that uncaring attitude to the delivery of health services in South Australia. The Keith Hospital is again under threat because the funding agreement that was struck between it and the current minister is due to expire at the end of June and the minister is reluctant to continue that funding arrangement.

I can tell the house that one of the reasons that the Keith Hospital has been unable to meet some of the targets that it was set in its business plan is because the Department for Health through Country Health SA has been pretty hopeless in its dealing in supporting the hospital. In one instance, it was trying to help the hospital get two doctors resident in the town. They were totally unsuccessful with that and the hospital eventually went to a different provider out of Victoria and now has two resident doctors.

Then it tried to get those doctors access to a clinic—which used to be manned from Keith, at Tintinara, also within my electorate—and it took over 12 months of bureaucratic bickering to get those doctors access to that clinic in Tintinara. In my hometown of Millicent, the local doctors have just told Country Health SA that they are unable to continue the after hours on-call service because

two of their number have taken ill; and so the remaining doctors were physically unable to do that on-call service.

As a result of that, one of the doctors who is not ill, and who used to have a fortnightly minor surgical list in the hospital, has been told that he can no longer do that. Country Health SA is taking this out on the Millicent community and saying, 'You can no longer have those services performed in the local hospital because these doctors can no longer perform the after hours service, notwithstanding that two of them have taken ill.' It is a disgrace.

Time expired.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (17:46): Deputy Speaker, I rise to make a contribution on the debate today, late as it is, and indicate that the opposition supports the Supply Bill 2016 for the appropriation of money from the consolidated account for 2016-17. For the sake of the readers of *Hansard*, a supply bill is necessary for the first three months of 2016-17 until the 2016-17 budget bill, otherwise known as the Appropriation Bill, has passed through the parliament and receives assent. The amount sought under the Supply Bill 2016 is \$3.444 billion. In the absence of supply arrangements, there would be no parliamentary authority for budget expenditure between the beginning of the financial year 2016-17, and the date on which assent is given to the 2016-17 budget bill. That all takes some time and includes having to go through this parliament and through the debate.

Like many others on this side, I am going to talk a little about the economic fundamentals of this state, and then spend a bit of time highlighting some of the issues, concerns and spending priorities in the electorate of Flinders. Sadly, the economic fundamentals are not good for the state of South Australia. There are no surprises, and everybody is aware of that. We hear a lot from the government about transitioning to a new economy. I am not exactly sure what transitioning to a new economy might mean at this stage, and what that new economy might look like. Certainly there is nothing on the horizon, and it is hard to imagine what a new economy might look like.

In fact, traditional industries are in decline, and I could highlight Port Pirie, of course, where the unemployment rate is around 15 per cent, the highest of any local government area in the state, despite the expenditure into Nyrstar. Port Augusta is seeing the closure of the power station and, just adjacent to that, there is the shutdown of the Leigh Creek coalfield, and there are the challenges that Arrium is facing in Whyalla. What was once known as the Iron Triangle is certainly facing a challenging, if not bleak, future.

I have a few stats in front of me that highlight the difficult situation that this state is in. I talked a moment ago about the unemployment rate in Port Pirie. In fact, across the state, the trend rate was 7.2 per cent in February this year, which turned out to be the highest in the nation. It was seasonally adjusted to 7.7 per cent in February, once again the highest in the nation. Exports in South Australia fell 0.4 per cent on an annualised basis, compared with the previous 12 months, to \$11.7 billion. The government's target, as indicated by the government, was \$18 billion by 2017, including services.

Our gross state product grew just 1.6 per cent in 2014-15, compared with 2.3 per cent nationally. Only Queensland and the ACT grew more slowly, meaning of course that South Australia was sixth out of eight jurisdictions—sixth out of seven states. There have been only 5,850 jobs created since Labor promised 100,000 extra jobs in February 2010, just prior to the re-election of that Labor government. Water prices have increased by 241 per cent since 2002-03, and I will come back to the impact that those water prices are having later in my contribution.

The CommSec State of the States report puts South Australia seventh out of eight in terms of economic performance, with only Tasmania having poorer economic performance across the nation. Due to the debt that is expected to peak at \$13.5 billion in 2017-18, we are currently facing a \$520 million annual interest bill on state debt.

Of course, that has significant impact. I think somebody calculated that is \$1.6 million per day of interest payments on the state debt. The unbudgeted spending has amounted to \$4 billion between 2002 and 2014-15, so the life of this government has had unbudgeted spending of around \$4 billion.

Our leader made an excellent contribution earlier in the day. He spent quite a bit of time talking about the 2036 document, which of course the Liberal Party and leader Steven Marshall have released recently. It provides a framework—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Chapters one and nine.

Mr TRELOAR: Chapters one and nine particularly are of interest, and I am sure everybody on the other side has read—

Mr Picton: It took five minutes.

Mr TRELOAR: Well, it provides a framework and an excellent framework with which to go forward, and policy will be developed around that. The Deputy Speaker has mentioned chapter nine, and it is particularly pertinent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: 9.4.

Mr TRELOAR: 9.4—let's have a look at that and see what it says. It is not my repetition; I am repeating our esteemed leader. Here we go: 9.4—'Balancing the budget and reducing state debt over the long-term'.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRELOAR: 9.3—'Providing high-quality services in an efficient way, eliminating waste and overspending'; 9.5—'Reducing the cost of living for families and households'; and 9.6—'Reducing the cost of doing business'. Of course, all we hear from small businesses in this state is about the cost of doing business. Certainly, a big part of that are the utility costs. 9.7—'Cutting red tape and modernising regulation'. That is chapter nine in quick summary.

It is certainly an excellent document. It has created a framework, as I said, with regard to growing our economy, providing the best education system in Australia, being a healthy state, strengthening our communities, building our state, ensuring safety and justice, protecting our environment, embracing our unique culture, and running an efficient and stable government. The document represents the values we will bring and the reforms we will implement to restore prosperity to South Australia. It is quite deliberately entitled 2036, because of course that is our bicentenary.

I want to now go to the seat of Flinders and highlight a few fundamental issues, I think, which require effort from government. Often it is a combination of both state and federal, but particularly at this time I would like to talk about mobile phone blackspots. I know the member for Mount Gambier has already spoken about this, but regional members will be well aware that, as they drive the many thousands of kilometres that they do annually right across their electorates right across the state, mobile phone service drops in and out.

For large areas of regional South Australia, there is little or no phone service. I have got to the point now where I can almost indicate to the kilometre as to when I am going to fall in or out of service. It is a very serious issue, particularly for those people who are living in those areas and trying to do business in those areas. Obviously, our businesses are competing in a world market, and a big part of that competitiveness is having adequate communication. Last year, there was a wonderful opportunity for the state government to make a contribution to mobile phone towers within regional South Australia. Unfortunately, it proved—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRELOAR: The commonwealth funding was available—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is unparliamentary to interject and unparliamentary to respond to interjections.

Mr TRELOAR: —and, in fact, there was a commitment of \$100 million, but it was supplemented by funding commitments from the government of New South Wales, who put in \$24 million, while Victoria put in \$21 million, Queensland put in \$10 million and Western Australia

put in \$32 million. From Tasmania, there was \$350,000, as well as around \$1.7 million from local governments, businesses and community organisations. South Australia was the only state that failed to contribute, and that is reflected in the low number of blackspots that could be addressed in South Australia under the funding guidelines which sought to leverage co-investments.

There were new towers erected as a result of that funding arrangement. In New South Wales, 144 went up; in Victoria, 110; in Queensland, 68; in Western Australia, 130; in Tasmania, 31; and in South Australia, just 11. There were just 11 new mobile towers last year. I am not critical of this, but I note that four of those were in the APY lands. Those people deserve a mobile phone service just as much as anyone else, but the population, I suggest, is particularly sparse in that part of the world. There is another round of funding open at the moment, and the challenge is for the state government to step up to the plate and make a contribution not just for the people who are living in country areas—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRELOAR: —but for the people who are travelling through country areas and the people who are trying to do business in country areas. The people who live in country areas are competing against the rest of the world. They are competing against Canadians, they are competing against Europeans, and they are competing against North Americans. They deserve the opportunity to have reasonable communications.

I note that before the parliament at the moment there is a motion to note the NBN report from the Economic and Finance Committee. I will take the opportunity then to talk about the NBN rollout because it is another pressing issue in regional South Australia, particularly with regard to the delivery of health and education services.

Obviously, we are more and more reliant on the internet. We in this place could not work without the internet each and every day. I know for a fact that there are senior high school students in country South Australia attending area schools who are taking their senior subjects remotely and are severely disadvantaged purely and simply because of inadequate internet access. As the Treasurer rightly pointed out, a lot of this is a federal responsibility, but there is a place for state governments to keep pressure on and make a contribution, I think, to mobile phone tower funding in particular.

I would also like to talk, as always, about water on the Eyre Peninsula. I note the state government is providing some expenditure, as of their last budget, on the upgrade of the reservoir bank at the Tod Reservoir. This has locals mystified, I must say, because it is being labelled as an upgrade or put forward as an upgrade. It is going to strengthen the dam wall but in fact diminish the capacity of the reservoir. I know the Tod Reservoir has not been utilised for potable water since 2002, but it seems a crying shame to me to essentially walk away from a lot of the infrastructure that has been in existence for over 80 years. It is certainly workable, and it provides that little bit of extra water security for Eyre Peninsula.

We have now the opportunity, via third-party funding access legislation, for new parties to come into the water market, and I actually believe there is a prime opportunity now. The time is ripe for private investment companies to step into the water market in South Australia, particularly in places like Eyre Peninsula with coastal towns such as Ceduna, Streaky Bay, Port Neill—the list goes on—where companies could invest in small desal plants. I think the days of large desal plants are well over, despite this government having famously promised way back in 2002 that a desal plant would be built on Eyre Peninsula. Those days have disappeared, I think. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMPLAINTS (BUDGET REPORT) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Thursday 14 April 2016 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***RE-TOOLING PROGRAM**

154 Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (9 September 2015). For the Re-Tooling program in 2014-15, please advise:

1. How many successful grant applications and what was the value of those applications?
2. How many unsuccessful grant applications and what was the value of those applications?

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

1. For the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015, five applications were approved for a total of \$1.2 million in grant assistance under Retooling for Diversification.
2. For the same period, two applications were declined, seeking a total of \$134,500 grant assistance under the program.

AUTOMOTIVE SUPPLIER DIVERSIFICATION PROGRAM

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

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

1. For 2014-15, the South Australian Government approved \$1.23 million grant assistance under the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program.
2. For the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015, 11 applications were received under the Program—6 were approved, 2 declined and 3 were under assessment.
3. No