HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 30 November 2016

The SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson) took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO AN AMENDMENT OF THE BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGULATIONS 2011

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:04): On behalf of the member for Little Para, I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into an Amendment of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Regulations 2011 to enable the recognition of de facto relationships on the register recording the death of a person (death certificate), be noted.

In the absence of the member for Little Para, I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PLAYFORD INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:05): I move:

That the 556th report of the committee, entitled Playford International College Redevelopment, be noted.

Playford International College is the former Fremont-Elizabeth City High School located on the corner of Philip Highway and Crockerton Road at Elizabeth. I have had the pleasure of visiting there on a couple of occasions, and I am very pleased that this report is focusing on the long overdue redevelopment of sections of that school that are certainly required. It is undergoing a rejuvenation under the direction of its new principal. The principal is an outstanding person who is doing an exceptionally good job and surrounding himself with equally capable teachers and support staff.

A three-year transformation plan has been developed for the school and is now in the process of being implemented. The key elements of the plan address cultural and educational matters as well as the physical environment and school facilities.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Can you ladies stop fighting with each other, please?

Mr Pederick: Order!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you chairing from over there, member for Hammond?

Mr Pederick: Absolutely.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It might interest you to know that it is not necessary.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Many of the facilities date back to the 1950s with the commencement of teaching on this site. This project addresses the need for upgraded modern facilities for students. The redevelopment works proposed will cost $7.342 million (GST exclusive) and are part of the northern economic stimulus package. The works will provide much-needed new and upgraded facilities that establish a new physical performance training centre, a new creative arts centre, a new visual arts centre, a new hospitality function centre, a new supported learning centre, an upgrade of the student toilet facilities and an upgrade to the reception, administration and staff facilities, as well as improving pedestrian connections to the school reception area.

In addition, there will be the demolition of nine non-fixed structures, which will assist in tidying up the site. The school has also been allocated $2.5 million (GST exclusive) from the government's STEM program for the establishment of a new STEM facility. This is in addition to the redevelopment costs for the school. This will include two practical spaces as well as support and teaching spaces for electronics, 3D printing and wet testing.

The staff and students will remain at the current school site during the construction works. As such, the works will need to be staged to ensure the continued operation of the school and the safety of the students, staff and visitors. Construction is due to commence in December 2016 to take advantage of the school break, with completion in December 2017. This project, in conjunction with the new direction provided by the principal and the support of the staff, will assist this school change its direction from one with low attendance rates and high behavioural management issues to one more in line with the state's average.

I would like to thank the staff from the Department for Education and Child Development, especially the principal, Mr Rob Knight, for presenting this project to the committee. Mr Knight has been at the school for less than two years, but already his vision and commitment have seen significant changes to the school's culture and have had a positive impact on the behavioural issues at the school. I would also like to thank the members of the committee for their time in considering this important and worthwhile project. 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) (11:08): I can only endorse the words of the member for Colton. This was a particularly good project. I will pick up on some comments the member made. I would like to say that I could not speak more highly about Mr Rob Knight, who was outstanding in his presentation that day. He clearly has done an incredible job with the school, given his time there, and is passionate about where it has come from, where it is going, and where he wants it to go. We have absolutely no problem, on this side of the house, supporting that project. With those few words, I resume my seat.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:09): I commend the project.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SWALLOWCLIFFE SCHOOL P-7 LEARNING AREAS UPGRADE

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:10): I move:

That the 555th report of the committee, entitled Swallowcliffe School P-7 Learning Areas Upgrade, be noted:

Swallowcliffe School P-7 is the result of the 2011 amalgamation of the Swallowcliffe junior primary and primary schools. Many of the buildings date back to the commencement of the school in the 1960s, with the last major redevelopment occurring in 1994. The school, which is in the northern suburbs of Adelaide, provides much needed educational facilities to a low socio-economic demographic.

Updated school facilities will encourage student learning and attendance and assist staff to manage some of the behavioural issues that are being encountered. We heard from the very enthusiastic principal about the proposed changes to the school and the positive impacts they will have for students, teachers and the community in general. She was very excited and, in her foresight in preparing the proposed redevelopment, has included a STEM facility.

This will be the first stand-alone purpose-built STEM facility in a government primary school. I commend the principal, Ms Tonia Noble, for her foresight in this area and her commitment to that school and the surrounding community. I am very pleased that we have such a principal doing the work that she is doing in that area. Other works that are also included in the scope are:

- the refurbishment of the general teaching areas—blocks 1, 3 and 4 with an internal fitout that will provide greater flexibility of the learning spaces and allow for more natural light;
- in addition, upgrades to buildings 1 and 4 will also provide external re-engagement with direct access from the internal learning areas;

- an extension to the administration building, providing a highly integrated and focused administrative, staff and leadership hub, as well as a more functional area that will separate staff and the public areas;
- upgraded and rationalised toilet facilities, storage and teacher preparation areas;
- upgraded information and communication technology, security and air conditioning systems; and
- a kiss-and-drop zone.

The cost of the works is $6.5 million, GST exclusive. The principal, governing council, school staff and the education director have endorsed the scope of works and are eager to see the redevelopment occur. The principal herself has been a key driver behind the redevelopment plans, ensuring the needs of this school are being met.

The school will remain operational during the construction period. As such, the works will need to be staged to ensure the safety of students, staff and visitors to the site. Construction works are anticipated to start early next year, with completion by mid-2018. These works will provide much-needed updated teaching facilities for staff and a contemporary learning environment for students. It will allow students some autonomy in how they learn, which is an important part of engaging and empowering students.

It is hoped that this redevelopment, along with staff support, will make this school a school of choice in the area. I would like to thank the staff from the Department for Education and Child Development, especially the principal, Ms Tonia Noble, for presenting this project to the committee. I also thank the members of the committee for their time in considering this project. 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) (11:13): Once again, we support the project on this side of the house. This is a good example of a school that has had very little done to it for a long, long time. Again, the school has an extremely enthusiastic principal. As mentioned by the member for Colton, these works will go a long way towards improving things out there for everybody, staff and students, and they will make it a good place for learning. Hopefully, they will give the students the opportunity to achieve a lot more in a good environment and give the staff a good feeling as well. We have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting the project.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:14): I will be extremely brief. I would like to say that I am very proud that the government is providing money to these areas that are most in need, and that is where a significant proportion of the education budget should go. Without reflecting on previous administrations, we have let some of these schools not be upgraded to the quality they deserve. I am very pleased that these areas, such as we have just reported on, will have access to educational facilities that are appropriate for the area and the students who attend those schools.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: UNCONVENTIONAL GAS (FRACKING) FINAL REPORT

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:15): I move:

That the 119th report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into Unconventional Gas (Fracking) in the South-East of South Australia Final Report, be noted:

The Natural Resources Committee Inquiry into Unconventional Gas (Fracking) in the South-East of South Australia was referred by the Legislative Council to the committee on 19 November 2014 on the motion of the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC, as amended by the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC. Pursuant to section 16(1)(a) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the committee has inquired into the potential risks and impacts in the use of hydraulic fracture stimulation (fracking) to produce gas in the South-East of South Australia, and in particular:

1. The risks of groundwater contamination;

2. The impacts upon landscape;

3. The effectiveness of existing legislation and regulation; and

4. The potential net economic outcomes to the region and the rest of the state.

After a public call for submissions, we received 178 written responses. We also heard from 66 witnesses. The committee took evidence from Santos, Beach Energy, Cooper Energy, Halliburton, the Department of State Development (DSD), the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy (SACOME), the petroleum industry lobbyists APPEA, many business people and residents from the South-East and a wide range of expert witnesses from Australia and overseas. We also heard from the Hon. Thomas George, Deputy Speaker and member for Lismore in New South Wales.

The inquiry, one of many conducted on this subject by Australian parliaments in recent years, has attracted a high level of community interest since the committee began hearing evidence in December 2014. This interest has remained high throughout the two years of the inquiry, with frequent contact via email, telephone and postal mail received from members of the public, community groups and industry.

The committee undertook four fact-finding visits, comprising two visits to the South-East, one to Queensland and one to the Moomba gas fields in the Cooper Basin in South Australia. The South-East visits were to take evidence from local residents and businesses and to visit gas industry sites. We planned a third visit to the South-East, intending to visit Mount Gambier, but as there were no new witnesses who wanted to appear before us the visit did not proceed.

The extended visit to Queensland included the towns of Roma, Chinchilla, Dalby and Miles, as members sought to gain an appreciation of how the unconventional gas industry and agriculture might coexist and what community impacts might be expected. The Moomba visit was undertaken by a subset of the committee in order to view an unconventional gas well in development. An interim report, entitled Inquiry into Unconventional Gas (Fracking) Interim Report, was tabled 12 months ago, on 17 November 2015.

To add to the enormity of the task, the body of evidence the committee was considering increased over the course of the inquiry, as the unconventional gas industry in Australia and worldwide is being studied and reported on regularly. Adding further complexity to the committee's task has been the transition towards low and zero-carbon energy sources underway within global energy markets.

This change has been and will continue to be spurred on by the rapidly falling cost of renewables, especially solar and wind, and as the effects of climate change become more apparent and nations work towards decarbonising the global energy system. All these changes have important implications for the economics of unconventional gas development in Australia. To illustrate my point, I provide a list of just a few of the energy-related events that have taken place in the last 12 months:

1. The Leigh Creek coalmine was closed down in November 2015.

2. Domestic gas prices have more than doubled since completion of the gas hubs at Gladstone, linking Australia to world market prices.

3. March and April of this year saw the most widespread coral bleaching event on the Great Barrier Reef as a result of sea-surface warming induced by climate change. New reports just in yesterday show even more widespread bleaching, with 67 per cent of corals dead in the worst hit northern section of the reef.

4. In May, the Port Augusta coal-fired power station was shut down.

5. BP announced on 10 October that it was withdrawing its plans for exploration drilling in the Great Australian Bight.

6. Global renewable energy capacity overtook coal on 25 October 2016.

7. Victoria banned on-shore unconventional gas development in October this year.

8. Earlier this year, the Hazelwood coal-fired power station in Victoria was scheduled for closure in March 2017.

9. Just a few weeks ago on 10 November, Australia ratified the Paris agreement of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, agreeing to work towards keeping global temperature rises within 2º Celsius.

10. On Friday last week, the former member for Giles and Speaker, now Whyalla's mayor, Lyn Breuer, was quoted in *The Advertiser* as saying that Adani's new 120-megawatt solar plant proposed for Whyalla would bring major benefits to the region. The solar project would be 'just the tip of the iceberg', said the current member for Giles.

All of this is in just 12 months and, according to a range of expert witnesses we heard from, the changes to the energy market will be permanent. Even the International Energy Agency, recognised among global energy analysts as being relatively conservative, described 2015 as a year of remarkable growth in renewables, offering two revealing statistics: first, about half a million solar panels were installed every day around the world last year and, secondly, in China, which accounted for about half the year's wind additions and 40 per cent of all renewable capacity increases, two wind turbines were installed every hour in 2015. All of this helps to give a sense of the context in which our inquiry was conducted.

As important as these developments are, however, what the committee has repeatedly come back to is the community at the centre of this inquiry and thus the question of social licence; namely, does the social licence to operate exist that would allow the development of an unconventional gas industry in the South-East of South Australia? Social licence was invoked in many submissions to the inquiry and by a number of witnesses appearing before the committee. The member for Mount Gambier, Mr Troy Bell MP, summed up social licence in his evidence to the committee:

> The term 'social licence', or 'social licence to operate', generally refers to a local community's acceptance or approval of a project or a company's ongoing presence. It is usually informal and intangible, and is granted by the community based on the opinions and views of stakeholders, including local populations, aboriginal groups, and other interested parties. Due to this intangibility, it can be difficult to determine when social licence has been achieved for a project. Social licence may manifest in [many] ways, ranging from absence of opposition to vocal support or even advocacy, and these various levels of social licence (as well as, of course, the absence of social licence) may occur at the same time among different interested parties.

Under this definition, social licence is given by the local community and other stakeholders when a project has broad, ongoing social acceptance. Without proper community engagement, industry may find obtaining social licence more difficult than obtaining legal approvals.

After considering all the evidence available to it, particularly the definition of social licence provided by the member for Mount Gambier, the committee reached a position that social licence does not yet exist for the development of an unconventional gas industry in the South-East of South Australia. This was made starkly apparent by the widespread opposition we witnessed from the local community. We noted that opposition, in spite of there being a pre-existing gas industry in the South-East which had undoubtedly provided significant benefits for the community, including employment.

The vast majority of the submissions and representations the committee received were anti-fracking in the South-East. Essentially, the only submissions in favour of unconventional gas development were from companies and lobbyists engaged by or heavily involved with the oil and gas industry. None of the pro-fracking representations, written or verbal, came from representatives of the South-East.

The committee made an effort to understand, from the perspective of local people and businesses, what the economic benefits may be but, despite repeated invitations and approaches to bodies we felt might represent this aspect of the debate, there were no witnesses forthcoming. The committee was surprised that no regional representatives or businesses approached us to express support for the development of an unconventional gas industry in the region.

At the beginning of this inquiry the committee initially saw its task as recommending whether to frack or not to frack but, after two years, the NRC resolved that ultimate responsibility rests not with the committee but with industry, government and the community to decide in partnership. This

inquiry has provided a forum for discussion and the committee has encouraged all stakeholders to have their say.

I wish to thank all those who gave up their time to assist the committee with its endeavour. From my experience in this place, our gallery was always full when we held hearings in Parliament House and certainly when we went out to the regions there was a crowd there as well, wanting to know about and wanting to listen to the evidence we had before us.

I would like to commend the current members of the committee: the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC, the member for Napier, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars MLC and the member for Flinders, as well as past members of the committee, the member for Kaurna and the member for Elder, for their contributions to this inquiry and to the report. All members have worked cooperatively on this report.

I would also like to extend my thanks to the member for Mount Gambier, the member for MacKillop, the member for Hammond and the Hon. Mark Parnell for their assistance with and interest in this inquiry. Finally, I would like to thank the committee staff, the executive officer Mr Patrick Dupont and the research officer Ms Barbara Coddington, for their amazing effort. I would particularly like to acknowledgement Ms Coddington's work over the past two years with this inquiry. I commend this report to the house.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:28): I rise with great pleasure to speak to the 119th report of the Natural Resources Committee. As I have said before in this place, it is a committee I very much enjoy being a part of, and there is no doubt that this particular inquiry was the great task given to this committee for the past two years. Our interim report was tabled in this place just over 12 months ago and, finally, this week we have managed to table our final report.

The Natural Resources Committee's inquiry into unconventional gas, or fracking, in the South-East of South Australia was referred by the Legislative Council to the committee in November 2014. The committee has inquired into potential risks and impacts in the use of hydraulic fracture stimulation, otherwise known as fracking, to produce gas in the South-East of South Australia. This inquiry particularly related to the South-East of South Australia. It relates in particular to (1) the risks of groundwater contamination; (2) the impacts on the landscape; (3) the effectiveness of existing legislation and regulation; and (4) the potential net economic outcomes to the region and the rest of the state.

The committee's inquiry into unconventional gas has taken almost two years to complete. After the public call for submissions, we received 178 written responses. We also heard from 66 witnesses including a large contingent of local South-East residents and businesspeople, South-East local government representatives and members of parliament, including the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Hammond and the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC. Also, the member for MacKillop I think—

The Hon. S.W. Key: The member for MacKillop.

Mr TRELOAR: —provided a submission, yes. The committee heard from Santos, Beach Energy, the Department of State Development, the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy, petroleum industry lobbyists APPEA and a wide range of expert witnesses from Australia and overseas. In fact, on a couple of occasions, overseas witnesses were even skyped into a committee meeting. It is amazing what we can do with modern technology. Their evidence was greatly appreciated. The committee also conducted additional research including reviewing relevant reports, papers and media articles.

As the Presiding Member has already put to this assembly, this is of course just one of a number of inquiries that have occurred in jurisdictions around the world in relation to fracking. It has been very topical for a number of years now. The committee undertook four fact-finding visits, comprising two visits to the South-East of South Australia to take evidence, one visit to Queensland and one visit to the Moomba gas fields in the Cooper Basin of South Australia. The South-East visits were to take evidence from local residents and businesses and to visit gas industry sites.

The extended visit to Queensland included the towns of Roma, Chinchilla, Dalby and Miles as the committee sought to gain an appreciation of how unconventional gas industry and agriculture

might coexist and what community impacts might be expected. Of course, that part of Queensland has undergone significant change and development in the gas industry. It was a prime opportunity for the committee to see how that interaction had occurred.

We heard from many witnesses and it is fair to say that we heard from those who supported it and those who did not. That is all part of the inquiry. I will come to the recommendations shortly, but the report talks a lot about social licence. It is difficult to define but the member for Mount Gambier in his evidence quoted from a paper that summed it up:

> The term 'social licence' or 'social licence to operate' generally refers to a local community's acceptance or approval of a project or a company's ongoing presence. It is usually informal and intangible and is granted by a community based on the opinions and views of stakeholders [including local populations, Aboriginal groups and other interested parties]. Due to this intangibility, it can be difficult to determine when social licence has been achieved for a project. Social licence may manifest in a variety of ways ranging from absence of opposition to vocal support or even advocacy and these various levels of social licence may occur at the same time among different interested parties.

Under this definition, then, social licence is given by a local community and other stakeholders where a project has broad ongoing acceptance. Without proper community engagement, industry may find that obtaining a social licence to operate may prove more difficult than obtaining the legal licence to operate. Given that definition and recognising the intangibility, the very first recommendation of the committee states:

> Without social licence, unconventional gas exploration/development should not proceed in the South East of South Australia. The committee found that social licence to explore/develop unconventional gas does not yet exist in the South East of South Australia.

Recommendation 2 states:

> While the specific process of hydraulic fracturing or 'fracking' in deep shale, properly managed and regulated, is unlikely to pose significant risks to groundwater, other processes associated with unconventional gas extraction, including mid to long-term well integrity and surface spills, present risks that need to be properly considered and managed.

Recommendation 3 states:

> A review of the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000 and relevant regulations would be appropriate, with particular consideration given to:
>
> - defining terms such as 'consultation processes' and 'risk' to provide more clarity to the public and other stakeholders in relation to regulated activities;
> - the development and integration of formal guidelines for community engagement and consultation to assist with negotiation processes…
> - the perception of a conflicted regulator/promoter, and hence the role that other state agencies and departments, such as the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, the Environment Protection Agency and Primary Industries and Regions SA, might fulfil in managing aspects of exploration and development such as water use, community consultation, landowner rights and ongoing monitoring.

Recommendation 4 states:

> The potential for disruption to landscape and local community in exploration, construction and production phases of unconventional gas development should be addressed in agreements with landholders, state and local government prior to any significant works occurring.

A very important recommendation, in my mind. Recommendation 5 states:

> A definitive proposal for unconventional gas development in the South East of South Australia should be produced before any further consideration can be given to potential economic benefits. This would enable social, economic and environmental impact studies to be undertaken to collect baseline data and inform consultation and community engagement processes…

Recommendation 5 continues but, for the purposes of this morning, those who are interested in the recommendations can go onto the committee website and read them more fully. They are broad-ranging. I congratulate the committee on coming down to just five recommendations because, as we have said already this morning, we received an incredible amount of interest and a significant number of submissions. All in all, I am very pleased with the final report. The recommendations we have come up with form a piece of work we as a committee can be proud of.

I would like to acknowledge the work of the Presiding Member, the member for Ashford, who, in her own inimitable style, chairs this committee in a way that leaves everybody feeling comfortable and gives them surety that their presentation and their submissions have been heard and acknowledged. I also acknowledge Rob Brokenshire in the other place, John Dawkins in the other place and other committee members, Mr Jon Gee and Gerry Kandelaars, as well as Chris Picton and Annabel Digance, who have sat on the committee.

I particularly would like to thank our staff members who provide such fantastic support to this committee: Patrick Dupont and of course Ms Barbara Coddington. Barb was charged with collating and considering all the submissions and, in the end, producing this final report, which was no mean feat. We all knew that, ultimately, we had to table this report and we had in mind that it needed to be done by the end of this year. Barb, I am sure, was working some very late nights and very early mornings to get the report to this point. It is with pleasure that I speak to this report and support the work of the committee, and I look forward to next year.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (11:38): In my 10 minutes, I want to talk about economic vandalism and what that means to the people of South Australia.

Mr Williams: You can talk about Roxby Downs in 1980.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is not in his place, and I would ask—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What a very good—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Just a moment. I would ask him not to interject.

Mr Bell: Kicked a couple of people out of your party, didn't you?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask the member for Mount Gambier not to interject as well. I am getting the book out, and you will not be here for question time if you are not careful. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can I have my 30 seconds back? The member for MacKillop makes a very good point: what about Roxby Downs in 1982? I will concede that that was a poor decision of the then Labor opposition to oppose the beginning of the mining at Olympic Dam. I do not think there is a person in South Australia, other than extreme fringe groups, who still maintain that the position the Labor Party held at that time was the right one. I submit to you today—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I submit to the house today that the position that the Liberal Party has taken is in line with that opposition to mining at Olympic Dam. Future generations will look back and think what a silly decision that was. There has been a bipartisan agreement in this state since the 1960s about energy independence, and that bipartisan agreement was started by Sir Thomas—

Mr BELL: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier needs to have a really good point of order. What is it?

Mr BELL: I am wondering whether the Treasurer is going to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is it first?

Mr BELL: It is relevance, Deputy Speaker. Is the Treasurer going to address the report or is the Treasurer using this as an impromptu speech?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Mount Gambier!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Everyone needs to take a deep breath. He has only just started his remarks. I will be warning you, and you will not be able to make a contribution if you are

not careful. Everyone is entitled to hear the debate in silence. I will pull him up and the table will pull him up if we think it is not relevant. We do not need your help just at the moment. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand the nervousness of members opposite when they are telling their base that they don't like them anymore, but I will say this: there has been a bipartisan agreement in this state on the extraction of gas for energy security for the nation. South Australia is interconnected with gas pipelines to nearly every major capital city in the country, excluding Perth and Tasmania. We have pipelines to Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. Indeed, the first gas basin that we explored and produced gas from was in the South-East, the Otway Basin. It is the parent region where the oil and gas industry was first formulated. We have fracture stimulated in this state since the 1960s and we have done so safely.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand the member for Mount Gambier's anxiety about this—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No.

Mr Bell: There's no anxiety.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will call you to order and warn you if you are not careful. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you. I understand the anxiety—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, ma'am.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This better be relevant and it better be pertinent and it better not be frivolous.

Mr PENGILLY: Well, it is relevance: it has nothing to do with the report, and the member for Mount Gambier is irrelevant to what the minister is talking about. We are completely off the report.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down. Treasurer.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand the anxiety of members opposite in their ability to try to frustrate a debate here because the industry is devastated by what they announced yesterday. It is fair to say that they are in shock because those who have been their traditional supporters have turned on them so violently.

Mr Bell: Which findings are you commenting on?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is warned for the first time.

Mr Pengilly: That's not fair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And you will be called to order as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The real impact of this is on jobs, of course, because there is a logical extension that people can make from the Leader of the Opposition's remarks. He says that fracture stimulation is unsafe. By saying that the extraction of gas is unsafe in the South-East, investors and people who run multinational—

Mr BELL: Point of order, Deputy Speaker, again on relevance: I do not understand which section of the report, which I have read, that comment is related to. Nowhere in the report is the Leader of the Opposition quoted as mentioning anything near what the Treasurer is now debating.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I am advised, this is the very beginning of his remarks. You have been up and down and he should get another two minutes. You will have your own time in a moment to say basically whatever you like. I understand your—

Mr Bell: So I can get up and speak about Kermit the Frog but it's got nothing to do with the report?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you keep defying the Chair, there will be consequences. If you have something to say, come and speak to the Clerk and we will handle it properly, but this is not going to be tolerated. Treasurer, back to the point.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I made my remarks about the gas industry. The gas industry is devastated by what they have seen as an attack on them, because the logical extension of the Leader of the Opposition's argument is that the extraction of gas in the South-East of our state is unsafe.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, ma'am: debate. The report mentions nothing whatsoever about the Leader of the Opposition—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just say the number and sit down.

Mr PENGILLY: Bring him back to order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down. The ruling is: until he is given a chance to bring it back to the report, it is a bit hard to see where it is going. But if you keep standing up and stopping him, I will not be able to prevent him from interjecting when you start, because it is all about preventing quarrels on the floor. You have the standing orders to allow everyone to be able to speak in silence. If you have a problem, come and see the Clerk, but do not keep interrupting the debate. The Treasurer does need to bring it—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, I am talking about gas extraction, ma'am, and I will continue to talk about gas extraction. If gas extraction is unsafe in the South-East, then it is unsafe everywhere. It is not illogical for investors in South Australia to think that if the Leader of the Opposition can make this blanket announcement of a 10-year moratorium on the basis of no recommendation of the committee for a moratorium—in fact, the member for Mount Gambier, on the committee, recommended against a moratorium. He recommended either a ban or to allow its use.

If it is unsafe in the South-East of South Australia, therefore it is unsafe everywhere. If it is unsafe everywhere, investors need to know from the opposition right now if that will be the policy of their government if they are elected. Quite frankly, I think the damage they have now done to South Australia's reputation as an investment jurisdiction is dramatic. What they have actually said to the investment community across Australia and internationally is that, on the basis of no science and on the basis of a report that made no recommendation for a moratorium, they have implemented this ban on unconventional gas in the South-East. This is despite their own members on the committee saying that the opposite should occur and there should not be a moratorium.

Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition's remarks on radio today were that, even after a 10-year ban, he does not expect it to change and will maintain that moratorium in place. I have to say that this committee's report was all about understanding how to implement social licence. The Leader of the Opposition has not come up with a policy that says, 'Until we achieve social licence, there will be a moratorium.' He has simply said, 'Regardless of the social licence implications, there will be a 10-year ban.'

What happens, hypothetically, if in two years' time there is a gas shortage in South Australia, electricity prices are skyrocketing because there is not enough investment in oil and gas, and wells that can be extracted cheaply and efficiently in the Otway Basin, alongside the SEA Gas Pipeline which runs through the South-East, cannot be explored and cannot be extracted because of a ban? Why? The simple answer to why they have done this is not based on science; it is based on votes.

The NXT team in the federal election achieved a majority of votes in a number of booths in the South-East. Millicent and Millicent South received 56 and 52 per cent, and Mount Gambier achieved up to 60 per cent. That is what this is about. It is about two members of parliament who are terrified of losing their seats. In the chase for votes, they have abandoned principle and science. What about making South Australia the best jurisdiction in the world to invest in? What about supporting two of our most famous (and, quite frankly, hardworking) South Australian headquartered companies, Santos and Beach Energy? How about giving them every opportunity to succeed?

Instead, they are treated as if they are the enemy. They are treated as if they have done something wrong. What have they done wrong? They have invested billions into South Australia. They have employed thousands of South Australians. Make no mistake that this is a very simple formula for people to follow. The reason we have higher power prices in South Australia is that all our gas generation requires gas. Our thermal generation requires gas, and gas is not liquid in the market because the price of oil has plummeted. Because the price of oil has plummeted, the returns they are getting on gas are low. They have signed long-term contracts for export. That means the spot market in South Australia and nationally is high, but they do not have enough money to invest in new wells.

This decision yesterday by the opposition will dent even further their ability to invest. Quite frankly, I have to say this: where is the shadow minister? My job as the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy is to defend this industry. My job is to make sure that this industry operates efficiently, effectively and safely. What has happened now is that, on the basis of no recommendation, the shadow minister has decided on a ban, just a blanket ban, not to work through to rebuild social licence. There is no talk about trying to encourage the building up of social licence. It is just a ban that is going to cost jobs, investment and, quite frankly, it is going to hurt South Australia.

This is another decision that shows, in terms of economic management, that the opposition are lost at sea. Economic management is about making difficult decisions in the light of public perceptions. I believe that the vast silent majority of South Australians are sick and tired of special interests controlling our members of parliament. They are sick and tired of fringe groups like Lock the Gate—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know the opposition want us—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am standing up.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If it keeps going like this, we will not be moving at all. The Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I note the opposition is clamouring for removing the curfew—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, no need for that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and I will be using that in my pamphlets. However—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, you should talk. That is the pot calling the kettle black.

Mr Bell: You were talking about special interest groups controlling this state.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All I am saying is that we base our decisions on science, not on the basis of a member terrified of losing his seat to an Independent, and we base our determinations on what we can do safely. All the opposition have done is make South Australia a less attractive place to invest in, and the shadow minister should resign.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:52): I would like to put on the record my thanks to the parliament's Natural Resources Committee for the work they have done on this issue. They have approached this topic, which is extremely challenging with regard to not only the science but also socially and politically, extremely openly, objectively and in a very forthright fashion. I would like to thank all members of the committee, their staff and the Chair in particular for the way they have gone about this work over the last two years. I would also like to thank people who provided submissions and came as witnesses to the committee. They provided the information that was required for the committee to do this work.

It is also important, of course, that I put on the record the fact that the things that the Treasurer, the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, has just said are largely untrue. He does everything he possibly can to play politics with this issue, and he is clearly now trying to use this

issue as an excuse for the fact that he and his government have mismanaged our state's energy policy for the last 15 years at least. He is scrambling for excuses and he is trying to use the committee's work in this area as another excuse.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE SACA PREMIER CRICKET MERGER DECISION

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (11:54): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended until Wednesday 15 February 2017.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: UNCONVENTIONAL GAS (FRACKING) FINAL REPORT

Adjourned debate (resumed on motion).

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:54): I rise to speak to the 106th report of the Natural Resources Committee on unconventional gas. Following on from the Treasurer's comments, it is quite interesting that when you have a minister who does not like the findings, or a government that does not like the findings, they are very quick to dismiss whatever process has been put in place. I would remind the Treasurer that this was a Labor dominated committee, with three Labor members, two Liberals and an Independent.

The committee found, as I had been expressing for a very long time, that there is no social licence to operate in the South-East of South Australia. Without that social licence, it would be impossible for a mining company to explore or start producing gas from fracture stimulation. Being on committees, I know how much work goes into them, and I would like to thank the members of that committee: the Hon. Steph Key, the Presiding Member; the Hon. Rob Brokenshire MLC; the Hon. John Dawkins MLC; Mr Jon Gee; the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars; and Mr Peter Treloar, the member for Flinders.

What may be really hard to understand is what we have seen reported by Daniel Wills in the paper today: 'Populism rules under martial law'. It is almost like the Treasurer himself wrote that headline because people in South Australia have not been listened to on many issues. This is a very clear example of what a change of government will provide to the people of South Australia—that is, the people's voice being listened to.

That headline could have easily read, 'The people's voice has been listened to, and the government is taking action', or it could have read, 'The Liberals listened to community concerns and acted decisively', but, no, we have more rhetoric and more spin along the lines that this is somehow some populist position. This has been a very difficult position to come to. There are lots of proponents on our side who support fracking. I must admit that our position does not talk about conventional gas extraction, which has been going in the Katnook gas region for a very long time.

Again, when the government does not like something it will attack the process. We have had the nuclear debate with a citizens' jury; that has now been tossed out because they do not like its findings. We had the South-East drainage funding citizens' jury; again, they do not like that, so they just ignore the recommendations. This is going to be a very stark reminder to the people of South Australia that in March 2018, if they want a government that is going to listen to them and act decisively, they need to change this government. They actually need to vote Liberal at the next election.

I will not resile from my position as a local member of sticking up for the interests in my region. They have been saying to me loud and clear for three years—in fact, it was before I was even elected, so for nearly four years—that they have major concerns with fracking in the South-East. An area that contributes over a billion to this state's economy cannot be put at risk by an industry that people in the South-East do not support. That is why the number one finding talks about that. It comes into a larger issue—that the Department of State Development cannot be the promoter and the regulator of this industry. No wonder people distrust that system.

If there is one thing this government can take out of this, it is to have an independent regulator where farmers can go to have their grievances heard and have their issues dealt with in an independent manner. Sadly, that is unlikely to happen because we have a government, particularly the front bench, that is deaf to the people of South Australia. They have stopped listening. It is as though Labor is just talking to themselves and believing what is echoed in the room, instead of really listening to the people of South Australia. You cannot ride roughshod over the people of South Australia. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON JUMPS RACING

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:01): I bring up the report of the committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

Resolutions

ELECTORAL COMMISSIONER

Consideration of the Legislative Council's resolution:

That a recommendation be made to His Excellency the Governor to appoint Mr Michael Sherry to the Office of the Electoral Commissioner.

(Continued from 16 November 2016.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:02): I move:

That the resolution be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (SIMPLIFY) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November 2016.)

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (12:04): I rise as the lead speaker for our side on the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Bill. I do so noting that we will not oppose the bill in this house, but we reserve our right to consider amendments in the Legislative Council. I note that four areas of this bill were looked at. The bill has potential and it is a promising idea, but I fear that this simplify bill may be poorly executed, as have been a lot of projects by this government.

We know that there are problems with Transforming Health, the NRAH, the EPAS that has been talked about a lot, especially today, and the ongoing legal battles that have ensued from the NRAH project. Child protection is another issue which has been poorly handled by this government and which is very much in the media at the moment, not to mention our poor jobs state, electricity prices and other such issues here in South Australia. I hope that this bill does not follow in that vein. As I said, it is a simple idea that has the potential to do good things, but I have concerns as I look through it.

This government has been in power for more than 14 years, and it has taken them that long to get to the point of realising that we need to simplify some legislation in order to help grow jobs, which one would think is a very key point in South Australia. I note with interest that the government has gone through four areas in putting this bill together: (a) legislative changes; (b) regulatory changes; (c) repealing legislation; and (d) talk about future reforms. I will look at some of these areas.

We note with interest the legislative changes and the consultation the government undertook with the industry. At a recent briefing attended by colleagues of mine, the government was questioned on whom they had contacted and which industry groups they had spoken to, and there was some uncertainty in giving the answer to that question, which is a little bit of a concern. We will

be consulting on this bill between the houses to see if there are any concerns for industry with some of these bills which are meant to help simplify legislation but which in fact have the opposite effect. We will be keeping a very close eye on that.

All shadow ministers are out talking and listening to the people of South Australia and industry groups, and I think that is a very important point to mention, especially in this modern day and age when communicating and consulting with the community are vitally important. We have heard the member for Mount Gambier speak about how important it is in his local area, and we know across the board that communicating and consulting are vitally important in this job, especially in this age of social media.

Some people pooh-pooh the modern media that are out there, but there are some real and innovative upsides as we move forward as a society because there are great ways we can consult with the community, and I think it is vitally important that we do that. We know that everyone may not always agree, and we are very conscious of that, but this is certainly a day and age when we must talk and listen to the people and industries in the community, take on board their thoughts and concerns and make decisions accordingly.

You must take people on the journey with you, too. I think this government has failed to do that on a number of occasions, and that is why they are now having a lot of problems within the community. They have not taken the community on the ride with them and they have not taken them on the journey with them. I am hoping that these changes are for the good, that consultation will be fair and just and that everyone will have a chance to be heard. That is something we are very keen to keep a close eye on.

As I said, we will be going out and speaking and listening to industry groups and people in the community, as that is really important. A number of legislative changes have been listed here, and I will talk about a couple as we work through this bill. Again, I know that some industry groups are a little bit concerned, and we will be speaking to them at a future date, as I have pointed out. During this period, it was noted that the government had spoken a lot to the departments about the changes to the legislation.

They have spoken to the departments to try to make things easier for them. This has some upside, but we also know that making sure we make legislative changes that will help save money for businesses, grow businesses and grow jobs is far more important than making a lighter workload for the departments. The departments are there to help businesses and help grow South Australia. I know that the people in the departments are very keen to work hard and help do that, and that is a really key point.

As we look through some of these legislative changes—as I said, we will be exploring them in more detail—I will just pick out one, that is, the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. There was a recommendation by DPC to allow any licence, permit, exemption or other document issued under the act to be in electronic form or as a physical document. This is a fantastic idea. In fact, it is an idea we put forward last year, to say that we should be looking at electronic licences, so to see that the government has adopted that policy idea put forward by the Liberal Party is fantastic.

We need to get with the times and we need to be moving forward with this to make sure that, down the track, people can have their licence on their iPhone. Carrying it with them electronically will make it easier for renewing their licence, easier for taking it with them wherever they go, and it will add a lot of convenience for people. Ultimately, it will save people time and money, with not having to line up at Service SA. They could quite comfortably and easily flick through an app on their phone and make their payment when they have to renew their licence—heck, they could even take their own photo themselves with their phone as a camera. The options are endless.

These are things we have called on the government to do, and it is good to see they have listened and taken them on board. This is just one little example where they have followed on from one of our policies again, which is great to see. It is good to be doing government from this side of the house and helping out the government of the day, even if they are a little bit slow to react. That is just one issue; there are many others, as I have mentioned, and we will be going through all of those. We will also probably hear more from others in the house who have individual areas they would like to discuss.

With regulatory changes, it is similar. We want to speak to people out there to make sure that any changes that are happening are making life easier for South Australians, making life easier for South Australian businesses to do their work, grow their business, employ more people and create more jobs for people out there. I mentioned digital licences and, while I am on this issue, we did mention that New South Wales had moved into this space quite a while before us, so the precursor is out there for the government to follow, and again I commend the fact they have done that.

Looking at section C of the legislation, this again has me raising my eyebrows as the government moves this piece of legislation forward. There are concerns about how well it will be executed and what the outcomes will be. I stress the point that growing the economy and growing jobs is vital, but if we look at repealing legislation under this section of the document there are 11 points there. The Debits Tax Act from 1994 has been redundant since 2005, so making alterations to that or taking it off the table is really just a bit of pencil pushing; it is not going to grow any jobs or change the economy or help businesses grow to employ more people.

I will run through the list because it is interesting to see. As I said, the Debits Tax Act 1994 has been redundant since 2005, and the Financial Institutions Duty Act 1983 has been redundant since 2009. Really, we have gone along with these things in place and it has not impacted anything, but what we are doing today is putting a pen through them and wiping them off the board. Again, that perhaps tidies up the paperwork but does not do anything for growing jobs.

The Industries Development Act 1941 has been redundant since 2008, and the Gift Duty Act 1968 has been redundant since 1980. With the Mount Gambier Hospital Hydrotherapy Pool Fund Act 2009, the money from that fund has already been allocated so there are no problems with that for the member for Mount Gambier. In fact, I am sure that act is not what drags him down every day and has him working hours and hours in his office, so removing it does not really make any difference.

The Naracoorte Town Square Act, again, the project was completed, so a line goes through that. The Software Centre Inquiry (Powers and Immunities) Act concluded in 2001 so no problems there at all. The South Australian Meat Corporation (Sale of Assets) Act 1996 is again, an old one. In terms of the South Australian Meat Corporation Act 1936, the property was sold in the late 1990s, so it has been sitting there on the books not doing anything and putting a line through it is just a formality. As to the Wilpena Station Tourist Facility Act 1990, again the project was completed, job done. The Year 2000 Information Disclosure Act 1999 is, again redundant.

The government will say, 'There are 11 pieces of legislation we have just removed to help cut red tape,' but realistically they were not doing anything to impact on South Australia and were not doing anything to prevent the economy from growing. It is really just putting line through those, so we cannot give the government any credit for those.

I find the future reforms quite interesting, and this is where potentially the real interest lies. This is the work that the government could have done. We are going through them and speaking with stakeholders about the handful the government has dealt with. We have looked at the repealed legislation the government has taken off the table which really has no impact or no influence. Looking through the future reforms, one might question why, after nearly 15 years in power, some of these reforms have not been progressed. Why have they not moved forward? Why has more not been done to help South Australia and help our economy and help grow business?

Let us have a look at this. The government talks about bus lanes and about looking at proposals to allow other buses in the bus lane, rather than just public transport buses. This was put forward by the MTA and it is a great idea. Why has the government not acted on it? I know that, in 2013, Bus SA actually went to the government and talked about doing this. The government has a push to get more and more events in the city, which is potentially a good thing. It allows regional people to come to the city, and a lot of them come by bus.

A lot of those bus drivers, companies and small businesses want to attract people, bring people from the regions to the city to be a part of some of the events we have in Adelaide to help grow those industries, those businesses and those events. When I was shadow minister for transport, these bus companies came to me and talked about this at length. Again, Bus SA broached this with the government before, but they have just ignored it or shelved it as too hard or will look at it later. Now, through some pressure, they are saying, 'We'll look at this again in the future.'

Why has this not been looked at? Why has this not been addressed? Buses come down to the city ferrying people to events, such as a footy game at the Adelaide Oval or a cultural event in the city. They bring people down from the regions. These bus companies want to attract people. They want to say, 'Look, come with us. We'll take you down. We'll take you in close to the event, drop you off, pick you up afterwards and take you home and we can offer you a really great service,' but they come to town and get stuck.

They cannot use the bus lanes and they see the public transport buses going past. They are taking vehicles off the road, which has a great environmental effect and also a great social impact in allowing these people to be active in the community and engage in the social event they have come down to see, but they cannot get their buses in the bus lanes. The bus driver is left sitting there saying, 'Well, that's a bus lane. I'm a bus. Why can't I travel in that lane?' Again, that legislation really does need to be looked at.

For me, it is a priority to allow these businesses to grow and allow people to get better access to facilities. Bearing in mind that they are driving buses and that there is a bus lane, how can we not work something out and make something happen? That was a great recommendation put forward by the MTA that I would be very keen to explore if I were in government, but our government has again just shelved it saying, 'We will have a look at somewhere down the track.' It is work to be done, as far as a future reform is concerned.

It concerns me that the government is shelving some of these future reforms that could actually help grow our state and grow businesses. That one example could create a lot of opportunities for regional bus companies to be more active, generate more work, have people more socially involved in events in the city and really help add to what is going on in South Australia and make people engaged with events that are happening, It has great potential for growth.

Another issue that interests me relates to caravans. This is again a future proposal, a future reform the government has flagged. Why they cannot look at this leaves me scratching my head. They are looking at shorter registration periods for caravans. Interestingly, not long into his tenure the Minister for Transport actually did introduce some legislation that allowed boat registrations to be over shorter periods—six months for certain size boats. I think they had to be under seven metres, if my memory serves me correctly.

That was a great idea, which was well received by the boating community. Someone might own a boat and only use it in the summertime. They might have a holiday away over the summer period with their family but they only use their boat for six months of the year. Under the old legislation, they might have sold their boat or might not have purchased a boat. Saving money on the rego and only registering the boat for six months seems like a really good idea.

I commend the minister for doing that, but here we are now talking about it for caravans and it really is the same sort of fit. I am a caravan owner myself. I have a 1964 Millard. Glenn McGrath, of course, owned a Millard, which was in fact his nickname because he lived in his Millard. My Millard is probably not able to be lived in, but it is a caravan and my family use it around Easter time at best. We mainly have the caravan because my wife takes away so much stuff that we have to put it in the van and take it away for a weekend, but that is a whole other story.

The point of this is it would be great to be able to just register this caravan for the six months that it is needed, not to register it for the whole year. This is something that the government is looking at, and I can see real growth in the industry and real growth in the caravanning sector where you could entice someone in. They might want to start off with a 1964 Millard much like mine, and they might do it for six months and then realise they like it, get a bigger caravan and help grow that industry.

Again, the government have that flagged, but the point I make is that is flagged under future reforms. The government have done that work with the boats, and we commend them for that, but now they have an opportunity to do this with caravans, and what do they do? In reality, they have balked at it and not put the work in. They have not done the work around this.

This is a great idea. Again, what we are looking at here is saving money for families, improving the cost of living for families in South Australia and helping businesses out because it is another sales point that these caravan industries would have when they sold their products. It is a

chance to help grow industry, jobs and businesses in South Australia, so it is a win-win for everyone. I cannot see why the government have not looked at this as they did with boats. I think boats under seven metres can have the six-month registration. Potentially, you could do it for smaller vans. As I said, the 1964 Millard might fit into that category as well. You may not do it for the bigger vans.

When I look at this list, probably the most impressive things the government have put forward are unfortunately the future reforms. They are the things that potentially have the most to offer. I look at that with great interest and wonder why, again, the government is talking about lots of stuff but not doing lots of stuff to take South Australia forward. Another issue I note with interest is one I look at from an innovation point of view. Whilst the 1964 Millard may not interest younger people with what they are looking to do in life, I look at something that is captured under broader transport reforms. Again, this a future reform, so it is not something the government is doing straightaway.

I look at Segways, those fancy little two-wheeled scooters you see around the place but not on the roads or footpaths in South Australia. Whenever I have travelled interstate, and on a couple of occasions I have been lucky enough to go overseas, I have seen this great innovative tourism opportunity where people are taken on tours on these Segways. People are all helmeted up and speed limited, but again this is an area where we could create a potential business for a young entrepreneur here in South Australia, right across the state. We do have a couple, and I commend the people who do it up in the wine region, I think. There are maybe a few other regions where they do it on private property.

With our wonderful Riverbank Precinct that South Australia should be very proud of, and our wonderful city, suburbs and surrounds, we have so many opportunities. By looking at this legislation—not keeping it on the 'to be done' list or future reforms list but looking at stuff that we really could and should be doing right now—we could open up opportunities for South Australia. By changing this legislation, by looking at ways in which we can get this happening here in South Australia and by having a bit of initiative, we could create more tourism opportunities for an up-and-coming business around the city.

I mentioned the operation we have in South Australia in Seppeltsfield. This is one that is done on private property so it is fully legitimate, but this could be brought onto the roads. I think I have seen it in San Francisco, and I might have even seen it in Central Park, New York. I could be wrong, but I have been looking on the internet and have seen it in a few of these places, and it looks very exciting.

There is not a lot of work for the government to do because they can look not too far from our own borders and see where this is happening. I see this as being exciting for South Australia, and that is a big part of the reason why I have come into this place. We need to look at opportunities that will really excite South Australians and get businesses moving here in this state.

I looked at where this was happening close to our shores to see how we could implement this here and what would need to be done. We would not be reinventing the wheel or even reinventing the Segway for that matter; it could be very easy to do. The Northern Territory has looked at this and made a couple of quite simple reforms. They have allowed this to happen on shared paths and very safe places. Victoria is also trialling a pilot at the moment, which they started in August this year. They are doing it, too. Again, we are being left behind.

One of the great things about South Australia is that we are not as congested and overpopulated as perhaps the major cities in Victoria or New South Wales. Brisbane and Perth have a bigger population base. We are a smaller city, so let's look to leverage that. This is where opportunity lies for South Australia. We have wider streets and we have great facilities where an industry like this could evolve. It could be a whole lot of fun doing a Segway tour around the Adelaide Oval. It would be a chance to value capture from the investment we have made in that facility if a business were able to start up around that. The legislation is there, the regulations are there and the opportunities are there to create this.

People will say that there are concerns about all sorts of things. The legislation interstate has Segways very much tempered around the legislation regarding motor scooters or scooters that elderly people often use around the city. They are speed limited. There are a whole heap of things that could be put in place. Again, that is work that perhaps the minister or the Premier should have

had the department doing, looking at how we could follow on from what is happening in the Northern Territory, and Queensland for that matter. There is some very sensible legislation up there as well regarding how they are going to make it happen. As I mentioned, Victoria is trialling it as well.

South Australia is falling behind some of these other states. That is a classic example of where we could be using innovative, exciting ideas to help make South Australia a leader and give young entrepreneurs the opportunity to grow their businesses and grow jobs in this state. Again, I stress the point that this is another reform that the government has put as a 'future reform'. It is stuff they are going to look at down the track. It has been 15 years. Let's not kid ourselves, it has been a long 15 years under this government and people are starting to get tired of missing opportunities like this. The government is really just leaving this behind. We are really keen to see these future opportunities be grabbed.

Another issue they are looking at is unfair contract terms for small businesses. As the shadow minister for small business, I think this should be at the top of the list. Again, small businesses and businesses in the state are vital to keeping South Australia pumping. That is where growth will come from. If we can get a small business to employ one more person, we can add hundreds of thousands of jobs in this state, and that is what we need. We need jobs, so we should do anything we can to help undo unfair contract terms. That is something that the government is again looking at as a future reform, but I think it needs to be addressed and worked on straightaway so that we can create jobs for South Australians. That is what is important.

We need to put the vibrancy back into South Australia and we need to get people working. We need to create jobs and get people into jobs so that people will stick around. The number of people who leave South Australia is not good; we lose a lot of our young up-and-coming talent who really could help take this state forward. It is little things like this that do not help our state. They are a couple of examples.

That is some of the legislation the government has been working on. I argue that maybe they have been looking at the wrong ones. Maybe there are some others that would have been more important. My colleague David Ridgway from the other place goes out and speaks to a lot of the industry and stakeholder groups with whom he is heavily engaged and he has a couple of concerns as well.

He is a little unclear as to which industry groups have either recommended or endorsed the proposed amendments to the various PIRSA legislation in particular. We know that the government has had some feedback. On the website, there are six or eight groups that have lodged feedback; others have apparently emailed their thoughts. Exactly what those thoughts were, whether they were pro or against some of the changes, we do not really know, so that is a bit unclear.

The Hon. David Ridgway, as I mentioned, will be out like the rest of my colleagues consulting on these changes to ensure that there is industry support for this bill. He has also raised questions about amendments to the Aquaculture Act 2001. He has noted that clause 8 will allow the minister to approve licence conditions and variations without referring to the EPA, and he would like to know who suggested this change and what the implications may be. There has been a bit of lack of clarity with this bill as it has come forward. That is why I again mention that we would not oppose this bill in the House of Assembly but will reserve our right to consider amendments in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. David Ridgway from the other place also had some concerns around the Fisheries Management Act 2007. It was noted that clause 57 enables the minister to cancel a licence, permit or registration if has been suspended for more than six months of non-payment or if that holder cannot be located. While we understand the intent of the clause, it may affect the way financial institutions view licences as security. That is one thing that we will be seeking some further information about as well.

Clause 59 of the Fisheries Management Act also changes the presumption of innocence; that is, if someone is accused of trafficking a species, it will be presumed that if there is no proof suggesting otherwise, the person has the species in their possession and is therefore guilty of the offence. This is something that we would like to explore a little further. Similarly, in clause 61, it states that a permit granted by the minister:

(a) is not transferable; and

(b) is subject to such conditions as the Minister thinks fit—

and allows the minister to revoke or vary conditions at any time. Again, there are concerns that this may have the same implications as clause 59, and we would like more information about the full extent of the proposed provision. So, there are concerns about these changes and the additional powers the minister will have. As I have mentioned, the Hon. David Ridgway from the other place will be looking into that. If there are more questions or issues raised around that, we will be raising those in the other chamber.

I talked about consultation. It has been interesting and maybe murky at best. The process was that people were called to have their say and as far as I am led to believe, as I pointed out a few moments ago, if they sent through their application it was tabled on the website and you could read it. I think there were half a dozen or maybe eight that appeared on the website. If it was sent through as an email request, it was not open to the public and we were not entitled to see or know what these people had claimed, whether they were saying they were good, bad or indifferent. So, again, it is hard to have that communication.

I go back to that point of communication because I think it is vitally important that we keep those lines of communication open when we are talking to stakeholders. I note with interest that the government is saying, 'Well, we did engage with a whole heap of stakeholders.' In fact, they have provided us with a list of stakeholders to whom they sent the actual report on Simplify Day. These were organisations that the government sent the information to once Simplify Day had happened. There were only a handful that were listed on the website but more were sent the information when Simplify Day happened. It is not entirely clear, but we will keep working through that, and we are happy to keep working with the government in that space. I just stress the point that communication is very helpful.

I do drive back to the point I made earlier that, whilst this has some good intentions—cutting red tape is always a good thing—I am interested to hear from the Premier or the member carrying this bill as to how much money has been calculated will be saved and how many jobs will be created. I think that would be a very important fact and figure. Also, how do they justify that these jobs will be created? That is what we want to do with red tape: we want to simplify things and make it easier for businesses to operate in South Australia. Ideally, we want to make it easier for businesses to operate in South Australia than in other state, to attract more business to South Australia and grow our state.

We know that is what we need to do to grow jobs and keep people working in South Australia. We know where our unemployment rate sits across the nation and how low it has been for such a long time. They are a couple of things that we want to talk about. As far as the consultation is concerned, I have managed to get onto a couple of people as far as that is concerned. I spoke to the Property Council and I know they have been back in touch with the Premier about a couple of issues that they raised. As they looked at the bill, one of the points they made was that the significant areas of reform they identified were not really covered. They talked about strata titles, easements, registrations of titles, adaptive re-use of existing building stock and trading hours.

We have talked a lot about trading hours on this side of the house. We see the opportunity to open up trading hours and create far more opportunities for businesses in South Australia to be open more hours. Again, we talk about innovative operations now and we know that the advent of online shopping really has eaten into the traditional method of shopping. I could probably steer these comments towards younger people, but I am probably not young and I do look at online shopping as well. Online shopping is something everyone is getting into these days and that makes it harder for bricks and mortar businesses, so we need to give bricks and mortar businesses more opportunities to trade and sell their wares as well.

That is why we have looked at the shop trading hours and we think it is a great policy. The South Australians we speak to, communicate with and listen to tell us that they would like the shops to be open more often. A classic example is my local Foodland just down the road. It has a great proprietor and it is very handy, being only 150 metres from my house.

My local Foodland really probably operates as my pantry. I do not need to keep much in the pantry at home because we can always go down and top up. In fact, I often go down, buy my milk and bread, then realise I need something else, so I whiz down and top up two or three times. After I

have done it two or three times, if I have still forgotten something I will often ask one of the kids to go down and do it for me. It is really handy, we have a great relationship, it creates a great community atmosphere and we like to support our local business.

My point is that the other morning we got up and my wife wanted me to do some jobs around the house. We had some work that needed to be done, and she is much better at that than I am, but she thought it would be a good idea. I said, 'That's great. How about I make breakfast first?' I thought I could buy myself half an hour to read the paper and have some breakfast with her, which I like to do on a Sunday morning. I said, 'I will make some bacon and eggs and cook that up.' She said, 'That's fine. No worries at all.'

I went to the fridge and we were out of eggs, and bacon for that matter. I thought, 'I will just whiz down to the shop.' It was 9 o'clock on a Sunday morning. I thought I would go and get the stuff from my local Foodland and come back, but of course the Foodland was shut. I could not get my bacon and eggs, so I suggested to my wife that we wait until 11am and I could go down there then. She said, 'Fat chance, big fella. We'll have some muesli and get into those jobs.' I do not really like muesli, so it was a disappointing morning for me and I was into the jobs far earlier than I had hoped and planned.

The point is that the opportunity was there to go to my local supermarket, support my local business but that money was not spent. That money did not go into his pocket and it did not help support my local business. I think shop trading hours really will open up a lot of opportunities for businesses to grow and to give different offerings, too. There is a great opportunity for businesses to be entrepreneurial, to be forward thinking and to give greater offerings to allow more opportunities for South Australians to shop and spend their money locally, which we know is important. We hear the government talk a lot about 'shop local', but you cannot shop local if the shops are not open, so I am interested to see if the government is going to get behind this and support our shop trading hours reforms, which I think have a great upside for all South Australians.

The Property Council also talked about competitive utilities prices. We know about the high price of electricity in South Australia. We have the highest electricity prices in the state. We pay a lot for our electricity and, of course, we have the most unreliable electricity supply as well. We know about the recent blackout. I do not want to go over old wounds or old ground, but we know that the state did black out. We know that industry was hit savagely by these blackouts. We know companies like BHP and Arrium were hit with costs in the millions—$20 million plus in losses they suffered because of that power blackout, and that damages confidence, too.

I have talked about this before in this place, where people think, 'That's fine. We have a blackout. We put the candles on at home, we might play a board game and not watch TV.' That is nice for the four, five, six, eight or 10 hours, or whatever it was at your place that you had the blackout, but it really damages business. Industry and business look at South Australia and think, 'Do we want to take our money and set up in South Australia?' They might have an industry they might want to bring here that actually needs reliable energy and reliable power supplies at a competitive price. When they look at the situation we have in South Australia, they just say, 'No. No, we don't want to go to South Australia because of those impediments,' because we do not have competitive utility prices. The ramifications of that blackout are going to be felt for a very, very long time, and that is something we are conscious of.

They are the areas that the Property Council identified. I will run through them again: strata titles, easements, the registration of titles, adaptive re-use of existing building stock, trading hours, and competitive utilities prices. They were the issues they raised. They were not even in the future reforms. We have talked about things being future reforms, and here is quite a big industry group saying, 'These are things we think are important,' though I must say that adaptive re-use was flagged for potential opportunity beyond 2017. That is the only one that was flagged as a future issue.

We know that the adaptive re-use of Adelaide buildings is something that we on this side of the chamber have supported and put forward as a policy. We think it is a very important thing, and we note that the government has grabbed onto that initiative that we put up. They are looking at it, as I said, for potential opportunity beyond 2017. We would like to see legislation to allow for easier adaptive re-use of buildings constructed prior to 1980. We think this is a big opportunity to breathe

some life into vacant buildings in the City of Adelaide and increase property values right around the state.

The figures show that D-grade building stock has a vacancy rate of almost 21 per cent, and that is the highest recorded level in Adelaide. The C-grade building stock has a vacancy rate of almost 18 per cent, and this is the highest level in 12 years. So, there are opportunities there with this legislation. It is good to see that the government has flagged the potential opportunity to look at the adaptive re-use of existing building stock beyond 2017, but it is something that we have been calling for and believe will help to grow business and grow jobs in South Australia. We know that is vitally important.

As we talk more about this bill and we look at where there are potential opportunities—and again, they are future opportunities, and we have asked why they are not being addressed now—we see some of the things that the government has done. This is my concern with this bill: great intentions, poor delivery. That is potentially the history of what this government has delivered a lot in recent times. It brings me to compare this bill with other projects the government has done. Let's start by talking about child protection, because this is something very dear to my heart. A lot of constituents in my local community come to talk to me about this and I listen to what they have to say.

The government yesterday released its 'Child protection: a fresh start' document. I am not sure how many fresh starts you can have when you make such grave mistakes in this area, as this government has. We know and understand that this is a delicate area, and we know and understand the issues that go with it. I get very passionate when I talk about this. We know the issues, we know there are problems, and we know that it needs work all the time, but the failings of this system by this government are really damning. When we look at legislation and whether or not this government gets it right, we can go through the history of child protection in South Australia and the parliamentary select committee on families that took place in November 2009.

Over two years, the select committee received 92 written submissions and heard evidence from 38 witnesses. In that, notably there were what I suppose you would call whistleblowers from the department who spoke about their concerns. Bear in mind that this is 2009. The report handed down revealed that there were a number of failures, and not just one or two, but a big number of failures within the department. There was talk of cover-ups and problems that were going on there. I think it was outlined in 2009 that the agency was in crisis. That was 2009, and we stand here today in 2016.

The Debelle inquiry in July 2013 was another independent inquiry into education after it was revealed in this place in November 2012—before I was here, I know, but it was something that was very much talked about in my community at the time—that parents of children who attended a school in Adelaide's western suburbs were not informed, were kept in the dark for two years, that an out-of-school-hours care worker had raped a seven year old. That is a really, really poor system to have had in place. That is the concern, when we look at the legislation before us, that this goes on.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Newland has a point of order.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Ma'am, we have progressed from the somewhat large discussion on regulation through to the Debelle inquiry. I think perhaps if we could bring the debate back to the bill at hand, that would be good.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, we have allowed the member for Mitchell to range fairly widely, but I know he is going to come right back—

Mr WINGARD: I appreciate that, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We have allowed you to range really widely, so we just would like to remind you that we are listening.

Mr WINGARD: I understand that, Deputy Speaker, and I appreciate that. I am little bit concerned that the member for Newland raises child protection and talking about child protection as an issue, as do others on that side of the house. We on this side of the house see this as a very, very important point. The point I am making is that, as we go through the failures of the government

when it comes to their child protection system, there are concerns within bills that, if you do not get it right, grave things can happen.

In the simplify bill, it is not to the same extent, but the point that I am making is that, as we go on through Chloe Valentine, Shannon McCoole and now the Nyland royal commission with that child protection issue, the government has got it wrong time and time again. I started with the select inquiry in 2009. It is now 2016, and the government is looking for a fresh start. The point I am making is that I do not think the government deserves a fresh start when it comes to running South Australia.

Mr PICTON: Point of order: I think we all agree that child protection is an important issue, but there is nothing in this bill specifically about that, so I ask the member to return to the subject of the bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have asked the member for Mitchell to be mindful that we have let him have a very, very wideranging debate, and he really does need to focus on the actual bill.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and again I do not resile from the fact that I find child protection as a very—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: So, you are going to ignore me again?

Mr WINGARD: No, I am happy to move on. I am just making my point, Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay, that would be good, thank you.

Mr WINGARD: —that I find child protection—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WINGARD: —very important. Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Again, to have people on the other side—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, member for Mitchell, you are talking to me, and you said you would move on.

Mr WINGARD: And I will, and I say to you—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Straightaway.

Mr WINGARD: —thank you for your protection. It probably leads me to talk about the nuclear dump which is another issue. We talk about social licence and talking with communities. There are issues that I could go on about for hours: child protection, Transforming Health, the nuclear dump. We could talk about the Attorney-General, the deputy leader, becoming an SC. That is another issue, and it could even take me on to talk about the Minister for Water and his foul language when he attends meetings. This government has dropped the ball.

As we look back at this legislation, there are some things that the government has not done and that probably concerns me as much as some of the things they have done. One of the things they have done is to strike a pen through a couple of pieces of outdated legislation that do not have any impact on anything at the moment. There are other things that have been put forward to make sure that we have the right consultation, that they have listened. We will be doing that, and I made the point right at the start that we will make sure that we engage with, listen to and talk with the relevant industry groups and people involved in making some changes to this legislation. With that, the member for Fisher has pointed out that I have gone on. I would just like to remind her that as lead speaker I can speak on this bill for as long as I like and just—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is almost like responding to a silent interjection because I did not hear her actually say anything to you.

Mr WINGARD: I can assure you, Deputy Speaker, it was said. I am just making the point that everyone in the house knows how this operates, and I appreciate your time on that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And we have been very, very lenient in letting you go as widely as you wished up to the moment when members raised points of order. You are winding up; I will let you go.

Mr WINGARD: I will, Deputy Speaker, and I will just say that my concerns have been raised. I am glad that I had the opportunity to document most of them, even though I was cut short on a couple of points that I think really need to be addressed in this place. At the next opportunity, I will make those points again because I think they are issues that South Australians are very concerned about.

We know that this is a great state. We want to make this a great state, but after 14 years of this government I fear that we are not in that position, that we have been dragged further down the list of productive states in this nation. I believe that we are better than that. I believe that we have a brighter future than that, and I think a change of government will allow that to happen.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:49): If we are going to be relying on the opposition to provide ideas about the future of this state, we will be in a very sorry state. I might add that it was funny just listening to the member for Mitchell and his complaint about not being able to have a discussion about the nuclear issue. The only people stopping a discussion about the nuclear issue in this state are the opposition. So, it is a bit rich for him to come in here and complain about not being able to talk about the nuclear issue.

I also noted that all his complaints about not going far enough came from ideas outlined in government documents. It is not like the opposition has come in here with their own list of regulations they think should be overturned, repealed or changed; we are seeing that they are just listing off things we say we are going to do—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is called to—

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: The government is saying that it is going to do at some—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down. Member for Hartley—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hartley, you are called to order, and if you defy me I will have to warn you.

Mr Tarzia: Thank you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, don't say 'thank you'; actually take it on board. The member for Newland.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: The member for Hartley—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Back to the debate, please.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Yes, ma'am. We have not seen the opposition come in here with their own list of regulations. What we have seen is them complaining that we are not moving fast enough on all the things we have pointed out. They have no ideas of their own, and that is what we can expect in the future I think.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: The part I want to speak particularly about is the areas of this bill accompanying regulations and an extensive list of future considerations for Simplify Day 2017 and beyond associated with the planning and transport sector.

The bill itself incorporates a number of reforms to reduce red tape and take away some of the burdens on both businesses and consumers in planning and transport. I will just touch on some of those now; the first is the heavy vehicle registration labels, and perhaps the most prominent of the immediate reforms in transport is the abolition of the requirement for heavy vehicles to have registration labels. This amendment has come about as a result of significant feedback from the heavy vehicle industry calling for this change.

From an industry perspective, this reform represents a real and practical reduction in red tape. It means that businesses with heavy vehicles no longer have to worry about keeping track of their registration labels at the risk of receiving a fine, and it also increases productivity for these businesses, who would otherwise need to call in their vehicles unnecessarily and take them off the road to arrange and change new labels.

From the perspective of reducing red tape in government, this amendment is expected to generate savings through greater efficiencies, including by removing the direct costs of label printing, processing and postage. The initiative demonstrates the government's increased uptake of digital technology in preference to paper-based systems. I might say that, from my point of view, the removal of stickers in my vehicles has been a good thing. I can do all my registrations on my private vehicle on the phone using the EzyReg app, which is an excellent function. The only time I ever need to visit Service SA offices now is to have photos taken.

Another reform relates to the Survey Advisory Committee. Included within the bill is the abolition of the Survey Advisory Committee. This initiative formalises what already happens in practice, where the review functions and initiatives coming from the profession are being delivered through the Institute of Surveyors, rather than through the Survey Advisory Committee. This reform gives effect to a recommendation in the government's Boards and Committees final report of 2014, which proposed to abolish the committee.

Although the committee was relevant during the early years of monitoring the functions of the Survey Act, this role has increasingly diminished over time, with the board no longer meeting regularly and with very few matters to discuss when meetings do occur. In addition, the Survey Advisory Committee currently duplicates many of the functions of the South Australian division of the Institute of Surveyors. This amendment abolishes the Survey Advisory Committee and transfers its functions to the Institute of Surveyors.

New motor vehicle pre-registration inspection is another area of reform. This regulation, made by the government on Simplify Day, removes the unnecessary requirement on the preconditions for registering new vehicles. Currently, a new vehicle cannot be registered until a report requiring various information in relation to that vehicle, such as the vehicle identification number, make and date of manufacture, is completed by a police officer or authorised person. An authorised person is someone working in the new vehicle dealer's business who has been certified to complete the report.

The regulation will remove the need to authorise, manage or audit persons authorised to carry out inspections. This means that the industry is no longer having to nominate authorised persons or hold documentation for audit purposes. This change represents little risk, as the department can verify new vehicle data against the National Exchange of Vehicle and Driver Information System.

Some of the things I will briefly mention in the planning and transport area included in the bill itself are:

- allowing the minister to grant the Rail Commissioner standing approval to exercise powers under the Rail Commissioner Act 2009 that would otherwise require the minister's consent and approval. This will mean that the Rail Commissioner can carry out operations like installing and maintaining traffic control devices, maintenance of trains and tracks, and overseeing day-to-day administrative staff functions and getting rid of the need to confer unnecessarily with the minister;
- removing an unnecessary duplication between the Australian Road Rules and the South Australian legislation relating to the restriction of selling goods and services on the side of the road by simply repealing the South Australian prohibition to leave the single prohibition at the national level; and
- removing the redundant voluntary mandatory alcohol interlock scheme, under which a disqualified driver could obtain their licence sooner if they agreed to the installation of an interlock device. The voluntary scheme was discontinued in May 2009 when the scheme

became mandatory for drivers convicted of a serious drink-driving offence. There are no longer any participants in the voluntary scheme.

The additional regulatory reforms include removing redundant provisions established in 2008 which covered a transition period of appointing independent members to council development assessment panels, and removing redundant child restraint standards provisions in our South Australian legislation, as these have been superseded by the current Australian standard for child restraint requirements.

I note some of the future commitments this bill has introduced on parliament's Simplify Day, and the regulations made by the Governor on that day are certainly not the end of the government's work in red-tape reductions. As was announced on Simplify Day, the government is committed to continual efforts in red-tape reduction, signalled by the annual Simplify Day process. In particular, the government has identified a wide range of potential future reforms in the area of transport going to 2017 and beyond, including:

- allowing private or charter buses to use bus lanes. I think this is a big change for the charter bus industry, and is expected to assist in boosting tourism. This is a great idea;
- allowing for the optional postal delivery of number plates direct from the manufacturer of the plates to the vehicle owner, skipping the need for people to attend Service SA to collect their plates, another convenience for consumers;
- removing duplication in the medical fitness-to-drive assessment required for a drivers licence and passenger transport driver accreditation, reducing costs and administrative burden. I actually have a couple of constituents in my electorate who are in the position of having to get two doctors' checks within perhaps a month or two of each other for essentially the same purpose, so removing that burden would be an excellent result for them;
- providing an option for owners of light trailers and caravans to have a six-monthly registration when currently only three-month and 12-month options are available;
- allowing trials for Segway tours to operate along the Riverbank Precinct, which is a great idea, with a view to allowing a framework for these devices to be used in the CBD and popular tourist areas;
- simplifying accessibility of the conditional registration for historic left-hand drive and street road vehicles to allow greater opportunity for enthusiasts of these vehicles, particularly attracting more of these niche industries in South Australia. I think while the minister is doing that he might want to check those historic vehicles, especially those that are imported, American muscle cars and those sorts of things. They are very, very strict on original equipment and changes to wheels and tyres, etc., and it is becoming increasingly difficult to find original parts. Allowing some form of mild modifications, as they do in other states, would be an excellent addition to that work;
- removing duplication and unnecessary forms associated with the process of authorising driving instructors to conduct heavy vehicle licence assessments;
- introducing simpler access to low-risk events held on roads, particularly those that flow rather than static events, such as the Tour Down Under passing through town;
- allowing farmers to tow their field bins in particular circumstances along public roads, making it easier for farmers to go about their day-to-day business (and I know my brother-in-law, Joe Honner from Yorketown, would be very pleased about that); and
- removing the requirement for new light vehicles to be inspected before they are registered to transport passengers, given that all these vehicles are already required to meet Australian design rules. This will remove the red tape for tour operators and other passenger service operators.

I understand many of these future commitments were put forward by the transport minister as a result of the substantial feedback he has received from industry.

All these reforms relating to transport and planning are only one aspect of the Simplify Day initiative which is, in itself, only one part of the government's red tape reduction agenda, and the government has evidenced a clear intention of continuing ongoing reduction of red tape, helping South Australian businesses to thrive.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the excellent work of the parliamentary secretary in this area. I am particularly impressed by his organisational skills and the way he has been able to pull together quite disparate parts of government. It is a mundane task in many ways but it is a very important task, and he is to be commended for the work he has done in that area. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Tarzia.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:01.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (HEAVY VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES) BILL

Message from Governor

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—
Grant, District Council of Annual Report 2015-16
Onkaparinga, City of Annual Report 2015-16
Streaky Bay, District Council of Annual Report 2015-16

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Administrator National Health Funding Pool—Annual Report 2015-16
Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency—Annual Report 2015-16
Health Performance Council—Annual Report 2015-16
Health Services Charitable Gifts Board—Annual Report 2015-16
Lifetime Support Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2015-16
National Health Funding Body—Annual Report 2015-16
National Health Practitioner Ombudsman and Privacy Commissioner—Annual Report 2015-16
Pharmacy Regulation Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2015-16
South Australian Medical Educational and Training Health Advisory Council—Annual Report 2015-16
South Australian Public Health Council—Annual Report 2015-16
Veterans Health Advisory Council—Annual Report 2015-16

By the Minister for The Arts (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Adelaide Festival Centre—Annual Report 2015-16
Adelaide Festival Corporation—Annual Report 2015-16
Adelaide Film Festival—Annual Report 2015-16
Art Gallery of South Australia—Annual Report 2015-16
Carclew—Annual Report 2015-16

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2015-16
South Australian Government Financing Authority—Annual Report 2015-16

By the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Communities and Social Inclusion, Department for—Annual Report 2015-16

By the Minister for the Status of Women (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Social Development Committee—Domestic and Family Violence—Response from Government dated December 2016—2016

By the Minister for Ageing (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Office for the Ageing—Annual Report 2015-16

By the Minister for Multicultural Affairs (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission—Annual Report 2015-16

Question Time

QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO ALTERNATIVE MINISTER

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and Housing and Urban Development is feeling unwell today. His transport and infrastructure questions will be taken by the Treasurer and the housing and urban development questions will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The appending of postnominals is prohibited.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Minister for Health. Why did the government sign a $12 billion contract to build and operate the new Royal Adelaide Hospital that does not address ramifications for noncompliance?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:06): Well, it does. It was very interesting to see the Hon. Stephen Wade once again completely out of his depth—

An honourable member: Wading in.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —wading in, quoting comments he had only heard second-hand. How extraordinary! The simple fact is that that assertion by the Hon. Stephen Wade is not an accurate representation of what Justice Blue was saying.

The second point I would make is that we do have a very strong contract. That contract does have ramifications for noncompliance. Those penalties amount to at least $1 million a day for every day that hospital doesn't reach technical completion. The government will be seeking compensation for other areas as well. The fact is we do have a very strong contract, and that contract does protect the interests of South Australian taxpayers.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): A supplementary: are there any provisions included in the contract for the government to seek liquidated damages?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:07): I will get advice about exactly what I can say, but I will reiterate what I said in my previous answer.

Mr Marshall: It's either in the contract, or it's not.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: This contract protects the interests of taxpayers.

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: This contract does provide for penalties. It does mean that every single day that this hospital is not delivered SAHP are forgoing approximately $1 million a day. That is $1 million a day—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —coming off the total cost of the contract; $1 million a day that South Australian taxpayers are better off when this hospital is not being delivered along the time lines provided for in the contract. As I said, we will be seeking compensation for other issues as well. These issues are playing out in the courts, and I am very confident of a satisfactory resolution of these issues, but my first priority will always be the safety of patients. Unlike the opposition, I will not go weak at the knees and I will not be compromising on patient safety because I get intimidated, unlike the opposition who are so easily intimidated by the big boys from New South Wales who come over. They are quite happy to do their bidding—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —ignore doctors, ignore patients and ignore the safety issues with these hospitals.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No. 98.

The SPEAKER: Are you claiming it was debate?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order, and in that pause I call to order the members for Mitchell, Hartley, Hammond, Adelaide and Chaffey. Leader.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): Are there any provisions included in the contract to redress the cost to taxpayers of having to pay to maintain the old Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:09): We will go into all these things and I will get advice. All I need to say is that, if the Leader of the Opposition is really interested in this issue, I would be more than happy to organise for him to get a briefing about exactly what are the provisions of the contract, all of the provisions in there. I am more than happy to organise for the Leader of the Opposition, if he has detailed questions of this nature, to get a briefing. But the bottom line is this: unlike the opposition, I am not interested—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am not going to be intimidated by the big boys from New South Wales. My first priority will always be the safety of patients.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Same point of order, for the same debate.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think they were the same words. I uphold the point of order. It has also been drawn to my attention that there was some contretemps before lunch and, as a result of that, the member for Mitchell is now on a warning.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And the member for Hartley is now on a warning, and I call to order the members for Newland and Davenport. Leader.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Minister for Health. Is the $1 million a day figure that the minister claims the government is saving through the delayed opening of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital the same delay costs that HYLC Joint Venture says it will be seeking to recover from the government in legal proceedings?

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) (14:11): Well, you will need to speak to HYLC about the basis for their supposed claim, but I can make one thing very, very clear: there are critical issues with that hospital that need to be fixed before it is safe to put patients in there. I have to say that I am rather surprised that the opposition would be so quick to hop into bed with multinational corporates, with the big side of town, from the Eastern States rather than sticking up for the rights of South Australians and, in particular, caring for the safety of patients.

There are critical defects that need to be fixed before it is safe to be moving into that hospital, and the opposition are seriously trying to suggest that somehow the builder is being let off lightly and there are no penalties. Well, they are making a big fuss for someone who isn't being exposed to significant penalties because of their failure to deliver a hospital on time and a hospital that is safe and ready for patients.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. Caica: You're going to get thrown out again today, Steven. Nothing surer.

The SPEAKER: On that topic of being thrown out, which the member for Colton rightly raises, I call to order the members for Morialta, Finniss and Colton. I warn the member for Morialta; and I warn for the second and the final time the member for Mount Gambier, who had a warning from the pre-luncheon contretemps, and also the leader. Leader.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given that the 2016-17 budget assumed that the first day that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital would be open for business would be tomorrow, what is the new date of commercial acceptance that SA Health has advised Treasury to use in the Mid-Year Budget Review?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:13): Those dates will, of course, be revised and taken in the Mid-Year Budget Review, but that will be a very conservative position from the budget point of view, as you would always expect from Treasury. But that will be in the Mid-Year Budget Review.

CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How does the minister consider suspending three employees identified in the Shannon McCoole case as representing the government's response to Nyland recommendation 144 as being completed, when they are still employed by the department?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:14): It is difficult for me to talk in detail, of course, about individual employees, but the employees who have been stood aside as a result of the investigations following the Shannon McCoole case are under various forms of investigation or under some form of process. Clearly, there are industrial restrictions on at what point separation can occur, but the fact is that, while they are not working with children, that element of the decision has been taken.

CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): Supplementary: given that the report tabled by the government yesterday in response to the Nyland royal commission

recommendation 144 says that this action is completed, why is the minister telling us that in relation to those three employees, their employment is still under review?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:15): If I can read from the publicly available document, 'The Department for Education and Child Development has taken action to suspend these employees.'

CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Supplementary: are those employees still on full pay?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:15): Very clearly, the chief executive is responsible for managing staff—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Very clearly, the staff that are referred to in this context—which are not the staff, incidentally, that I was referring to previously, having misunderstood the question—have been suspended as a result of the report from Margaret Nyland in August. Having been suspended, as we have accurately reported, that has been addressed. What happens from the point of suspension is a matter for the chief executive to manage under the current industrial relations requirements.

CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): Can the minister perhaps provide some clarity to the parliament as to when this recommendation from Margaret Nyland will actually be complete and the government will determine the ongoing suitability for employment in their role, as outlined in the recommendation?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:16): Again, this is a matter for the chief executive to manage; however, what is quite clear is that the suitability has been assessed and staff have been suspended. That is a resolution of the consideration of suitability. What happens from now on is a matter for industrial conditions to be followed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before the leader asks a further question, I warn the member for Morialta for the second and the final time. The minister's replies are not in the least provocative; there is no suggestion that they are debate, yet she is being met with a wall of interruptions. The next member of the opposition to utter anything outside standing orders during the Minister for Education's answer will be leaving, and if it is more than one member, so be it. Leader.

CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): When will the department make a decision about the ongoing suitability of the three suspended Families SA workers identified in recommendation 144? When will the department make a determination about their suitability for employment in their current roles?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:17): I will seek a detailed answer from the chief executive, and that will be able to be made public whenever is appropriate, given that we are talking about the employment of individuals.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. Can the minister now identify how many of the 102 Families SA staff identified in the Hyde review are still employed by the agency, and how many are currently suspended on full pay?

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) (14:18): I thank the honourable member for her question. I can indicate, as I think I did in answers yesterday, that the government is presently seeking some advice in relation to those matters, and as soon as we are in a position to advise the house about those matters, we will.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:18): Supplementary: given one of these employees was subsequently arrested for child abuse offences, why is dealing with these staff not a higher priority for 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) (14:19): Again I thank the honourable member for her question. I reject the premise of the question, which is that this is not a high priority for the government, and I emphasise—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I emphasise that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Adelaide.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:19): Supplementary: how much did Families SA spend on salaries and wages for staff who were on suspension in the 2015-16 and current financial years?

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) (14:19): Obviously I would need to seek some advice about that because I am not presently in a position to say exactly how many people and at what rates of pay those people were operating. What I can say to members is this, and this is a matter which I think might be helpful in understanding the situation in which we all find ourselves: as a matter of appropriate management of staff, it is neither appropriate nor lawful to dismiss people on suspicion without due process.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If there is a serious allegation made against a staff member, it is entirely appropriate that, depending on the nature of the allegation, perhaps that staff member be moved by the chief executive from a place in which they are perceived potentially to be problematic to another place where they are not going to be problematic, or in other circumstances it may be entirely appropriate that that individual be suspended from service altogether. But there is a significant difference between suspending a person pending the completion of an investigation of allegations against that individual and terminating that person on the basis of an allegation.

If a person who is the subject of an allegation, whether it be in the public sector or private sector, is terminated from their employment without due process and without that person being given the opportunity to hear the allegations made against them, to respond to those allegations as they may see appropriate and for their responses to be properly considered and weighed in the balance, that person has the opportunity to seek a remedy against whoever their employer might be, whether that be the state or somebody else. The state, as an employer, is obliged to observe these rules, and the state is an employer that should aspire to be a model employer in particular. I just make the point.

I will try to find out the answer to the question in terms of the dollars and the number of people concerned, but let's all be very clear about this: just because an allegation is made against an individual, that allegation may not be substantiated. That allegation may be untrue, it may be malicious, or it may be completely accurate, and appropriate disciplinary action, which might include being shifted about or termination, should occur, but only after due process.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:23): Supplementary: what would be a reasonable time for an investigation, given it has been about 28 months?

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) (14:23): I am not sure exactly what the honourable member is trying to say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would anyone like a question?

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Why is staff morale the Premier's measure for a successful child protection system, rather than keeping children safe?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:23): It is because our front-line staff are at the centre of our child protection system. They are the people who go in—

Mr Marshall: That's your number one priority?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is, actually. It is, because they are the people—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I know those opposite don't care about the morale of our staff and are prepared to attack our child protection workers at every turn, but the truth is that the last person who seeks to help is the first person they accuse, and they have been pointing the finger at our child protection workers for years and years and years. This is some of the most difficult work that occurs in government: going into difficult families, going into places that many of those opposite would not dare to even actually go near—would not even dare to put themselves in this position.

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, Mr Speaker: 98 and 127.

The SPEAKER: No.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Those opposite, who feign this concern for these poor impoverished families where some of the most difficult and awful things happen—it is galling. I must say that I did enjoy the lecture we had from those opposite in the same radio interview, I might regard, from the Leader of the Opposition who said this was a crisis for 14 years. He said that this had been going on for so long and there hadn't been—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: 'Hear, hear!' they all say. Well, where was the child protection response from the Liberal Party of South Australia in the 2014 state election campaign? Zip, zero, nothing. Zip, zero, nothing for child protection centres. Where was the money? Where was the pledge? Where was the pledge in the election campaign of the additional resources that these children need? Zero. Where did the money go? To the big end of town: big land tax cuts, big handouts to the big end of town. This is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, that's right. Those opposite will be looking at those people who actually step up and look after some of the most impoverished families, some of the families that are facing the biggest challenges in our community. What we know is that the front-line

workers in our state who actually go into these families need our support. They need to make courageous decisions about whether to leave children in families, because it is a brave decision to leave a child in a family where you believe you can strengthen that family and ensure that that child is safe, or an equally courageous decision to remove that child from a family, which can be a brutal decision.

It is a brutal decision to take a child from their birth parents in the interests of that child. That is why the morale of our child protection workers, their understanding of their role, that very clear remit they have to put the interests of the child front and centre, is an incredibly important measure of success and an early measure of success. There is much to do in this system, but the first thing we need to do is make sure that those workers on the front line have the confidence and the support necessary to ensure that they are going to be a successful agency and that our children are safe.

RIGNEY-WILSON REVIEW

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister confirm whether a review of the Rigney-Wilson murders case has been undertaken, who undertook the review and whether she has read this review?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:28): The standard practice that occurs when a terrible tragedy occurs, such as that murder, if there has been any engagement with the family or any individuals with the department, is that there will be a senior practitioner's internal review of practice. That is then made available to the Coroner.

Any further investigation is delayed until after the Coroner has had an opportunity to consider all of the matters and then any subsequent investigations or reviews, such as the child death and serious injury committee, occur after that. So, there has been an internal review that is only for practitioners to determine whether there are any immediate lessons to take home. That is not made public by common practice because it is provided to the Coroner and then is able to be made public through that process.

RIGNEY-WILSON REVIEW

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:28): Have any staff been suspended as a result of this review?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:29): I have no advice to that effect.

SINKUNAS, MR M.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:29): My question is to the Treasurer. Given that the minister told parliament on 5 August 2014 that former small business commissioner Mike Sinkunas had resigned, why did taxpayers have to pay a total severance package of $296,000, plus accrued entitlements to recreation, long service and retention leave?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:29): We sought crown advice and followed it.

SINKUNAS, MR M.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:29): Why did the minister require Mr Sinkunas to agree not to make any disparaging statements about the minister, as a condition of the $296,000?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:29): It was a recommendation from the agency, and I followed their recommendations in full.

SINKUNAS, MR M.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:29): Supplementary: given that the agreement notes that if the minister is asked a question about the circumstances of the resignation of Mr Sinkunas, and he must answer that question truthfully, will the minister now indicate what was the allegation of improper conduct that was made against Mr Sinkunas and what was the result of the final investigation into that allegation of improper conduct?

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:30): Given the time that has transpired since the investigation, I will. I will return to the house with a detailed answer.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm that EPAS would have been ready to be deployed at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital at the original technical completion date of 4 April 2016—seven months ago—given that the Auditor-General's Report tabled yesterday contains a catalogue of issues yet to be resolved?

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:30): Yes, it would have. My advice is that if the hospital were ready today, EPAS would be ready to roll out. The reason why we have taken the decision not to roll out, not to have full functionality of EPAS upon the first day of opening the hospital, is simply to manage—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The member for Morphett is actually interested in this answer, I can tell. It's a pity that his colleagues don't show the same decency and politeness—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —that the member for Morphett shows. The simple answer to the question is, yes, it would have been ready, and it would be ready—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —were the hospital ready today. We would be ready to roll EPAS out. The reason why we are not rolling out full functionality is not because that functionality is not available, but simply because we need to enable the clinicians to manage all the change that they have to do with the new hospital, and we want to try to keep that as limited as possible. At this stage, when we open the new hospital, EPAS will be rolled out in its entirety, but we won't switch on every component of it to enable the clinicians to manage all the change they have to do at one time.

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE REDRESS SCHEME

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. In relation to the proposed national redress scheme for institutional child abuse, and in light of the minister's responses yesterday, can the minister confirm that it is the case that the existing state-based scheme is only for victims of child sexual abuse in state-run institutions—that is, not in charitable and other institutions—and that the maximum payout to date under this scheme is only $15,000, whereas the maximum anticipated payout under the proposed national scheme is $150,000?

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) (14:32): I thank the honourable member for her question, and there are a couple of things about it. First of all, as to what the maximum payment has been in any one of the many ex gratia payments that have been made under that scheme to the present time, I would have to check.

I don't know what the actual maximum payout to date has been, but I can tell members that the ex gratia scheme that operates at the state level, and has been operating for some years, first of all has a maximum payment of $50,000. If we are going to compare apples with apples, just because the commonwealth proposal is $150,000 doesn't mean that everyone who goes in there is going to be getting $150,000.

Ms Cook interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The comparison is between our scheme, which has been running for some years and, I might say, has resolved the complaints of many individuals who would have had virtually no hope of any sort of recovery at common law because the threshold for the proof that they would have had to establish of facts relevant to the circumstances of their abuse would have actually prevented them from being able to sustain a claim. We have a number of people who have taken advantage of that. The benefit, Mr Speaker—because I think in your time this scheme was originally established—for those people has been that they have had some end to the torment associated with this by having resolved their matter by way of a payment under the ex gratia scheme. That's the first thing.

We have had our scheme running a long time. Yes, it is true that our scheme applies to people who were in state care or people in respect of whom the state was an intervener. So, it's not necessarily the case that the state was in control of them in the sense that they were in a state orphanage or they were in some other state institution. It might well have been that the state was in some way responsible for that individual being placed somewhere else and in the other place something happened which was completely unacceptable.

To say the state scheme is confined to state care is to artificially constrain the scope of what the state scheme actually does do. What the commonwealth is proposing, as I understand it, or at least the royal commission is proposing and I believe the federal government is now picking up to some degree, is that in respect of every other institution—and these are institutions, we are talking about here, who may have had no particular contact with the government at all; without singling anybody out, we are talking here in terms of people like the Salvation Army, the churches and so on, institutions that might have had the care and responsibility of looking after children—the new scheme should apply to those institutions and to the state governments.

Those institutions, if they are either no longer in existence or find themselves devoid of sufficient funds to be able to make good on any claim, would then be able to use the state Treasury as an insurer of last resort in circumstances where the state Treasury has never ever been in the business of insuring these people. The state Treasury has not received a penny in premiums at any time historically to insure these institutions and these people. What that means is that the commonwealth is potentially asking the state to accept an extremely large potential unfunded bill for which the commonwealth presently is offering no compensation.

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE REDRESS SCHEME

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (14:37): Supplementary question to the Minister for Child Protection Reform again: how does the minister justify his apparent unwillingness to opt in to the proposed national redress scheme for survivors of child sexual abuse in light of the Premier's statement yesterday that, 'We know the cost of not investing in our children,' and again, 'We are devoting the resources necessary,' and the Premier's agreement in question time yesterday that he accepted responsibility for the government's failure to protect the state's vulnerable children?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:37): It's probably worth going back to the history of this whole question of abuse of children in state care to understand the nature of our response. Back at the time when we designed our response, it really had three elements to it

and we considered it carefully. We took advice from respected psychologists in relation to trauma, people who had actually been involved in setting up the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa, and it had a number of different elements to it.

At its most basic level, for some people what they wanted for this process—and we happened upon the Mullighan inquiry process, which allowed people to come and tell their stories—was their story told. They wanted to be able to have somebody respectfully listen to their story and have it validated and honoured. That is what some people wanted. Other people wanted the people who were the perpetrators brought to justice. You will recall around that time we also removed the time limitation date on pursuing criminal justice cases in child sexual abuse. Some people wanted that and only that.

Some people wanted the payment of money, and the payment of money could be dealt with in two ways; one is through their common law rights. We freely accepted that if they had common law rights they should be paid every last cent of their loss, not something artificially constrained but every last dollar of what they had lost and what they had suffered. Fourthly, and a variant of that, we also wanted to give an option for people who did want the payment of money but didn't want to go through a lengthy court process. In that sense, we offered the redress scheme, the $50,000 redress scheme.

We also had to make sense of our system of civil wrongs. How could we distinguish between somebody who was essentially injured in these circumstances compared with, say, our criminal injuries compensation scheme, which also had a $50,000 limit? That's why we happened upon this regime. Some people wanted to access all those opportunities, and some only some of them, but that is the decision we took.

The advice we received from some of the people providing support, whether they be psychiatrists or other people providing support, was that there was an important opportunity here for people to retell the story of their life so that instead of being victims they could be recharacterised as survivors. Instead of being somebody who was seeking to maximise the way in which this had disabled them to try to maximise their compensation—which is a necessary but perhaps unfortunate part of the way in which our litigation system is designed—they could actually accept a sum of money, which perhaps wouldn't be as large as the sum they might otherwise have pursued at common law, but get on with their lives in a way that was beneficial for them and their families.

That's the approach we took. We made that available to the royal commission when it was looking into these matters, but the royal commission took a different approach and suggested a different scheme. I think the commonwealth is a bit tendentious to set up the scheme and invite all the states to participate in it, with a very large bill attached to it, but not offer any sum associated with it at all and, in some respects, paying very little respect to the fact that some states had actually already attempted to resolve this matter in a particular way. So, I don't think it is fair to criticise this state for being tardy about the way in which we have sought to respond to survivors.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister explain to the house why a 92-year-old lady, who was delivered by ambulance to the Mount Gambier hospital at around 7pm last Wednesday with chest and shoulder pain, was put in a taxi and sent home at a little after 2 o'clock in the morning? She was subsequently returned to the hospital, as the taxi driver could not awaken her carer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:42): I am not familiar with the particular circumstances of the patient the member for MacKillop is referring to, and I am also a bit careful about responding about particular patient matters. However, I am more than happy to investigate—and I won't get back to the house; I will get back to the member for MacKillop personally.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:42): Supplementary: does the minister condone a practice where patients are discharged from hospital in the wee small hours of the morning, irrespective of whether or not they are elderly?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:42): I am not in the business of second-guessing our clinicians. The decision to discharge this particular patient would have been done by a doctor. I am not in the business of—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —second-guessing or critiquing decisions made by our doctors in our hospitals.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Leader of the Opposition just shows how completely out of depth he is. If he were health minister, he would be individually directing and second-guessing the decisions being made by our doctors day in, day out. This is what the doctors of South Australia would have to look forward to from the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition would be directing our doctors about their decisions and he would be wading into the political fight and criticising doctors without any information, criticising doctors and criticising nurses about the decisions they make. I think it just goes to show how completely out of depth and how completely ill prepared the Liberal Party is for government in this state.

OTWAY BASIN

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister outline to the house the importance of the Otway Basin to the South Australian economy?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for his question and for his support for the economic benefits generated by the state's oil and gas industry. The Otway Basin has been a critically important source of gas for this state since the first commercial discovery in 1987. Gas production from 1991 to 2011 at the Katnook field generated $420 million in natural gas sales and $32.2 million in condensate sales in current dollar terms. Total royalties paid to the state are estimated to amount to $30.5 million. Sales and royalties are just the beginning of the economic benefits.

Commercial discoveries of gas and condensate led to substantial investments in valuable infrastructure such as the gas pipeline network and the construction of the Ladbroke Grove and Snuggery power plants. Infrastructure and access to locally sourced gas have helped support the SAFRIES chip factory, the Kimberly Clark Australia paper mill and local jobs supported by those companies. Locally sourced energy offered a competitive price as a critical factor supporting the South-East economy. The shorter distance gas has to travel through a pipeline means lower cost to consumers.

We are still to determine the full potential of the Otway Basin, but what will be crucial to unlocking future production will be the ability to explore and employ the most up-to-date technology to extract discoveries. One of those technologies is the ability to fracture stimulate to extract gas from unconventional reservoirs. Fracture stimulation is a technique that we have been safely managing in this state for 60 years. South Australia has a long history of well-managed, well-regulated fracture stimulation with a focus on well integrity, safeguards of our aquifers and, of course most importantly, the protection of our natural environment.

Modern fracture stimulation techniques developed in the United States have sparked an energy revolution. In 2012 alone, the shale gas revolution in the United States added $74 billion to the federal and state governments' revenue and is expected to generate 3.3 million new jobs by 2020. The scale of the revenue and jobs growth in South Australian terms is not as likely to be of that magnitude, but there is no reason—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I see members opposite laughing at investment. There is no reason to doubt that the development of our unconventional gas reservoirs anywhere in this state would lead to increased production, investment and employment. Those jobs aren't confined to the drill pad. The potential for jobs extends well beyond the wellhead to all the equipment, technology and service suppliers along the value chain that stand to benefit from the energy revolution.

More gas supplies help keep downward pressure on energy prices for consumers, including industry. Why would we want to deal ourselves out of that potential? Conventional gas exploration, development, production, processing and transport have been conducted for decades in the Otway Basin. Despite more than 100 petroleum wells drilled in the region, the Coonawarra winegrowing industry and agribusiness have continued to grow without putting at risk our state's clean green image.

Do we have to work harder to convince landowners? Absolutely, we do. Industry accepts that, I accept that and the Department of State Development accepts that. There is much more we can do to engage with landowners and dispel their fears and address their concerns. Of course, it takes leadership but, most importantly, what this state needs most of all is a bipartisan approach on the science and experience, not a weak leader who flinches in the face of a Green-led scare campaign.

FRACKING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:48): Supplementary: given the minister's answer that there should not be a moratorium on fracking anywhere in this state, why did his own department tell the Natural Resources Committee that 'we have a ban, we have a moratorium on fracture stimulation in the South-East'?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:48): The member is deliberately, I think, trying to construe taking out a selective quote. The Statement of Environmental Objectives, if they are in place, of course don't preclude fracture stimulation. What we don't allow anyone to do in this state is to simply start drilling a hole and fracture stimulating. That is prohibited unless you have the appropriate licensing. So, there is, in fact, across the entire state without the appropriate licensing—

Mr Marshall: A ban, a moratorium.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You can apply anywhere in South Australia to fracture stimulate currently. What the opposition has done is announce a region where, regardless of the science and technology or your ability to prove you can do it safely—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —you are banned anyway. What we do is minimise harm. We have an approach, and our first principle is to do no harm so, yes, we do not allow anyone to fracture stimulate. They must prove to the agency that they can do it safely without doing any harm to the natural environment. Only after they are licensed can they in fact fracture stimulate.

The shadow minister attempting to take that out without understanding what the agency means means that (1) he is not an advocate for the industry and (2) he doesn't understand the elementary processes. Quite frankly, how he can stay in this position with that policy amazes me. If he had any decency, he would resign.

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Supplementary, sir?

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier.

UNCONVENTIONAL GAS PROJECTS

Mr GEE (Napier) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister outline to the house the impact of a 10-year ban on unconventional gas development in the South-East of our state?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:50): I thank the member for his question and his desire to better understand the risks to the oil and gas production in this state from policies such as bans on development. Both the Cooper and Otway basins have been important sources of oil and gas for this state and indeed the nation for nearly half a century.

The use of fracture stimulation has been key to the production of more than five trillion cubic feet of gas from this state. Advances in engineering practices have enabled companies to extract gas from both conventional and non-conventional gas reservoirs. Oil and gas activities are not approved in this state without first undergoing stringent assessment. Unless stakeholder concerns are adequately addressed, approval of these activities will not be granted.

As you would be aware, Mr Speaker, the Natural Resources Committee has spent two years inquiring into unconventional gas in the South-East, and it's fair to say that the inquiry's findings are not that there have been any shortcomings in regulation or any impacts on the environment but rather that what we have had here has been an inability to assure the community that has been subjected to an horrendous scare campaign. Despite a 30-year history of gas production in the South-East, more work needs to be done to engage with the local community and assure them of the safety and compatibility of oil and gas activities in that region—multiple land-use frameworks.

In light of recent developments interstate, the industry would have been forgiven a sense of relief when reading these findings. The collective sigh of relief was almost immediately followed by an almighty kick in the guts from the investment killers on the other side of the house. Barely had the committee's report been tabled but the member for Dunstan promised he would impose a 10-year ban on unconventional gas in the South-East.

This is a position not supported by the inquiry, not supported in the evidence provided by the member for Mount Gambier and not supported by the federal Minister for Energy, the Hon. Josh Frydenberg. Minister Frydenberg correctly says that what the Australian market needs is more gas supplies. While there are some legitimate sensitivities, this is what he says: 'Blanket moratoria are not the answer.' To quote Matt Doman, who is the—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is on two warnings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To quote Matt Doman, the voice of the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association, the South Australian Liberals—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He used to work for a former finance minister, but not one of ours. The South Australian Liberals have shown weak leadership. I quote: 'If implemented, this puts jobs and investment at risk!' Mr Doman warns. SACOME (the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy) describes the ban as a 'dangerous message to the oil and gas industry'. The chamber's new chief executive, Rebecca Knol, says that the threatened ban sends a 'worrying precedent to the wider resource sector'.

Santos, a proud South Australian company, recently rated South Australia's number one company by the SA Business Index, says we need to foster gas development, not ban it. I quote, 'Doing so will only push up energy prices and prevent us from meeting our climate commitments.' Beach Energy warns that closing off regions to gas production will only make it harder to supply gas to many customers, and just today, Business SA have condemned the opposition. Just like with

shopping hours, just like the nuclear debate—no consultation with industry and blanket bans. He is a weak leader with no vision, he is not interested in growing the state or growing jobs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is on two warnings.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Supplementary sir: given the minister's answer, I have a supplementary question for the Minister for Regional Development. Given that he says that he is dedicated to regional South Australia and will bring a regional focus to the cabinet table, will he stand up for the people—

The SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary. The member for Ashford.

CHILDHOOD IMMUNISATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:55): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Minister, how is the Women's and Children's Hospital working to improve immunisation coverage in the community?

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:55): I would like to thank the member for Ashford for her question. We are very fortunate to live in a First World country where the diseases that our grandparents and great-grandparents faced are no longer part of everyday life, but that means we can become complacent about immunisation. Australia has a comparatively high vaccination rate and, since community-wide immunisation began in 1932, the burden of disease has fallen substantially in our country.

However, this year alone, there have been 11 confirmed cases of measles and more than 1,500 confirmed cases of whooping cough in South Australia. The evidence shows that there remain pockets of our community where vaccine coverage rates remain very low and, in some cases, are actually declining. In fact, there are a number of regions in Australia where immunisation rates remain so low that an outbreak of disease would not be able to be prevented if an infection took hold. We also know that more than 84,000 children aged two, one in five across Australia, were not fully immunised last financial year.

The good news is that in South Australia we have made significant strides in increasing vaccination rates. Some of our local regions even boast the best vaccination rates in the country. However, some metropolitan suburbs still record low immunisation rates. It is clear our work to improve immunisation coverage and its perceived value in our community has to continue, and that is where initiatives like the Immunisation Clinic at the Women's and Children's Hospital, which I was recently invited to help officially open, has a unique role to play in our community.

The creation of a highly visible, one-stop immunisation shop makes it easy for our children and women to have their immunisations. The clinic is focusing on reaching children with chronic illness and disability who miss out on routine vaccinations as their complex care needs often take prime attention. However, all the inpatients and outpatients of the Women's and Children's Hospital will be able to receive any of the vaccines on the national immunisation schedule.

As well as the actual delivery of vaccinations, the clinic also has a key role in improving health literacy and helping bust some of the myths about immunisation. So far, the clinic has seen 50 patients in its first two weeks, and it is expected this will continue to grow considerably. Can I extend my congratulations to all those involved in setting up this clinic. I am very proud that the Women's and Children's Health Network is taking a national lead in establishing an in-hospital based immunisation clinic that offers this dedicated service.

RIVERLAND PEST-FREE STATUS

Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:58): My question is for the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Could the minister provide the house with an update on recognition of the Riverland's pest-free area status?

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) (14:58): I thank the member for Fisher for the question. There was some good news, indeed, today with the South Australian Riverland receiving a big boost with the Indonesian government's formal recognition of the area's pest-free status. I want to put on the record my thanks to Deputy Prime Minister Barnaby Joyce and Senator Anne Ruston, with whom we have worked closely, along with the industry in the Riverland, who have done a terrific job. I would also like to thank the team at Biosecurity South Australia who are up there working very hard with all the growers.

We have terrific conditions up there and we are the only mainland state in Australia that remains fruit fly free, and we work diligently to maintain that status. It is really important for us. The government spends $5 million a year on maintaining that status and promoting the fact that we are fruit fly free. It is not always easy and it takes a long time to convince overseas markets of the status that we have. The benefit is in the reduction in the cost of production. There are all these pre and post-harvest things that you don't have to do once you have been recognised as an area that is pest free. This will be a huge benefit to growers in the area.

Earlier this year, China recognised the Riverland for nectarines as a pest-free area. We are still working with the federal government—and, again, these things take time—to get a wider pest-free area recognition from China. The diplomacy and the talks continue in that area. It is certainly terrific news today that Indonesia has given the South Australian Riverland that recognition, and it follows on from a trial they have been doing.

The Indonesian government was down here earlier this year just making sure that they could verify all the claims that we made. The South Australian exports to Indonesia in terms of citrus are 2,500 tonnes a year, split evenly between oranges and mandarins. Seventy-eight tonnes of Australian stone fruit, such as nectarines, peaches, plums and apricots, are exported to Indonesia, and that market is growing. There is no doubt that this new status and recognition will really help us.

It is also a great example of the collaboration between industry and the state and federal governments, who realise the benefits of pest-free areas. What we need to do now that we have it is to continue those trade missions we have been doing, being led by the Premier and the Minister for Trade, and I led one up to Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand as well. We need to keep going back into those markets because what they know about South Australia is that we do turn up every year into those markets.

No other state or territory is doing it to the extent that we are doing it. We go up there with industry, and that is very important because so many of these markets want to deal face to face with the growers and with the industry, but they like to see that the government is standing side by side, giving their full support and backing to those growers and marketers who are trying to get our wonderful premium food and wine into their markets.

We have a proud tradition in South Australia of producing premium food and wine. It is one that we want to continue doing, and it is one that both sides of government, going back to 1836, have really focused on—the importance of producing the very best food and wine anywhere in this state. As to the Indonesian recognition, I would like to thank the Indonesian government for their support. We look forward to doing more deals with your government and your markets to get more South Australian produce into Indonesia.

IMPACT ACCELERATOR PROGRAM

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Disabilities. How will the impact accelerator program help disability service providers in South Australia?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:02): I thank the member for her interest, and particularly for this question. The NDIS is creating a dramatic change in business practice in many disability service providers in our state. Providers are faced with a wide variety of options under the NDIS that are game-changers in the way they deliver services and how they implement them internally as service providers.

A business model that has worked in the past may not work in the future under individualised funding arrangements as we move into that space with the full introduction in July 2018. That is why the South Australian government is contributing $50,000 towards a pilot program, called the impact accelerator program, which is to be targeted at a select number of disability sector businesses. The impact accelerator is a pilot program that is a fast-paced 100-day program that will take 10 teams through an intensive and rigorous program to create new social ventures and new businesses for our state.

It provides opportunities for organisations to explore new ideas, develop new skills and explore their future business models as they move into this area. This is arguably one of the most exciting pieces of social reform our state and nation have seen in many, many years with the NDIS's birthing. Once the full transition occurs, there will be many new services and many new technologies that do not currently exist providing services to individualised care-orientated programs for consumers, directing their own decisions about what they buy in the marketplace.

It is about looking for fresh new ideas that will improve services for people with a disability but also provide new kinds of jobs for South Australians and new sorts of businesses for people to develop. Based on the latest estimates, once fully rolled out this will create more than 6,000 new jobs across our state and inject around $1.5 billion into our state's economy each year.

The impact accelerator program is part of South Australia's commitment to ensure the NDIS sector flourishes, is prepared and fully ready for the rollout in July 2018. I commend the work of the program team, and I look forward to hearing more about the developing job opportunities and new businesses that will flourish in this sector.

NORTH WEST INDIGENOUS PASTORAL PROJECT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister advise the house of the outcomes of his recent visit to Emeroo Station?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:05): As the member for Stuart understands, you can only ask a supplementary to the first minister you asked the question. I had the great pleasure of visiting Emeroo Station, just out of Port Augusta, as I made my way home from the country cabinet in Whyalla and Coober Pedy, also dropping in to Cairn Hill Mine, Roxby Downs and Andamooka. My reason for visiting Emeroo Station was to meet some of the—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is warned. The next person to interject will be removed under the sessional order.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel will depart under the sessional order for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Kavel having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: My reason for visiting Emeroo Station was to meet some of the participants in the North West Indigenous Pastoral Project and to see the project in action. If members on the other side are not interested in what is happening in the regions, I would say—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I know that some of them are. Emeroo Station is an arid landscape, but only 15 kilometres from one of South Australia's major regional centres, Port Augusta. There has been no stock for more than three years on this Indigenous project, but the North West Indigenous Pastoral Project and the Bungala Aboriginal Corporation are changing this.

The station needed all new fencing, which had deteriorated, as well as new water infrastructure: a new bore, troughs and tanks. These will allow a vegetable garden to also be established on the premises. Locals have been trained to build fences and sheds and, once sheep

are returned to the station, skills such as shearing and animal husbandry will be taught. I met with five wonderful young Aboriginal workers who had all been struggling to find work before they were engaged in the North West Indigenous Pastoral Project.

But there are wider benefits beyond training locals who have been out of work. The project has been very successful in its engagement with Aboriginal landholders, the business sector (particularly BHP Billiton) and the Indigenous Land Corporation. Of the three million hectares of Indigenous land in the north-west of South Australia, only 5 per cent is currently grazed under Indigenous-owned stock. This project was designed to help Aboriginal pastoral landholders to build profitable pastoral businesses and sustainable employment.

Fourteen pastoral workers are currently involved with the project, and I am very pleased that the project has been extended for an additional two years, which will help to employ up to a further 20 Indigenous pastoral workers to gain employment and training. The five pastoral workers who were at Mabel Creek Station near Coober Pedy have recently completed their program after successfully bringing 600 square kilometres back into production as well as restoring the homestead ready for use.

To encourage further employment, the Indigenous Land Corporation works with the National Indigenous Pastoral Enterprise (NIPE), which operates 14 agriculture businesses on land it either owns or leases from Indigenous landowners. These agricultural businesses are operated as commercial enterprises and provide fully integrated training and employment opportunities for Indigenous people. Each year, NIPE invites Indigenous people to apply for permanent positions available within these businesses. These positions will now be offered to pastoral workers engaged in the North West Indigenous Pastoral Project. This will encourage transition from subsidised employment provided by the project to sustainable and independent employment.

The project will continue to build sustainable employment outcomes for Indigenous landholders, who now have up-to-date pastoral development plans which provide a strong business enterprise focus to complement the Jobs Accelerator Fund for job creation. The project continues to support Indigenous landholders on the APY, Emeroo at Port Augusta, Purple Downs, Andamooka and Roxby Downs stations, with Mabel Creek Station at Coober Pedy recently successfully completed.

This project is an example of what can be achieved in a short time with effective government leadership, investment and communication. There is much work still to be done, but a foundation is now laid to improve—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: sessional orders do not allow the minister to finish this.

The SPEAKER: Alas, the minister's time has expired. Thank you for your guidance.

Grievance Debate

MITCHELL ELECTORATE SCHOOL AWARD CEREMONIES

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:10): I rise as someone who is incredibly passionate about his local community and especially passionate about the abilities of young people in my region, so it gives me great pleasure today to talk about some of their successes, highlighted by the recent award ceremonies at two of my local high schools. Firstly, I would like to talk about Seaview High School, where Penny Tranter is the principal. I went along to their graduation ceremony and it was a pleasure to be at the Flinders University Plaza, even though it was a little bit nippy, but it was great to see the award winners.

I would like to talk about a number of people, but unfortunately I cannot talk about everyone. Someone I was quite amazed by was Cosette Hoe, who won four subject awards for biology, chemistry, mathematical studies and physics, which I thought was quite an outstanding performance. She also won the academic excellence award for Seaview High School. If that was not impressive enough, Michelle Florensia won five subject awards for business and enterprise, ESL studies, mathematical studies, music and physics, which was an outstanding performance. She was also recognised with the International Student Award.

Well done also to Xavier House, the senior school sports award winner. Jake Beaumont was emcee, along with Rachel Rattus. Rachel, who won the research project award, is one of the school presidents, as is Jake, and on the night they did an outstanding job holding it all together. Jake also won three awards: the Student Leadership Award, the Caltex All-Rounder Award and the Long Tan Year 12 Award.

Well done and congratulations also to the other outstanding year level award winners: Casey Johnson, the year 8 award winner; Jessica Carroll and Brett Stephanos, who could not be separated and were joint year 9 award winners; Anna Stretcher, year 10 award winner; and Crystal Menadue won the year 11 award. I presented the year 9, 10 and 11 awards, and it was a great honour to do that. There are some great young people in our community there.

I would also like to mention the Brighton valedictory and presentation evening. Again, it was a pleasure to be invited along to present an award to a number of outstanding award winners. Olivia O'Neill is the principal of Brighton Secondary School. Jordan Sims was dux of the school and won two subject awards for biology and chemistry. The Caltex Best All-Rounder, the Eric Donders Memorial Award, the Global Citizenship and Community Award and the Year 12 Academic Excellence Award went to Marcus Falckh.

The Year 12 Recognition Award went to Brian Lian, which was an outstanding performance. As an old scholar, I got to present the Old Scholars Award. Christopher McDonald also won the Head of Music Award, the Outstanding Achievement in Music Award, Stage 2 Subject Award winner for solo performance, music. The Spirit of ANZAC Award, Service to Volleyball and the Special Interest Volleyball Performance Award went to Katie Gardner.

The Long Tan Award, Year 12 Academic Excellence Award, Stage 2 Subject Award winner in health was Shamaya James-Bishop. Senior Sportspersons and Service to Sport was won by Nick de Vries and Sam Franson. The Head of Music Award, Year 12 Academic Excellence and Stage 2 Subject Award winner for musicianship was Katie Wong. Again, there were some sensational award winners.

Brighton also had a charities and recognition assembly, which I went to and at which again I was fortunate enough to present a couple of awards. It was wonderful to see the younger students coming through doing such great work. In particular, Connor Sampson, Michael Comino-Ewen, Zephyr Williams and Harrison McLeod were the comperes and did an outstanding job. Jye Thomson, who is from my footy team, did the welcome to country.

I can only mention a couple of awards, but I presented the Hindmarsh Shield to Nicole Kascak, who is in year 10; the Nancy Schupelius Award to Kiran Sachdev, who is in year 10; the Meredith Collins Award to Anna Woodley; and the Stewart Wallbank Memorial Prize to Hamish Petherick, who is also in year 10. The Freemasons presented an award, as did the Kiwanis, so there is a great community recognition. There was also a number of student program awards, and I offer my congratulations to all the winners.

In the time remaining, I would like to mention the primary schools in my area that have their award ceremonies coming up. Like many members in this place, I am sure that December is a very busy time, when there are a lot of presentations to go to. I would like to acknowledge that we had a Christmas card competition in my office, when we asked all the schools to draw a Christmas card of what Christmas means to them. Over 70 students from Darlington, Seaview Downs and Reynella primary schools entered the competition, and I thank them for doing that.

At Reynella Primary School, principal, Steve Freeman, and deputy, Michele Russell, had their twilight fair last Friday, which was very successful, and a number of other activities. At Reynella South School, principal, Jo Meredith, and deputy principal, Tracey Middleton, do an outstanding job. Once every few weeks, a number of students receive value recognition awards in recognition of their hard work throughout the year. Seaview Downs Primary School is getting underway preparing for its STEM space, and they are really looking forward to that.

The new principal there, Des Hurst, and governing council chair, Pauline Glover, are doing a marvellous job getting that school up and flying again. Seaview Downs Primary School as well had their twilight fair last Tuesday. Craig Fosdike is the principal at St Martin de Porres School and Jenny Engelhardt is the principal at Sheidow Park School. At Stella Maris Parish School, principal Sean Hill

is doing a great job. I would like to say farewell to Brian Marshall, who is leaving Woodend Primary School. He has done a great job over his time. I will also mention Darlington Primary School principal, Kathryn Entwistle, for the great job she does there.

Time expired.

ASBESTOS AWARENESS MONTH

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:15): Last Friday saw two special ceremonies concluding a month of work around raising awareness of the dangers of asbestos and the care of victims of asbestos diseases. November also sees the work of the Asbestos Victims Association of South Australia (AVA) and the Asbestos Diseases Society of South Australia come into focus. The AVA holds a ceremony in Pitman Park, proudly sponsored by the City of Salisbury. Each year, the number of deaths rises. People who attend the ceremony lay flowers by a rock memorial, and those flowers are then sent on to hospitals in the area. President Terry Miller OAM and his volunteer staff do a fabulous job promoting reforms and supporting and advocating for victims of asbestos diseases and their families.

They run a 24-hour helpline, seminars and friendship groups. It has been my honour to be associated with them from their humble beginnings. Sadly, there is no end in sight for their work, as another wave has started in this epidemic. We see now home renovators and the importation of banned products presenting new dangers to workers and the public at large. Any building erected or renovated between 1940 and the late 1980s may contain asbestos material. It is in fibro, lagging, cement, carpet underlay, tiles and adhesives, to name just a few of the 3,000 plus products associated with asbestos. There is no safe asbestos, and you must take proper precautions or engage licensed removalists when removing it.

This ceremony follows on from the breakfast service usually held on the same day by the Asbestos Diseases Society of South Australia (ADSA) in Kilburn, supported by the City of Port Adelaide Enfield. Here, too, the number of memorials is growing. This time, we see engraved pavers going around the central elements of the main tribute at what is known as Jack Watkins Park. Jack Watkins worked in the construction industry and became an active union organiser and advocate for occupational health and safety issues and workers' rights and conditions. He campaigned against the dangers of asbestos in South Australia for many decades. In 1982, Jack was appointed to the state government asbestos advisory committee and remained a member until he died in October 2007.

With local residents, Jack fought both state and federal governments for the clean-up of the Islington railway site and its conversion to a public park. Due to their efforts, the site was finally cleared of toxic waste, including asbestos. It has been landscaped and named the Jack Watkins Memorial Park and stands as a tribute to workers who have died from any asbestos-related disease. Between 1982 and 1988, Jack was an organiser for the Builders Labourers Federation and then was picked up for work with the United Trades and Labor Council. In 2005, the Asbestos Diseases Society of South Australia was formed and Jack became its inaugural president.

Jack lived in the north-eastern suburbs and took more than a passing interest in the demolition of old Housing Trust stock in Gilles Plains, often calling me out to sites where asbestos was not being handled correctly. I believe he also infamously threw some talcum powder from the strangers' gallery here to highlight the dangers of not understanding the insidious nature of asbestos-related diseases when he felt that his activism was not being taken seriously. There are many asbestos diseases. There are pleural plaques, which are not cancers and do not cause cancer but are a thickening patch, known as fibrosis, on the lungs. The pleura are in two layers in the chest, covering the lungs. Plaques do not often cause any symptoms but are there.

There are also asbestos-related pleural diseases: asbestosis, mesothelioma and, of course, lung cancer itself. The ADSA provides a social worker, legal advice, a newsletter and educational services. Current president, Kevin Purse, gave a very informative and insightful speech before the service got underway. Even though November is almost over, I urge everyone to be aware and mindful of asbestos. It can affect anyone and take many years before it manifests. While there are some exciting developments and treatments, prevention is much better than cure.

Vale, Jack Watkins and all the victims of asbestos diseases, and thank you to the Asbestos Victims Association and the Asbestos Diseases Society of South Australia for all they do. Unfortunately, their work is going to become very much a part of the lives of too many people in South Australia. When you listen to the dreadfully sad family stories on these memorial days, you realise that it can happen to anyone, not only the worker in the factory but also the wife of the worker who washes his overalls.

I think it is a timely reminder for everyone in this day of do-it-yourself renovations to be mindful that there are children playing underneath the people working on ladders, who might not have any signs of disease until later in life when it is too late to help.

SEACLIFF PARK NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:20): It is with great pleasure that I speak today on the work of the Seacliff Park Neighbourhood Watch. Last night, 29 November 2016, I had the privilege of attending the 25th anniversary of this Neighbourhood Watch held at the All Saints' Anglican Church in Lamington Avenue, Seacliff Park. Last night's meeting was an opportunity to look back on the group's quarter of a century of service to the local community and to celebrate particular figures within the Neighbourhood Watch who have provided an exceptional level of contribution during that time.

Since the group was founded, there have been five area coordinators, with Harry Priest, Jeremy Johnson, Tony Sullivan, Joan Pike and Paul Sutcliffe serving in that role. Paul Sutcliffe is the current coordinator and also serves Watch SA at a state level, providing input into what the organisation does statewide. Last night, I had the privilege of handing out Neighbourhood Watch 25-year service medals to eight members of the group who have been actively involved since the beginning of the group.

This award shows an exceptional level of commitment over many years and was provided to Jeremy Johnson, Eric and Heather Rampton, Joan Pike, Phillip Blows, Christine Solomon, Frank Williams and Ian Rogers. These locals are stalwarts not only of Neighbourhood Watch but also of the Seacliff Park community, giving of their time over a quarter of a century to organise and attend Neighbourhood Watch meetings, deliver newsletters and generally look out for the wellbeing of their suburb. Congratulations to all of them on their contribution.

It was interesting to hear that the first police liaison officer who worked with the group when it was founded was none other than Mark Carroll, now president of both the Police Federation of Australia and the Police Federation of South Australia. Mark was a junior officer when he helped the Seacliff Park Neighbourhood Watch get off the ground, and in its 25 years there have been only three police coordinators, with John Anderson and Jason Barker following Mr Carroll.

The Seacliff Park Neighbourhood Watch has been keeping their suburb safe for 25 years, and I want to congratulate each of its members, thank them for their valuable contribution to the community of Seacliff Park and encourage them to continue for another 25 years. Last night, long-serving Watch member Jeremy Johnson provided an impromptu reminder of the importance of community and the role of Neighbourhood Watch in building community. Mr Johnson lamented that the sense of community in the area might not be what it once was but urged those gathered to look in on their neighbours, say hello to people in the street and keep doing their bit by turning up to Neighbourhood Watch meetings and other community events. I want to reiterate Mr Johnson's words and thank him personally for that reminder last night.

While I am on the topic of Neighbourhood Watch, I also want to take the opportunity to mention the great work of the South Brighton Neighbourhood Watch group, led ably by area coordinator John Wallace. The South Brighton group is a strong one, holding monthly meetings at the Catholic Church hall at Strathmore Terrace, Brighton. The group plays an amazing role in building a sense of community in the local area, particularly with its annual Christmas in the Square event held in Dover Square.

This is an annual must-attend event for hundreds of residents in South Brighton. This year, Christmas in the Square was held on Friday 18 November, and with beautiful weather it was a huge success. Attendees were entertained by the police band and the Gospo. Congratulations to John Wallace and all the other members of the South Brighton Neighbourhood Watch for not only putting

on Christmas in the Square each year but also for their admirable work in keeping their local community safe.

I wish the hardworking members of both South Brighton and Seacliff Park Neighbourhood Watch groups a very merry Christmas, and I look forward to continuing to work with them in 2017.

WILTJA YEAR 12 STUDENTS

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:24): Each year, thousands of secondary students in South Australia graduate with their South Australian Certificate of Education. For each one of these students, it is an achievement but for some the hurdles are greater, sometimes measuring thousands of kilometres. This has been the experience of the seven 2016 graduates, and those who have come before them, of Wiltja Secondary College, an Indigenous boarding school in my electorate of Torrens that offers an alternative to the education commonplace in outback Australia. The graduates all hail from remote rural communities in the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) lands, Maralinga, Tjatja and Central Australia. In the words of Wiltja's boarding director Anthony Bennett:

> They have left their families and their country behind them to pursue an education which they believe will set them up for a strong future. For many of them, they have learned in a language other than the ones they speak at home. For some, they are amongst the first in their families to graduate with a high school certificate.

As such, their certificate is extra special. For the students living in these communities the prospect of conventional schooling can be daunting. The education program at Wiltja uniquely enables students from remote APY and other isolated communities in South Australia, the Northern Territory and Western Australia to engage in mainstream urban schooling within a supportive environment. Students at Wiltja are able to undertake their SACE whilst participating in vocational education and training, and an array of out-of-school hours learning.

Wiltja has been an integral part of the Anangu Lands Partnership schools and, though supported and resourced by the South Australian Department for Education and Child Development, it is directly governed by the Anangu communities themselves. Wiltja is the mainstream school of the Anangu Lands Partnership schools and is under the educational direction of the Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Education Committee.

Wiltja comprises Wiltja Secondary College and Wiltja Boarding, a school and residence program. Both cater to the educational, social and emotional needs of each student within a culturally respectful context. The program is a multicampus initiative that integrates schooling with Windsor Gardens Secondary College, in the seat of Torrens, and Woodville High School, with plans to introduce the programs to other schools.

The program's inception has been entirely driven by Anangu, who were of the view that their children's future interests and those of their communities could be best served by the educational opportunities offered in a mainstream environment. Objectively, the program at Wiltja seeks to empower children and young people through education so that they become self determining in order to manage their communities, determine their own futures, and actively participate in the wider world. They expressly want their children to be able to walk in two worlds.

Accordingly, students undertaking secondary education at Wiltja do so solely on the basis that they and their family wish for them to participate in the program. The Anangu community actively supports Wiltja to ensure the continuance of their communities and culture. As such, within the program Anangu culture and languages are maintained and enshrined, with some aspects of contemporary Western culture incorporated. However, the program is not without its challenges.

The remoteness and isolation of Anangu communities has restricted the students' exposure to many experiences which mainstream society takes for granted. This presents many challenges for transitioning, and it is a testament to the Wiltja students' tenacity to see their schooling through. Wiltja's residency program seeks to address and provide intensive support to students transitioning into life within an urban environment and ensure students develop to their full academic and social potential. In this regard, Wiltja's successes are irrefutable.

In 1998, Wiltja produced the first ever SACE graduates from traditional Anangu communities. Since then, each year more graduates have their names inscribed on the eminent graduation plaque in the boarding house foyer, as more boys and girls join the legacy of the 74 other Wiltja students to

graduate with their SACE. I recently had the honour of presenting awards at the Wiltja year 12 graduation at the John DiFede Reception Centre, and I place on record my congratulations to the following 2016 graduates: Myles Turner, Con Ken, Swayne Day, Suzhanna Bostock-Stuart, Partimah Fielding, Mitchell Forrester and Cyril Kunoth-Hampton.

MINISTER FOR SUSTAINABILITY, ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:29): Today, I rise to make some comments about minister Hunter and his petulant outburst last week. When he was supposed to be working for the people of South Australia with his interstate counterparts, he threw a hissy fit, abused everybody, stormed out and left the table empty and unrepresented as far as South Australia was concerned. The minister's claim was that the federal government was tearing up the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement and he took exception to that. I will come back to that in a moment.

Let me say that I am reminded of our Speaker telling us quite often when we rise in this place on a point of order that we should come to the table with clean hands. I think it was absolutely outrageous of minister Hunter to suggest that somebody else was throwing away the rule book and tearing up an agreement when he, as the Minister for Water in South Australia, tore up the National Water Initiative when he imposed natural resources management levy increases on my constituents and the constituents of some of my colleagues totally outside the agreement his government had signed off on.

The minister certainly was not at the table with clean hands. Indeed, he blatantly tore up an agreement, totally refused to acknowledge the agreement. I have spent the last 12 months endeavouring to get information out of his department through the freedom of information process, and the department refuses to even acknowledge that they have an obligation to supply me with information. Minister Hunter needs to have a very close look in the mirror. Let me turn now to the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement.

The agreement certainly states that 2,750 gigalitres of water will be returned to the basin and that will be returned via measures including buybacks of water and that is guaranteed. The 450 gigalitres that minister Hunter was arguing about were never guaranteed. There were always some caveats over that. At the time, I raised this as an issue with the then premier and the then minister and I took a fair bit of stick for supposedly not sticking up for South Australia, but the reality is that some parts of the agreement were certainly not in the best interests of South Australia. Indeed, South Australians, I believe, were sold a lie as to what the agreement actually said.

I believe that the additional 450 gigalitres of water can and should be delivered to South Australia, but Barnaby Joyce certainly was not tearing up the agreement when he suggested that it might not be delivered. The reason I say that it should be delivered to South Australia is that it was going to be delivered post-2019. It was going to be delivered via water being made available through works and measures. There are a number of works and measures which could and should have been undertaken many years ago, and the principal one is the works at the Menindee Lakes.

At the height of the drought, when the Labor Party was in government in Canberra, there was a huge opportunity to do important work in the Menindee Lakes that would have saved water principally from evaporation forever into the future. It is estimated that those works would have saved something like 174 gigalitres per year of evaporation, particularly in dry years. The federal Labor government of the time completely failed in its obligation to do the right thing by the river and save that water. That opportunity still exists, but the works would be much better done when the lakes are virtually empty. It would be much more difficult to do that work while the lakes have a lot of water in them. The golden opportunity that existed at the time was missed by the then Labor government in Canberra.

Lots of other works and measures can be undertaken. I visited the Riverina some years ago with a number of my colleagues and we went onto one property where the farmer was growing tomatoes. He had installed at substantial cost an underground irrigation system, and he told us that he could grow the same crop and get the same yield using half the amount of water. If you extrapolate that across the basin, it is not very difficult to free up water for environmental flows and, indeed, to find the additional 450 gigalitres but what we have always said is that that should not be done through

buybacks: it should be done through works and measures. Minister Hunter wants to go back and read the agreement because I do not think he fully understands it.

YOUTH WORK SA

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:34): On Friday 4 November this year, an exciting and important initiative was launched at the Brocas Community Centre here in South Australia. I was thrilled to represent minister Bettison at this launch, having worked with and employed many youth workers over the past eight years or so. Youth work is a vital profession providing relationship-based support to so many young people, with a huge percentage of them being vulnerable and isolated.

Youth Work SA is a professional association specifically for youth workers. It invites youth work practitioners, managers and academics as well as service providers and training providers to join an educative and restorative movement towards a strong professional identity for youth workers in South Australia. This local association is the embodiment of a much larger international push towards the professionalisation of youth work in recent years.

Youth work emerged in the UK around the middle of the 19th century with early involvement in the church and recreation sectors. Up until the 1970s, youth work in Australia was still largely being done by volunteers with Christian affiliations and was focused around civil society groups who sought to support young people to become healthy, active citizens. This included organisations like the Scouts, guides and brigades. In the seventies, my uncle formed a youth club in Chester, UK—an informal drop-in-style space for young people outside school hours which continues to be now a dominant form of youth work.

We also see detached youth work in which these workers engage young people in an outreach capacity in the community and on the streets. In Australia, the advent of child welfare and protection of young people from all manner of abuses continues to influence the identity of youth work, with the youth workers today in schools, churches, prisons, local councils, charities, for-profit as well as not-for-profit community services, advocacy and political movements. They employ knowledge and skill from psychology, sociology, criminology, teaching, counselling and social work as well as a range of practical life skills.

In South Australia, the peak body for youth affairs, the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia (YACSA), was incorporated in 1982; however, unlike the other states of Australia, South Australia has had no widely adopted code of professional ethics for youth workers. As such, they have not had a central body to advocate for and educate around the distinct identity of their profession. Across the general sector, there is a shared agreement on the need for a strong identity built on robust education and training.

At its core, youth work is really about professional relationships with young people. The relationship is a basis for young people having the capacity and safety to create changes in their lives. Whilst not an end in itself, the youth worker fosters a professional relationship with a young person for the purpose of supporting them to establish and maintain their own healthy, functioning relationships with other people, their culture and society at large. In doing so, the young person is understood to be a full citizen with the associated rights and responsibilities.

Youth Work SA exists to champion this vision of the youth work profession. By establishing a professional association in South Australia, youth workers and those interested in supporting young people can sustain and grow the profile of the unique and essential work of youth workers. In South Australia, Youth Work SA exists to:

- develop and promote a shared ethical framework for youth work practice;
- promote practice standards for youth work in South Australia;
- develop a strong identity for youth work as a unique profession;
- bring credibility and accountability to the unique and essential work of youth workers; and
- advocate for the ongoing development of training and development for the profession of youth work.

So far, the youth work association of South Australia has achieved:

- the facilitation of a sector consultation with youth workers;
- engagement with a number of youth workers and key agencies such as YACSA and the Office of the Guardian for Children and Young People;
- incorporation as an association in South Australia;
- development of an ethical framework to guide youth work practice;
- the successful launch of the professional youth work association, which I attended; and
- a register for youth workers as members of the association.

Congratulations to all the amazing workers who have worked so determinedly over and above their paid work to bring Youth Work SA to fruition. I am really grateful to have actually been there at the birth of the conversation around this association, talking about the imperatives and the essential parts of the work it would do, and then also to be able to help with its launch now years down the track. It is a real honour. Every day, youth workers not only change lives but create life itself for the young people they work with in an empowering and individualised way. I congratulate Youth Work SA and look forward to advocating on their behalf.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (UNIVERSITIES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:40): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966 and the University of Adelaide Act 1971. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Universities are places of learning, innovation and research. South Australia's world-class universities make a key contribution to our state. However, universities are operating in an increasingly challenging environment. The government is making a number of amendments to the University of Adelaide Act 1971 and the Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966 intended to improve the governance arrangements for these universities. Specifically, the bill will:

- reduce the size of the university councils;
- extend the tenure of student representatives on the councils from one to two years;
- allow for the tabling of annual reports in parliament by the Minister for Higher Education and Skills instead of the Governor;
- strengthen statutory liability protections for council members and senior officers;
- include provision for the establishment of common investment funds;
- expand the delegation powers of the university councils;
- change the name of the Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966 to the Flinders University Act 1966; and
- make associated consequential amendments.

The reduction in size of the university councils will bring the University of Adelaide and Flinders University into line with the University of South Australia and is consistent with Universities Australia's Voluntary Code of Best Practice for the Governance of Australian Universities. Importantly, this will

be achieved while broadly maintaining the existing proportions of staff, student and appointed independent members on university councils.

Extending the tenure of student representatives will similarly improve corporate governance by providing additional professional development opportunities. Providing for the establishment of common investment funds will simplify the management of moneys held in trust by the universities. Finally, expanding the ability of the university councils to delegate functions to officers or committees will streamline university administration.

The government has consulted closely with the University of Adelaide and Flinders University in developing these amendments, which are expected to make these institutions more responsive to the environment in which they operate. In turn, the universities put in place their own engagement processes to engage with their communities to explain the proposed amendments and the importance of ensuring best practice university governance. I commend the bill to members. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966*

3—Amendment of section 1—Short title

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 1 of the principal Act.

4—Amendment of section 2—Interpretation

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 2 of the principal Act.

5—Amendment of section 3—Establishment and incorporation

This clause amends section 3 of the principal Act to change the name of the university to Flinders University (currently the Flinders University of South Australia).

6—Insertion of section 3A

This clause inserts new section 3A into the principal Act, providing that references in existing documents etc to the Flinders University of South Australia will be taken to be references to Flinders University.

7—Amendment of section 5—Council

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act to reduce the number of members of the Council as specified.

8—Amendment of section 6—Term of office

This clause amends section 6 of the principal Act to increase the term of office for student members of the Council from 1 year to 2 years.

9—Amendment of section 18—Conduct of business in Council

This clause amends section 18 of the principal Act to provide that a quorum of the Council is to be one half of the total number of members of the Council (ignoring any fraction resulting from the division) plus 1.

10—Substitution of section 19A

This clause substitutes the delegation power in section 19A of the principal Act with one that is consistent with those conferred under similar Acts.

11—Substitution of section 27

This clause substitutes the annual reporting requirements under section 27 of the principal Act so that they are consistent with those applying to other universities.

12—Substitution of section 29

This clause substitutes the provision conferring immunity from civil liability under section 29 of the principal Act, replacing it with a provision that is consistent with the legislation of similar universities in other jurisdictions.

13—Insertion of sections 30 to 33

This clause inserts new sections 30 to 33 into the principal Act. Those new sections facilitate the establishment, management and distribution of funds from common investment funds and are based on provisions applying to the University of Melbourne.

14—Amendment of long title

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the long title of the principal Act.

Part 3—Amendment of *University of Adelaide Act 1971*

15—Substitution of section 10

This clause substitutes the delegation power in section 10 of the principal Act with one that is consistent with those conferred under similar Acts.

16—Amendment of section 12—Constitution of Council

This clause amends section 12 of the principal Act to reduce the number of members of the Council as specified.

17—Amendment of section 12A—Term of office

This clause amends section 12A of the principal Act to increase the term of office for student members of the Council from 1 year to 2 years.

18—Substitution of section 25

This clause substitutes the annual reporting requirements under section 25 of the principal Act so that they are consistent with those applying to other universities.

19—Substitution of section 29

This clause substitutes the provision conferring immunity from civil liability under section 29 of the principal Act, replacing it with a provision that is consistent with the legislation of similar universities in other jurisdictions.

20—Insertion of sections 30 to 33

This clause inserts new sections 30 to 33 into the principal Act. Those new sections facilitate the establishment, management and distribution of funds from common investment funds and are based on provisions applying to the University of Melbourne.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Certain members of Council of Flinders University to continue to hold office for remainder of term

This clause allows the specified members of the Council to continue to hold office until the end of their current terms, despite the operation of clause 7 of this measure.

2—Members of Council of University of Adelaide to continue to hold office for remainder of term

This clause allows the specified members of the Council to continue to hold office until the end of their current terms, despite the operation of clause 16 of this measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (SIMPLIFY) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:44): I rise today to speak to the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Bill 2016. I might just start where the member for Newland left off. He said that if we were to rely on the opposition (his words) for ideas he would be in trouble. I just want to remind the member for Newland that the idea of a repeal day was actually that of the Liberal Party. In my research before I was looking to speak on this bill, I saw that there was a Liberal Party document dated 3 April 2013 about a repeal day and removing redundant laws.

The Labor Party seems to have this obsession with passing laws that interfere with the daily lives of business owners. As Liberals, on this side of the chamber we are actually committed to making sure that government interference is at a minimum and that individual freedom is consistent

with good order and sound administration. We know that unnecessary legislation and redundant laws add costs to small business, and are a burden on society and government departments. We acknowledge that it is time to clean out laws that have passed their use-by date.

It has been said that in 1975, after about 140 years of South Australia's laws, a full set of South Australian statutes took up 60 centimetres of shelf space. Over 40 years later, they actually occupy double that space. We had a five-point repeal day plan to do a number of things, including:

1. Identify outdated legislation that had no relevance to the everyday lives of South Australian business owners, individuals and government;

2. Work with the private sector, non-government organisations, community groups and individuals to identify opportunities to cut down the burden of unnecessary legislation affecting them;

I point out that we would not just dictate; we would listen to the private sector, listen to non-government organisations and listen to community groups. What the government has done here, judging by the low level of consultation they have conducted, is as per usual: they are dictating; they are not listening to the people. You can see that because community groups have not had enough time, in my opinion, to be consulted and to provide feedback in relation to this. We also said we would:

3. Dedicate a full day of Parliamentary sitting in our first year in office—

because this is a priority—

to this cleaning up and repeal of outdated and redundant legislation: 'Repeal Day';

We would not rush it in one of the last weeks of a sitting year like this government is trying to do. We would also:

4. Ensure that all ministers in a…Government would actively identify ways to simply legislation in their portfolio areas—

which is consistent with this theme, and we would also aim to:

5. Consolidate other laws to remove duplication and avoid confusion amongst government and the private sector.

We would consult widely in doing this. We understand that we must embrace technology, especially when technology can reduce red tape and also add value. This South Australian government wants to talk about repealing redundant laws; however, it has certainly taken its time to do so. I understand that in recent times the Attorney's priorities have been perhaps in the wrong place, getting letters behind his name and what have you. I notice that he has passed it on to other members of the government to carry the weight in this bill.

The government keeps passing laws that interfere with our daily lives. As I said, we on this side of the chamber are certainly committed to keeping the level of government interference to a minimum. Individual freedom consistent with good order and sound administration is extremely important on this side of the chamber. We understand that we have to take the handbrake off the South Australian economy, because for too long it has been shackled by a bad Labor government which has too much red tape in a whole array of areas.

We understand that, whilst there must be a legal framework in some areas, the government should always try to get out of the way where it is possible to do so. Whilst the government's spin-off of this Liberal policy sees consultation with various government departments, it would be beneficial for the government to consult with more, and to listen rather than dictate to, various bodies, including the private sector. They should also work alongside these groups to cut down the burden of unnecessary legislation.

There are a few questions the government must answer, as put forward by my colleague the member for Mitchell. Firstly, we must understand from the government how many jobs this will create. Not only that, but how much money will this save, and is there any associated modelling with this? These are very important questions that the government must answer in speaking to this bill. As I said, we announced in the 2013 plan at the time that a Liberal government would dedicate a full day of parliamentary sitting to the cleaning up and repeal of outdated and redundant legislation rather than trying to rush things through in the late stages of a sitting calendar, as we are seeing this year.

We would ensure that every single minister in the government of the day would try to find ways to simplify legislation in their portfolio and also consolidate other laws, because we understand that duplication and confusion amongst government and the private sector is not a good thing. For the last 15 years, what have we seen? We have seen Labor pass many laws that interfere with our daily lives. We are certainly committed to minimal government interference wherever possible.

I would now like to speak on some of the legislative changes that the bill seeks to implement, beginning with the Conveyancers Act 1994. Clause 19 of the bill seeks to allow body corporate conveyancers to carry on their business without approval being obtained from Consumer and Business Services through changes to the Conveyancers Act 1994. The partnership details required to be listed on the public register are already under separate regulations. It is important to note that approximately 70 body corporate conveyancers operating in South Australia currently are inconvenienced by the need for approval from the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs. I support reforming what seems to be an unclear and unnecessary additional rule for conducting business.

The Crown Land Management Act 2009, which came into effect in 2009 under the Labor government, replaced the Crown Land Act 1929 and six other minor acts dealing with crown land during that period. Since its implementation, a number of provisions have been proven to be ambiguous and cumbersome, as acknowledged in the 'Simplify Day: reducing red tape and regulatory burden' document released by the government.

In the bill before us today, clause 21 provides that if a land parcel owned by a crown agency is declared surplus, the minister may dispose of it without declaring. Clause 23 gives the minister final consent on granting a lease in relation to crown land of which they are the custodian, and clause 28 allows some crown land to be disposed of without a competitive process and for less than market value.

In terms of the Electronic Transactions Act 2000, clause 42 seeks to extend the exemptions to government documents specified in the regulations. Clause 44 broadens the act to include other forms of electronic communications, to allow the government to issue documents electronically. Clause 48 allows the minister to determine what the approved communications system is and the usage rules around the system. The receiver of this information must also have consented to receiving the information electronically.

As shadow parliamentary secretary for entrepreneurship, innovation and business start-up, I hope to see the government spend more time looking into these kinds of amendments to assist in the shift to the digital age. I note that the government has engaged in a pilot program in this area and, should any issues be identified, I hope that they are addressed in the polishing of this legislation in the other place. It might be a good time to also point out that, whilst we will reserve our rights on this legislation, we will likely be amending parts of the legislation. We will reserve that right for the upper house.

Under the Evidence Act 1929, clause 53 adds a section 25A to abolish the oath belief rule, whereby a witness can be questioned and can express an opinion about whether the evidence given by another person in court on oath should be believed. We then have the Heritage Places Act 1993. Clause 64 seeks to implement changes to meetings of the Heritage Council so they will no longer need to be held in a public place and allows for a conference by telephone or other means to be a meeting, as long as participants have notice and are capable of participating. Clause 64 also states that meetings of the Heritage Council are to be open to the public unless the council considers it necessary to exclude them.

Under the Land Agents Act 1994, I note that clause 66 removes the penalty for a late payment of a land agent's registration fee. Clause 67 removes the default penalty for a failure to lodge an audit statement and also allows an agent to be liable in both a civil and criminal matter for a charge of failure to lodge an audit statement. Currently, I believe it can only be one or the other. Various changes are also proposed for the Security and Investigation Industry Act 1995. There are a number of regulatory changes proposed, especially in regard to the Development (Panels) (Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2006 and the Urban Renewal Regulations 2014.

The South Australian economy has certainly been slowed by unnecessary laws in a whole array of areas. What we need to be doing is addressing this now in every single area that it applies

because we know that simplifying and reducing the number of redundant laws is certainly an effective way of unshackling the red tape burden on the South Australian economy. I anticipate that many of my colleagues on this side of the chamber will also review and identify other areas of improvement for the legislation. As I said, we support the passage of the bill in this house; however, we do respect our right to seek amendments in the other place.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:55): I will not hold the house for too long.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We know what that means.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, that is right, I am going to use my full 20 minutes. You are right onto me, Deputy Speaker, and I apologise for having sunglasses on my head. One thing I want to start off with is that the member for Mitchell, in what I thought was a very interesting contribution to say the least, talked not so much about the things we are doing but the things that we should be doing. I draw the attention of the house to the fact that the Premier has given a commitment in his second reading explanation, or earlier, that this simplify bill is going to be an annual event.

I do not mean to put it in too simplistic terms, but the reality is that, before you make changes to existing legislation, you have to go through a process to make sure that the changes you are making or simplifying are actually understood with respect to the implications and that you have gone through a process of consulting with those people who will benefit or be affected by these particular bills. So, it is a bit of a nonsense to say, 'Bring this in. Bring this in. Bring this in.' Eventually they might, of course, but it needs to be undertaken by a process, and this is going to be an evolving bill over years as more bills are brought into the frame that are subject to and appropriate for some form of simplification.

What I basically want to do today is address some of the legislative and regulatory changes under the government's simplify bill initiative. I want to do this in those areas that relate to food and fisheries and the environment, in addition to some future considerations and commitments in those sectors.

Mr Duluk: You would make a good environment minister.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Thank you very much. I hope one day that you will make a very good member of parliament and very good minister as well.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's not the member for Davenport on two warnings I hear, is it?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And the member for Hammond and the member for Hartley. We would hate the member for Schubert not to have an audience.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Sorry, ma'am.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: We were delving into forming a self-appreciation society for a while there, but we will move on. In the fisheries area, the Simplify Day bill and accompanying regulations made by the Governor on Simplify Day itself address a number of burdensome, outdated or unnecessary requirements in the fishing industry. When we look at aspects of the bill, in particular the media advertisement options for fisheries and aquaculture, the bill addresses the outdated requirement for all notifications on fisheries management or advertising in the preparation of statutory policies to be published via a newspaper.

Currently, the legislation allows no other option for the distribution of such information and notifications other than in a newspaper, in an era where electronic means—of course, we know how good the member for Schubert is at accessing these more modern forms of communication—and media are much more widely used. This change will allow for alternative options to newspapers for these notifications and advertisements, allowing the information to be published in places such as the PIRSA website, and I might add that it is a very good website.

The bill also provides important clarification surrounding the rules over possession of protected species. I know what I would like to do with people who are in possession of protected species, but I know the bill probably will not cater for what I would like to do to those people. However, getting back to it, as I said, it provides clarification surrounding the rules over possession of protected species or parts of protected species in relation to historical exhibits, museums and national collections that were taken before species protection measures were in place, such as the white shark jaws in the Museum.

The possession of such protected species will now be allowed where it satisfies a test of being justified in the public interest. Long may it be that there will never be future exhibits of protected species that are taken in this day and age. The prawn fisheries—I suspect you like prawns, Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am very good at peeling them.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, I have a doctor who tells me my dietary requirements, so I can only have crayfish in various ways, but nobody ever seems to believe that when they ask, 'Do you have any dietary requirements?'

Changes to regulations have addressed ambiguity regarding prawn fisheries rules in the Spencer Gulf and West Coast, in particular rules on when prawn fisheries are opened and closed to fishing. Although the amendments are not expected to cause any big changes to the way in which the industry operates, they do remove unnecessary practices by taking away the need for temporary exemptions and closure notices to be issued.

I would say that the Spencer Gulf fishery is one of the best managed fisheries in the world. A similar thing can be said about the West Coast as well but, in particular, Spencer Gulf is recognised. As I said, the changes to the regulations define the fishing season as 12 months from 1 July to 30 June the following year in relation to the taking of prescribed species under a licence. The changes also allow the suspension or limiting of fishing activity, or the use of fishing vessels, at any time throughout the season. This can be done via a notice or direction issued to all licence holders.

This change affects up to 42 licence holders across three fisheries, allowing for the same activities to occur consistent with the management plans for the fisheries. Won't it be novel—to have activities that are actually consistent with the management plans for the fisheries. I am saying that tongue-in-cheek. I am just making the point that there are things within this bill that do simplify the way businesses operate in this state, and that can only be a good thing for those various businesses.

For broodstock and seedstock fisheries, a regulatory change was also made to remove the need to gain an additional permit to farm wild mussel spat naturally occurring within an area over which an individual already has an aquaculture licence. This removes red tape requiring a permit to cultivate the mussel spat occurring naturally on an aquaculture farm, positively affecting up to 36 aquaculture licensees authorised to farm mussels. I will repeat that: positively affecting up to 36 aquaculture licensees authorised to farm mussels.

On other aspects of the bill, the bill also introduces an amendment which clearly identifies the purposes for which the Fisheries Management Industry Fund can be used. These purposes previously lacked clarity. The bill also removes unnecessary requirements for the Environment Protection Authority to review minor administrative aquaculture licence changes. I state again that they are minor administrative aquaculture licence changes, such as the substitution of an aquaculture licence upon amalgamation or subdivision. I can tell by your face, Deputy Speaker, that it makes a lot of sense.

The bill also introduces a number of additional minor changes to fisheries legislation, including allowing for a fishing licence to be cancelled where it has been suspended for a long period of time and where it has not been possible to contact the licence holder. I notice that the member for Mitchell was talking about what impact this might have with respect to the value that a bank sees these licences to have. The way I read it, it is where it has not been possible to contact the licence holder. That says a bit about what the licence holder might think about the value of the licence, but I may be being a bit presumptuous there.

Certainly, in certain prescribed circumstances, the changes proposed in the bill allow the operators of fisheries to remove exotic and noxious species from state waters where the appropriate equipment and processes are used—they should be able to do that. The changes allow fisheries officers to report potential offences to law enforcement agencies and, where a person is discovered to have a commercial quantity of fish, incorporate a new presumption as to the purpose of trafficking. This is an important reform which will apply to priority species, of which there are only two: rock lobster (my dietary requirement, as my doctor says) and abalone. It provides a presumption—that is rebuttable on the balance of probabilities—that the priority species are taken for trafficking.

This reversal of the onus of proof is consistent with other parts of the Fisheries Management Act 2007. These two proprietary species are high-value fish species for which there is clear evidence of interstate and international black-market trade. The nature of illegal taking of any species has serious impacts on fish stocks, as it is indiscriminate and normally includes the take of juveniles. This can lead to localised depletion of these species. Black-market value for these species is conservatively estimated to be in excess of $1.5 million annually. The true value of undersize fish might be even higher if they were allowed to grow to full size and then taken in the appropriate, proper and legal manner.

I mentioned that I would talk about future considerations for fisheries. As part of the 2017 Simplify Day process, reforms to regulations under the Fisheries Management Act 2007 will be considered. These proposed reforms relate to various reviews and requests of the fishing industry. Again, I hark back to the comments made by the member for Mitchell about what should be in the bill here and now. That is evidence of the fact that we have to go through processes to ensure that we properly consult with people who will be impacted by any changes made with respect to simplifying bills.

In terms of the agriculture sphere, I know that many opposite have a great understanding of the importance of agriculture and horticulture in the State of South Australia. I know from my time that you never count your chickens until they are hatched, but in this case you never count the grain until it is in the silo. I imagine that it has been progressing pretty well to date in some areas, and there are still some areas that are late with their particular harvest. I wish them all the very best of success in ensuring they harvest well and get it to the place where it will be properly protected and then sold. Are the prices coming up or not?

Mr Pederick: No, it's looking alright.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Thank you; that is good. We just heard that the prices are looking better than they were some time ago, so that is a good thing. I thank the member—

Mr Pederick: They're not fantastic.

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, but farmers in general would never say they are fantastic, but at least they have a good crop and they going to get the majority of that into the silos, which is only a good thing, and especially a good thing for the state.

I want to focus on interstate trade after that little bit of deviation. In terms of interstate trade of horticultural products, more broadly in the food and agriculture sector the bill seeks to more closely align the annual fees and returns of accredited persons and registered importers of horticultural products with national requirements. It makes sense. It will also create efficiencies in associated state government audit and compliance activity, making equally good sense.

In terms of future considerations, as part of the plan for Simplify Day 2017, consideration will be given to Biosecurity SA to investigate whether their compliance arrangements regarding veterinary and agricultural produce could be simplified by adopting arrangements similar to those applicable to primary produce. In addition, it will be considered whether Biosecurity SA should remove some regulatory burden on companies exporting whole fruit. Consultation on this potential reform is currently in progress, to be completed next year, and builds on the contemporary approach of working proactively with industry on meeting their food safety requirements.

We heard today the Minister for Agriculture pay tribute to the work being undertaken by Biosecurity South Australia with regard to the decision to recognise internationally agricultural and horticultural produce from the Riverland—I think it was Indonesia on this occasion—as coming from

a fruit fly free zone. I think that one of the very sensible things the government did was to ensure that two aspects of Biosecurity SA in South Australia were merged. There was one with PIRSA and one with DEWNR, and they merged to form Biosecurity SA, and I think that was a very sensible and productive thing to do with respect to the management of biosecurity in this state.

On the environment, something I know is near and dear to the heart of everyone in this chamber, I would like to briefly speak about the reforms under this bill that relate to environment and conservation. The Simplify Day bill addresses a number of provisions within the Crown Land Management Act 2009 to improve clarity and reduce administrative ambiguity. These reforms go to the removal of duplication in declaring surplus crown land, simplifying crown land leasing arrangements and simplifying the disposal of crown land in certain circumstances.

In addition, the bill seeks to allow council officers the ability to use sensory evidence for all local nuisance matters, improving consistency in council processes. What better body is there than local council to use sensory evidence for all local nuisance issues? They are best placed to deal with these nuisance issues, and they ought to have mechanisms that make it easier for them to do that.

The bill also seeks to allow the South Australian Heritage Council to conduct out of session business by means other than members being physically present, allowing instead for a telephone call—fancy that—or other electronic means of communication. Again, it makes a lot of sense for that to occur, and removing that restriction is just the proper and right thing to do. The bill removes the requirement for a national parks and wildlife regional reserve report to be prepared every 10 years, supporting a more effective use of government resources for the preparation of publicly available management plans for reserves.

The Simplify Day bill also removes the need for a waste transport business licence applicant to advertise the nature of their business to the public, saving three weeks for these applicants. The EPA has not received public submissions for these types of notifications. The bill also addresses redundant ozone notification requirements within the Environment Protection Act 1993. Ozone protection regulations were removed from the Environment Protection Act 1993 in 2008.

In conclusion, I can say this: the government is committed to reducing red tape across all sectors of the South Australian economy, aiming to help ease the burden on our businesses and to stimulate economic activity. This bill, the regulations and future reforms are evidence that this government is continuing to reduce red tape to make our state a place where business can thrive. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:11): I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Bill 2016. I think it is a good thing to simplify legislation and, as referred to earlier today in the debate, repeal legislation that is not just years but decades out of date from when it was enacted.

It makes you wonder why it takes decades to get to a point of repealing acts that obviously were once needed to enact the laws of this state but that have nothing to do with our daily life any longer. This was certainly part of our policy platform. We need to make sure we do not create any inadvertent circumstances. From this side, there will be a watching brief, and certainly the conversation may be changed in the other place.

The bill was introduced on only 15 November by the Premier to amend a number of pieces of legislation and regulations. As has been stated in this place, the government announced earlier this year, on 14 July 2016, that it would hold a red tape repeal day annually, and this bill aims at making these legislative changes. What the government is claiming are the first four elements of Simplify Day are in the following categories: (a) legislative changes; (b) regulatory changes; (c) repealed legislation; and (d) future reforms.

I sometimes get concerned about changes in regulation because, unless you monitor the *Gazette* religiously, you may miss a regulatory change. One bill we debated in the not too distant past comes to mind, that is, the repeal of the Firearms Act and the new Firearms Bill, when a lot of the regulations were to be sorted out by a committee afterwards. My issue with that is partly that we do not get to debate those in this place, but the one saving grace we had then was that the Hon. Rob Kerin was chairing that committee.

With regard to legislative changes, as the shadow parliamentary secretary for agriculture and fisheries I, too, am interested in changes around agriculture and fisheries that have been put up in this legislative change. In relation to legislative changes to the agriculture act of 2001, clause 4 allows the regulations to clarify what matters do not constitute a variation of licence conditions. Clause 5 enables the minister to advertise policies in the media and on their own website, which currently requires the Premier's consent. Clause 8 allows the minister to approve licence conditions or variations without referring them to the Environment and Protection Authority.

In regard to other clauses relating to the Fisheries Management Act 2007, I have always argued in this place that this act governs, if not the best, one of the best management facilities for fishing not just in this country but in the world. Certainly, I have always contended that fisheries should be managed by Primary Industries and not by default through the environment department, talking about no-take zones, etc.

In relation to the Fisheries Management Act 2007, clause 55 allows voluntary contributions to be made to the Fisheries Research and Development Fund, with money in the fund able to be used for projects relating to management of aquatic research. I do not think there is ever enough aquatic research. Clause 56 changes the requirement for an advertisement of proposed management plans to be displayed in a newspaper and allows the minister to publish a notice in the manner they determine. It has been mentioned earlier by members in this place that you can use the electronic media now to put articles out there.

Clause 57 allows the minister to cancel a licence, permit or registration if it has been suspended for more than six months for non-payment or if the holder cannot be located. With a six-month lead time, you would like to think that people who are actually serious about their licences would know that they needed to renew and put up that payment. I do note that some licence payments are either being paid by the government or are not being taken by the government from the Coorong fisheries because of the impact of the New Zealand fur seals on the fishery, which is significant. That would be having an impact on the budget, where it would be better for a management plan to be in place to manage the seals.

Clause 58 allows the minister to issue a permit authorising the possession of an aquatic resource of a protected species if the minister deems this is in the public interest. A person or body must not generally be in possession of a protected aquatic species which speaks for itself, but obviously if it is in the public interest, for research or other purposes, there might be a need for someone to be in possession of an aquatic resource of a protected species.

Clause 59 changes the presumption of innocence for those accused of trafficking a species to presume that, if there is no proof suggesting otherwise, the person has the species in their possession and is therefore guilty of the offence. It changes the onus of proof. People would have to be aware of that and make sure they do not get tied up with that change in the regulation. Clause 60 allows the minister to issue a permit authorising the person to have an exotic or noxious species using appropriate fishing equipment.

Clause 61 inserts provisions stating that permits granted by the minister are not transferable, and are subject to conditions the minister thinks fit, and allows the minister to revoke or vary conditions at any time. Clause 62 permits a person engaged in the act to disclose information to authorities outside South Australia where information is required for any act or law of that jurisdiction. This was previously limited to providing information regarding fishing laws.

As I said, we have some very good legislation in this state. It is very tight, and there are severe issues for people who contravene the legislation. In some places, it is tough legislation. There are tough impacts on commercial fishers if they break the law, but they know that the consequences are tough and the fines are tough. They know their properties can be accessed under the act, but all that is required is that people comply with the law.

In regard to tourism and the Major Events Act 2013, clause 73 allows the minister to declare a major event by notice in the *Gazette*, which is currently limited to the Governor by regulation. Clause 74 allows a controlled area to be declared by a map or description for flexibility in defining the area and removes the Governor's ability to close roads for major events by regulation, leaving this solely with the minister.

In regard to the Plant Health Act 2009, clauses 95 and 96 amend the payment time of an accredited person under the act to be a yearly payment rather than being fixed by regulation. I think that will make it simpler when people understand that it is an annual payment and not something that, being fixed by regulation, could be changed over time. In regard to regulations around fisheries management, the Fisheries Management (Miscellaneous Broodstock and Seedstock Fishery) Regulations 2013 allow for the collection of a mussel spat by someone with an aquaculture licence. This bill removes the need for a specific mussel spat permit.

We heard about prawn fisheries earlier under the Fisheries Management (Prawn Fisheries) Regulations 2006, which define how prawn fisheries are opened and closed to specify the fishing season dates and to allow for the suspension or limits on fishing activity at any time during the season. I know the member for Colton spoke about how good the prawn fishery is managed. Certainly, the Spencer Gulf fishery is very tightly managed. I believe there are 38 boats that go out. They are all restricted to being identical, essentially, with identical motors and identical plant.

They go out together as a group, and it is really up to your skill as to how many prawns you get. It is very well regulated, and it just shows again how fisheries are well regulated under the Fisheries Management Act, which is how it should be. There is another clause involving reforms to simplify agricultural and veterinary products compliance through introducing accreditation and auditing. This happens in primary produce already, and this will assist to make it simpler in the agricultural world. Some changes are also going to be made to simplify the citrus fruit packing food safety arrangement.

On that note, it is good to see that we have had an outcome with the backpacker tax after some negotiation federally. I would just like to say that, without backpackers operating not just in this state but right throughout this country, an industry, especially horticulture, would just fall over if we did not have those tens of thousands of people who are willing to take up that work on the appropriate visas and get the job done. They are vital to our economy and I am really pleased that there has been a result after being in limbo for a very long time.

Certainly, in regard to the simplify repeal bill, we are in support of it. We will monitor its way through to the other place and, as a party, reserve our right to potentially debate more about any probable changes, if we deem it fit, in that house because this has come along rather quickly. In the main, we on this side of the house support simplification.

Ms Redmond: This is sleight of hand, not simplification.

Mr PEDERICK: Exactly. The other side is that we must make sure that we do not have any effect that may not be directly perceived in the way the bill is being presented, because there are multiple acts and regulations that are being changed and, when it comes through like this, it is a lot of legislation and regulations being amended in one hit. Certainly, if there are issues with it into the future, we can all come back to this place and amend the legislation. At this stage, we are running with it and will monitor the debate through this place and the other place as it goes forward.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:26): I am speaking today on one of the more prominent changes that form part of the Simplify Day bill, that is, amendments to the Electronic Transactions Act to allow for electronic transactions relating to a range of documents and processes, including the creation of digital licences. These legislative changes allow for the issuing of electronic licences, permits and identifications such as occupational licences and driver's licences without causing doubt over which document, physical or electronic, would be valid.

Currently, we rely on having our licences in a physical form, despite the fact that the systems that the licences rely on have been essentially digital for some time. Physical licences consume unnecessary costs, time and paperwork, all adding up to additional red tape. Generally, to obtain a physical licence, you are required to wait for something to come through in the mail, and the introduction of digital licensing would cut costs, reduce paperwork and save time for both customers and the public sector. Our physical licences do not represent the most up-to-date information. The physical licence is simply a snapshot of when the licence was printed. I do not know about you, Deputy Speaker, but my licence rarely looks like me at any given time of life.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can take current photos, you know.

Ms COOK: Thank you: I am not sure whether it is their camera or whether it is me, or whether I just have very kind mirrors, but my photograph does not look like me at all. A digital licence can be constantly updated and provide those analysing the licence, such as police officers, with real-time information, and I am sure there will be lots of folly and carry-on creating up-to-date digital photographs. It is important to emphasise that the changes included within the Simplify Day bill do not introduce digital licences now.

The changes simply enable digital licences to be put into effect in the future. A program of work is currently underway to determine how this will operate. In July of this year, the government initiated a pilot which successfully put to the test a limited number of digital licences. The trial involved the creation of a licence app, called mySA GOV, which allows for licence credentials to be accessed in real time, as opposed to a physical licence which does not always accurately reflect the licence status.

The app allows your licences to be stored in the one place and easily accessed rather than having to carry around multiple physical cards or bits of paper—which, Deputy Speaker, I also find very difficult in this day and age when you are trying to carry a phone and a purse and fit all your bits and pieces in. I think a digital copy will be much more practical. When available, customers will be able to opt in to create a secure verified account and access their stored credentials in a convenient way. A number of people have raised concerns with me about how people would be safeguarded if they were unable to access their licence right then and there, such as when they are out of range of a phone tower.

Thankfully, though, through the trial, those issues have been worked through and strategies are in place to deal with it. The licence information provided within the app relies on the same government systems that our physical licences currently do. This means that source data will remain protected as it currently is. Of course, with the introduction of digital licences, security precautions are of primary consideration.

One such security feature is a unique barcode that refreshes at defined intervals for validation purposes. In the trial, that period was every 30 seconds. For example, if a police officer were to check your digital driver's licence, they would scan the licence barcode, which prompts a real-time call to the source system. The current licence status is then represented on the police officer's app. When your phone goes out of service, the barcode is then removed and it shows the period that has elapsed since the licence was last refreshed. Obviously, if your licence—

Ms Redmond: Who wrote this for you?

Ms COOK: Indeed. Obviously, if your licence had not been refreshed for a while, the officer would take additional precautions to confirm your identity and the licence's validity on a common-sense basis. In addition, in order to protect against screenshotting of digital licences, there is a shake effect built into the app that shows a green tick when the phone is shaken to signify that the licence is not a screenshot. It is very clever, isn't it?

Further to this, the app itself, as well as licences within the app, would be protected by its own PIN code separate to the general PIN code on your phone. Thumbprint security will also be available for Apple phone users. I do understand how this would be challenging for people who do not already use that sort of technology.

Mr Duluk: It's like the Australia card.

Ms COOK: Is that right? Do you think so, member for Davenport? That is an interesting comment. The development of this app is occurring in parallel with engagement with businesses, associations and the public, incorporating discussions with and feedback from regulatory authorities. Of course, everything I have outlined reflects only the trial process for digital licensing and is subject to further development. There is still some way to go, and when digital licences are introduced they will be phased in under consultation with the public and through ensuring public understanding of this new policy.

It is proposed that digital licensing would be phased in through the introduction of licences such as land agent and boat licences first, and eventually driver's licences would be offered at a later time. Physical licences would still remain as valid forms of identification upon the introduction of

digital licences for those that wish to continue to use it in that format. With this system, it is proposed that renewal reminders would occur via electronic notifications including texts, push notifications and emails, rather than via post as currently occurs, resulting in time savings and further cost savings and efficiencies.

This move puts South Australia at the forefront of this kind of innovative thinking, with other states at various stages in considering this technology. The South Australian government has been working really hard to integrate our mobile use and networks into the way we use our transport system. Already we see around Adelaide time signs that give drivers an indication and advise on best routes, which are all done using Bluetooth technology in phones and cars, so that there is an up-to-date record of what time someone can expect to travel. This information is also available through a phone app.

It is great to see that we are further integrating technology into our transport system to help bring it into the 21st century. Although the amendments contained within the Simplify Day bill are just the beginning of the transition towards digital licensing, the potential benefits are significant and something the government is working towards right now.

I also wanted to briefly address another reform in the bill under the Attorney-General's portfolio: the abolition of the oath belief rule. This reform is consistent with views expressed or favoured by various courts, legal scholars and the Australian Law Reform Commission, as well as the department of public prosecutions. It is a good example of how the Simplify Day process has engaged and responded to stakeholders on areas where they would like to see change.

The oath belief rule is a common law rule relating to evidence. This rule allows a witness to be questioned and to express their thoughts as to whether the evidence given by another witness in court on oath should be believed. This rule is an ancient one and has been heavily criticised for its inconsistency with modern-day evidence laws. In light of these considerations, the oath belief rule is to be abolished in a common-sense update to our laws of evidence.

In conclusion, the changes I have just discussed are only two of the reforms within the Simplify Day bill, and the bill itself is an important part of the continuation of the government's red tape reduction agenda. Simplify Day is now committed to by this government as an annual event, with a large number of potential reforms already on the plan for 2017. The Simplify Day bill is a symbol of this government's commitment to making things easier for consumers and for business in Australia, and I commend it to the house.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:34): Reducing regulation and red tape is always hard. As somebody who has shadow parliamentary secretary responsibility for this area, trying to discuss this issue in the specific, rather than just in the broad and the abstract, is quite difficult. Even when talking with specific organisations, everyone knows that they want less of it, but they do not know exactly what it is they want less of.

The cumulative effect of regulation is a little bit like the boiling frog, in that every little piece of regulation we inch and bring forward in this place adds to the weight and burden of that which already exists but, because it happens incrementally and with the best of ideas and the best of ideals, it often goes unnoticed in the broader quantum. Getting rid of regulation and red tape takes courage. Whilst I think there are some things in here that are worthy, bill does fall short in a number of different ways.

It is funny that in my community I am often asked how often we parliamentarians sit. This year, we have sat for 18 weeks and last year it was 14 weeks. When people say, 'That doesn't sound like much,' I say, 'Well, the truth is, you don't want your politicians to be in parliament because all they are doing is making laws to take away freedoms you currently enjoy.' Really, we would be much better served by spending much more time in our electorates actually helping people on an individual, one-on-one basis.

Most of the time, when we are asked to help individuals in our community, it is helping them to navigate government, the bureaucracy, the regulation and red tape that exist. In fact, it is when that regulation and red tape break down that the vast majority of a politician's work in their own communities comes to the fore.

It is interesting that this day is called Simplify Day. I can only assume that is because the government was too embarrassed to admit that 'repeal day' was already taken as a policy idea—something the Liberal Party took to the last election. As much as imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, we would like to say to members opposite, 'You're welcome.' But, typical of this Labor government, it has taken a noble idea and done it in a pretty half-hearted sort of way because culturally and structurally those members opposite have a bent towards government controlling people's lives and so will always err on the side of more regulation rather than less. That is where I think—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: —the idea of courage comes into this because it is difficult, from time to time, to make the decision that the weight of regulation is more than the benefit that comes with it.

Interestingly, as I was going through the briefing on this bill, with the member for Bragg, with members from the department and also from the member for Kaurna's office, what became apparent to the member for Bragg and me was that many of the ideas put forward—as the member for Fisher spoke about when she says the intent of Simplify Day is to actually make life easier for business and consumers—have come from the departments themselves and that it is about departments making their lives easier. When I read through the report the government has put out in relation to Simplify Day, it makes the following statement:

> Initial public consultation was undertaken over 30 days concluding on 13 August 2016. A variety of engagement strategies were used, including a *yourSAy* discussion and face-to-face meetings with industry associations. In excess of 60 responses were received during the dedicated public consultation period from individuals, small business, local government representatives and industry peak bodies.

Interestingly, though, the first thing I want to point out (and I will get to some of these later) is that only 12 of these submissions were actually publicly available. It is pretty difficult for us to be able to evaluate the sum total of ideas that were put to the government when only 12 of the submissions have been made public.

The second thing I would say is that, again through the briefing, it became extremely apparent that ideas that were put forward by individuals, industry peak bodies and the like, were all filtered through the various departments. In fact, the departments themselves were the first port of call and they then put those ideas to the central group, which I think is running out of the Attorney-General's office with some help from DPC, especially in relation to the digital licensing project. In fact, I think that could be one of the fundamental flaws of this process.

In genuinely trying to seek out a better solution, it may indeed be better that the people involved with this project in the AGD's office do not allow the departments themselves to become a filter because it may mean that good ideas that may otherwise make life a little more difficult for the departments but, conversely, make life easier for consumers and businesses—which, as the member for Fisher says, was the idea of this whole thing in the first place—may be truncated and cast to one side.

Certainly, during the briefing it was apparent to me and to the member for Bragg that the departments were the ones that undertook the consultation in relation to their area. I can see why there is a need for that, but if it is the only way of engagement with individuals then there is a flaw in the process. When I look at the changes that have been mooted as part of this bill, it seems to me that the vast majority are not about making the lives of consumers and businesses easier; they are about making the department's life easier. In and of itself, that is not a bad thing, but it is not, as the government has stated, the intention of this legislation.

I want to go through a couple of things that I think need to be raised. I know other members have had issues with specific clauses. For instance, in relation to the presumption of innocence for those accused of trafficking a protected fish species, to reverse the onus that possession is nine-tenths of the crime essentially we are making it easier for the fisheries department to be able to prosecute people. I would like explained and justified in detail why we are essentially reversing an

onus to certainly make the fisheries department's job easier, but is that fair? In fact, does that in any way help business and consumers?

I am also quite worried about changes to the Fisheries Management Act in clause 61, which inserts a section stating that permits granted by the minister are not transferable, are subject to conditions as the minister thinks fit and allow the minister to revoke or vary conditions at any time. That seems like the minister and the department granting themselves a whole lot more scope when issuing fishing permits.

However, I know plenty of businesses out there that would stake the value of their business on these fishing permits, and any derogation of the rights available under those permits would lead to a loss of value in the permits and potentially a loss of value of those businesses holding those permits. So, again, something that may make the life of the department easier may, in effect, actually make the lives of consumers and businesses more difficult, which has been stated as the intent of this bill. In fact, it may cost them money. That is something I would like the member in charge of this bill to explain to the house.

I know that the member for Heysen is going to make a contribution in relation to a couple of clauses relating to the Crown Lands Management Act and a number of others. They all seem to be around making the department's life easier. Again, that is not bad, as long as you can justify that nobody else is made worse off under this bill. Clause 93, in relation to the National Parks and Wildlife Act, removes the requirement to prepare 10-yearly reports on the impact of regional reserves. As I understand it, that is one of the few notification mechanisms whereby we get to understand what is going on in our national parks. Is this just something that in the department they have thought, 'This pesky thing is a report we don't like to prepare, so let's just get rid of it and make our lives easier'?

That is not to say that there are not otherwise worthy things being considered in this bill, especially in relation to builder's licences issued by Consumer and Business Services. Removing the obligation for spouses who may be an owner of a business but not actually an active tradesman in a business to have to seek a permit I think is worthy. Certainly, digital licences could be, if conducted properly, a worthy pursuit. Perhaps we would be forgiven for not just handing over our trust to this government quite so easily when it comes to delivering IT projects, but we certainly wish the government well in that pursuit.

There are a number of ways that the government is actually reducing its ability to seek fines and permit fees under some of the changes to these acts. Again, I think that is a worthy cause, but a lot of the repeals of acts that we are seeking to get rid of here may help to pad out Simplify Day. In the words of *The West Wing*, they are maybe some of the packing peanuts to help bolster up what Simplify Day looks like. The problem with repealing redundant legislation is that it is already redundant, and if clauses are not actually being enacted, or the act itself has no practical purpose anymore, then all we are doing is getting rid of the bits of paper that they stick in *The Bluebook* in the statutes.

For instance, I understand that we are repealing the Y2K act, which I am sure we have not had to deal with for 16½ years. Whilst it may feel good to get rid of this piece of paper, and we will support getting rid of it, does it actually have any practical benefit? Is it actually doing anything to simplify anything, other than making the poor clerks, who are going to have to go through and take all these things out, not have to check these things from time to time? It may save Kane and the other attendants here a little bit of time, once they have taken the time to actually take the thing out, which may or may not be the only practical effect of getting rid of the act.

That is the problem with getting rid of redundant legislation. To the extent that we should get rid of it because it is redundant, that is great; but if it has no practical application, do not stand up in here and say you are making life easier for anyone. That is why I think that Simplify Day—because, again, 'repeal day' was already taken—is a missed opportunity. I want to highlight some interesting ideas that were put forward in the 12 submissions out of the 60 submissions that we have been able to see so far. I am not suggesting in any way that the Liberal Party is supporting any of these, but I want to put these on the record because I think that they are quite interesting ideas to explore. The RAA put in quite a good submission. Interestingly, on page 4 of their submission, they say:

RAA continues to advocate for the review of the application of the Victims of Crime Levy on all fines. RAA strongly believes that the Victims of Crime levy should not apply to all traffic infringements due to the lack of actual victims in [the] majority of situations. This is the view of 75 per cent of the respondents from the RAA Member Panel.

I think that is an idea worthy of consideration. I think it is an idea that was put forward in good faith, and we are going to have to start to deal with and tackle some of these harder issues if Simplify Day is going to be more than just a token effort at getting rid of things that nobody knew existed in the first place. Bartons Chartered Accountants put in quite a broad-ranging submission on a whole variety of issues. In relation to the transportation of plants interstate, they say:

Where a business is importing and exporting plants between states and needing to comply with bio security laws there is significant legislation requirements to comply with and these differ from state to state. Our recommendation is to seek national uniform laws in relation to the transportation of green plant matter.

That seems like a pretty worthy idea. I understand that that is possibly beyond the scope of just this parliament to deal with, but it is an idea that could be taken up in a COAG sense. They also go on to talk about incentivising research and development. They say:

Businesses who [are] continually researching…and innovating their product offerings in strict WHS environments find the WHS policy is inflexible.

Can I take that a step further and say that work health and safety, and occupational health and safety, is a big area that needs to be tackled in terms of regulatory requirements. It is not because I want to see in any way a derogation of the strict laws that are applied. I am not talking about fines or watering down the responsibilities of PCBUs in any way, but it is pretty difficult for businesses and consumers to enact legislation that they do not understand.

When you have these hefty tomes which are passed into law which only experts are able to understand, it is very difficult, for instance, for a sole trader plumber who happens to take on an apprentice to try to understand the whole plethora of work health and safety requirements and obligations that he undertakes by employing someone. I think the true spirit of Simplify Day is to look at burdensome regulation like the Work Health and Safety Act and make it accessible, understandable and enforceable for small businesses out there in the community.

Bartons go on to say that they would like to see greater flexibility for businesses who undertake high levels of research and development. Essentially, they were looking at a case study in Sweden, which has 'a robust regime to support and facilitate work health and safety employer risk in relation to R&D and innovation'. I think that is an idea worthy of consideration. In a state where we are looking for jobs, where we are looking for innovation, that is an idea that is worthy of looking at in the first place.

The Property Council put in a submission which would quite obviously lend itself towards looking at things like lowering land tax and a whole range of taxes, which their members, I am sure, would be extremely excited about. They talk about strata titles and 'a threshold of 25 per cent of owners voting against a proposal'. Essentially, they are talking about their 100 per cent limit, the fact that a unanimous decision from all owners is needed to cancel a strata plan and also to amend or dissolve an existing scheme, as well as third parties such as lenders, and that the threshold should be reduced to 75 per cent so that something can happen instead having a person involved in the strata being able to effectively veto.

Again, I think that is an issue that needs to be explored. I agree that it is extremely complex delving into some of the fundamental private property rights that exist in South Australia, but it is an idea worthy of exploration. There are ideas, for instance, from EnergyAustralia, and this one is perhaps a bit pertinent to the government. Its submission states:

The current design of SA energy concessions are complex, inefficient, error-prone—

and I think we have seen that in this place with the Auditor-General's reports on energy concessions—

and inconsistent with other state jurisdictions. In SA, a retail customer when accepting an energy offer with an energy retailer provides concession details to DCSI who verify their eligibility and advise the retailer to apply the concession. In other states, the customer provides concession details directly to the retailer who establishes eligibility with Centrelink and applies the concession. The result is the customer has two touch-points in SA, which is a cause of confusion and frustration and errors may occur—

I am fairly certain the errors have occurred—

when data files are sent between two active databases (DCSI and the retailer).

I think that is a fairly sensible suggestion, given the fact that the Auditor-General over the last two years has suggested that the way we run concessions has been a bit of a mess and also the fact that the government went from spending $600,000 to $7.8 million on a concession system that it had to scrap and is now starting over again, and the new system, COLIN, has gone, I think, from $2 million to $3.2 million already.

A helpful suggestion from some of the retailers, who are probably having increased compliance costs at their end because there is confusion and error on the government side, is probably an idea worthy of consideration. Business SA provided a submission. Quite interesting and novel is the idea to abolish employer registration before taking on an apprentice or a trainee. Business SA states:

This is a state requirement and is not a requirement in other states and territories including Queensland, Western Australia or the Northern Territory. Business SA has advocated for the removal of the registration requirement as it often delays the commencement of apprentices or trainees—

I think that is something we can all get around—

and imposes additional unnecessary layers of compliance. Business SA suggests that all compliance procedures included in employer registration are either adequately covered by other laws and regulations or could be covered through the contract of training and training plan approval process.

As somebody who has spoken to many private training providers about the process needed to get apprentices and trainees approved, I suggest that that is hard enough already without this extra layer of bureaucracy. Those ideas have been missed as part of this process, but I think they are worthy of consideration. I highlight them because if these ideas were filtered and discarded by the departments themselves before they got to this more centralised outcome, then these are voices that need to be heard and ideas that need to be aired.

I urge the government to take this process more seriously and make some hard and bold choices in relation to making life easier for businesses and consumers, and not just government departments, and to have an open mind about some more novel approaches that come from a whole heap of people who have done a lot of work to try to help the government to help themselves. I look forward to future repeal days, post 2018, being much more successful than this mediocre effort.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (16:54): It is my pleasure to rise to make a contribution in relation to the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Bill 2016. I indicate to the house that I will be opposing the bill because, in my view, it is a particular piece of sleight of hand on the part of the government and I think it is directed to get through this house in a particular hurry at the end of our sitting year for a particular purpose—and I will come to that in a minute.

The first thing that took my eye on this particular piece of legislation was amendments to an act I did not know even existed until quite recently, that is the Second-hand Vehicles Dealers Act. I knew that existed, but I did not know that in that act there was a Second-hand Vehicles Compensation Fund, and there are amendments in this legislation to that fund.

Madam Deputy Speaker, you may be aware that that fund is now administered through a government agency whereas it was previously managed by second-hand motor vehicle dealers through the Motor Trade Association (MTA). What happens is that each of the motor vehicle dealers in the state pay a fee of about $300 a year to be put into that fund, and the idea is that that then contains a guarantee fund for people who are basically dudded by licensed dealers who do not come good on a warranty for a second-hand vehicle when it is purchased.

As at 2010 that fund was administered by the MTA, as I said, and they managed to administer it pretty effectively. There were five claims in 2010, and the cost of administering the fund was $21,000. The claims themselves were not worth a great deal. Last year, having had the management of the fund transferred to the government—indeed to the minister for consumer affairs and the Office of Consumer Affairs—there was only one claim against the fund.

According to the annual report, that one claim was worth, I believe, $17,000 but the cost of administering the fund had gone up to $409,000. This is a fund with $6 million in it, so it will not take

very long to deplete it completely at that rate, but how on earth a government department can justify having spent over $400,000 administering one claim—which, in total, cost the fund $17,000—bewilders me.

However, that is not the main thing that concerns me about this act. What I believe is happening with this act is that it is part of a process that this government is going through as they really treacherously treat the people of this state in their dealings with the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site—that is, when it becomes the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site in the sense of the hospital eventually moving to its new location.

Over the years, we have had many statements from various members of the government—minister Hill in particular made a number of statements over a period of years—and there was a vast expectation as to the public use of that space. The fact is that the government itself, in 2005, passed an act, now known as the Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005, which sets out particular provisions as to how the land which comprises the Adelaide Parklands should be dealt with.

What I believe is happening with this particular proposal is that the government now needs to avoid the consequences of the various pieces of legislation that currently affect that piece of land, because it is Parklands. The whole of the site of what I will call the old Royal Adelaide Hospital is, in fact, part of the Parklands of the city. In fact, I have a copy of the certificate of title, volume 6134, folio 112, and it currently shows the registered proprietor as the Central Adelaide Local Health Network Inc., and its address as Level 3, Ground Floor, Royal Adelaide Hospital, North Terrace, Adelaide 5000. In fact, that particular entity owns the fee simple.

Under the Crown Lands Act 1929 (which has now been superseded by the act amended in this legislation, the Crown Land Management Act 2009), the land was dedicated as a reserve to be used for hospital purposes and the certificate of title was endorsed with these words: 'In trust, to permit, suffer and be used at all times as a reserve for hospital purposes.' That act was then repealed, but it was replaced by the Crown Land Management Act 2009.

Basically, under the transitional provisions, in layman's terms, the title is still held by the Central Adelaide Local Health Network and is still in trust for the same purposes but it is now managed under the new Crown Land Management Act 2009. There is no doubt that the whole of the land on which the old RAH now sits was originally Parklands, and it is also worth noting at this point that the Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005, which I already mentioned, stipulates as the first statutory principle in section 4:

> …the land comprising the Adelaide Park Lands should, as far as is reasonably appropriate, correspond to the intentions of Colonel William Light in establishing the first Plan of Adelaide in 1837.

But of course this government has announced that what it is going to do is sell the Parklands into private ownership, amongst other things, and put hundreds—if not, I think, a thousand—privately owned apartments on Parklands. This bit of treachery is being perpetrated partly by the amendment of the Crown Land Management Act in this legislation, laughingly called the simplify bill, when, as far as the Crown Land Management Act goes, the amendments go for five or six pages, I believe, and indeed change the nature of what is going on.

I will just take a few minutes to explain, and I am sorry that it is a bit complex and a bit long. The Crown Land Management Act largely deals obviously with what happens to crown land. There are provisions about dedicated land. Section 18 is largely concerned with new dedications of land and there are provisions for the minister to alter the dedication of land and so forth, but these provisions may not apply to all land that comes to the minister under the repeal and transitional provisions in schedule 1. So, section 18 may only apply to new land that has come to the minister.

What is important about what happens here is that under the amendments proposed by the Crown Land Management Act in this so-called simplify bill is that they change quite specifically the wording of the section that deals with the minister's power to dispose of surplus lands of a Crown agency. I have no doubt that part of what the government is planning to do once they move into the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is to say, 'This land of the old Royal Adelaide Hospital, although it is crown land, is now surplus to requirements because we've already got our new hospital, so it is now surplus land and we're going to deal with it.' The Crown Land Management Act currently provides in section 14:

If land owned by a Crown agency has been declared surplus, the Minister may dispose of the land by transfer of the fee simple (and Part 3 Division 3 applies to such a transfer as if the land were Crown land.)

I will get to part 3 and division 3 in a minute, but the bill before us changes what is said. It says the same thing except that, at the end, it states:

…(and part 3 division 3 applies to such a transfer as if the land were Crown land that had been declared surplus by the Minister.)

The effect of that is to enable the minister to more easily undertake this treacherous deal that he is doing to deprive the citizens of this state in perpetuity of land absolutely in contravention of what was said in its own Adelaide Park Lands Act in 2005.

One other little matter I will briefly touch on here is that there is also another piece of legislation involved here, that is, the Urban Renewal Act. Again, it is a bit complicated because there is the Urban Renewal Act and the Housing and Urban Development (Administrative Arrangements) Act. They are both from 1995, and this is a bit complex to understand. I will not go through the details of why we have ended up with things the way they are, but I have done a lot of work on the background of this.

In my view, it was a very clumsy way of dealing with it, but what happens is a Riverbank Precinct can be established under what becomes the Urban Renewal Act 1995. The Riverbank Authority is established as a statutory corporation under the act and given certain functions and powers, and that Riverbank Authority has to behave in a certain way under that act. So, the Urban Renewal Authority has the Riverbank Authority under it, and the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site becomes part of the Riverbank Precinct under the Royal Adelaide Hospital site and under the Urban Renewal Authority.

I put in a freedom of information request and asked, 'Can you tell me, when you set up these various committees that the legislation required you to set up, who were the appointments, when it was advertised and so on?' I received a response back from the head of the Urban Renewal Authority, John Hanlon, which said, 'There are no documents to say how we have complied.' We know that the Royal Adelaide Hospital site is part of the Riverbank Precinct site. We have a Riverbank Authority set up under the act, but there are no documents about this precinct.

I happened to see him that day. I had a meeting with John Hanlon, completely coincidentally on another matter, and I said to him, 'John, can you explain to me how it could be that I have received this FOI response signed by you, which came into my office this morning, telling me that there are no documents in spite of the fact that the Riverbank Authority has clearly set up this precinct?' His response was, 'We just called it a precinct, but we haven't set it up as a precinct under the authority.'

So, even though it is run by the Urban Renewal Authority, even though their legislation says that they have to set up a precinct and go through certain steps to set it up and behave in a certain way, they have set it up, they have called it a precinct, but they have not obeyed anything because they said, 'Yes, we have just called it a precinct. It is not a precinct under the act, even though we are running it.'

That is another part of the sleight of hand that is going on with this government in terms of how they are trying to manoeuvre themselves from a situation where their own legislation says quite clearly that they must do certain things. They have certain statutory responsibilities. They have responsibilities under the Adelaide Park Lands Act, the Urban Renewal Act and the Crown Land Management Act, and all those things need to be subverted and avoided in order for them to do the unthinkable, which is precisely what they are planning to do: sell private apartments on our Parklands.

It is an absolute outrage, and the members on that side sit there quietly, saying nothing about it. This is sacrilege to the people of this state, yet people are doing nothing about it and sitting there quietly accepting the fact that a government is just giving away to private enterprise private ownership of our Parklands. I am outraged that they can do this.

I am probably not going to have time to go through all the details, but I will just quickly talk about how they are achieving this in terms of dealing with crown land. As I said, they have changed it so that, whereas it used to say that part 3, division 3, applies to such a transfer as if the land were

crown land, it now says it will apply as if the land were crown land that had been declared surplus by the minister. Once you have land that is declared surplus, section 14 enables the minister to then execute any assurance, contract, deed or instrument that may be necessary to effect a transfer under this section.

The government's wish would be to give the fee simple to purchasers. At the moment, they are probably facing the dilemma of having to deal with 99-year leases, which are a common way of holding land in Europe but not very familiar here. However, given the history of our shack owners and so on, I suspect that what they would do is, if necessary, not give the fee simple in the first instance but proceed with a 99-year lease and then ultimately, some years down the track, say, 'What is the difference? It is owned privately anyway, so let's let them have the fee simple.' There will be a way around it, I have no doubt. If it is the last breath I take in this place, I will be opposing this with every fibre of my being because it is simply wrong.

As I say, the government's own legislation, the Adelaide Park Lands Act, says quite clearly that they have a responsibility to ensure that, to the extent possible, the public land (the Parklands) remains available for the public. Instead of doing that, what have they done? They have engaged a private consortium to flog it. That is what they are planning to do. Once you do that to the Royal Adelaide Hospital site, where do you stop?

There are some purists who say nothing should ever be built on the Adelaide Parklands, that nothing should have ever been built on the Parklands. I am not one of those people. I actually think it is good to have ovals, walking spaces and all sorts of interesting things on the Parklands that people can use. But what is common about everything—even the Casino, hotels, Next Generation and the tennis, the cricket and all those things that are currently on our Parklands—is that, subject to paying your way or dressing appropriately, or whatever the rules might be, the public can have access. The difference here is that this government is privatising the Parklands, and I cannot believe that a government could, in 14 years, get the finances of this state into such a dire position that we have no alternative.

My understanding is that it is going to cost something like $250 million—to be borne by the people of this state—to clean up the site in the first place (and I suspect that if that is the estimate now it will go well beyond that) and that it is going to take something like 20 years for this project to eventuate. If that is the case, why on earth does the government not say, 'Well, it's a cost we are going to have to bear. We have time. Let's just clean up the site and have a good long think about whether it is appropriate for us to go down this path'?

But, no, the government has already committed itself to the idea that it is going to sell the Parklands into private ownership. I went on radio in February, having not spoken to the media for three years, to alert the public to the fact that the government was planning to do this. Although they did not admit it at the time, they have since admitted that that is the intention and that private ownership of the Parklands will be part of the redevelopment of the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site.

I think that there are a thousand public things that can be done. Lots of money has already been wasted on that site—think of the competition for designs. What a nonsense was that and how many millions of dollars did it cost to run the competition? It was always a nonsense because how could you decide what was going to be built there if you had not actually figured out what the use of the land was going to be?

But the government had a competition, and I think it cost over $1 million, and possibly even more that. I think of the small communities in my electorate that could have shared that sort of money and done something useful with it, but instead of that we had a design competition for no particular purpose other than to be a part of the bells and whistles and circuses with which this government continually tries to distract the people of this state so that they do not comprehend what is being done to them.

As I say, I am absolutely opposed to this legislation. This is not about simplifying. It has been put into a bill when it is, in fact, a really important piece of legislation. It has a particular sinister purpose aimed at stealing something which rightfully belongs to the people of this state, and I will oppose it and speak on it at every opportunity as long as I draw breath in this place.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (17:13): I know that the Minister for Health, either yesterday or today in question time in one of his normal rants (I think he is trying to demonstrate that he is ready for leadership), suggested that the opposition is not ready for government. The bill before us today is, indeed, another good idea pinched from the opposition's manifesto from the last election campaign. As always, this government has managed to get it so wrong; a good idea has been mucked up.

There are a huge number of matters on our statute book that do not need to be there. I think it is a good idea to get rid of them and take some weight off the bookshelf. One of them, which I noticed when I was reading through the bill, is the Naracoorte Town Square Act 2005. I brought that matter to the house and got it through the house. The Naracoorte Town Square was given to the people of Naracoorte in trust and the local council—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes, a bit like the Parklands the member was just talking about. The local council wanted to rebuild the public toilets in the town square, and they could not do so because it contravened the trust deed. I remember speaking to the Clerk of the House at the time and he advised me of what had to be done. He knew where to find an obscure piece of legislation that had been through the parliament many years ago and we had the appropriate legislation drafted. Indeed, it was passed by the parliament when we sat in Mount Gambier back in 2005.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was there and I don't recall—

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes, the Deputy Speaker was indeed there; it was a most interesting time. I was thankful that the parliament passed the bill but I can report that, 11 years later, the task has well and truly been completed. The act is no longer necessary and can be removed from the statute book. I think there is a whole range of material within our statute book and within individual acts which could and should be removed.

That was an initiative of the opposition. We said that on a particular day, we would repeal legislation and regulation which were no longer useful and which were slowing down the pace, particularly of economic activity in the state. It was a way to unburden us with both red and green tape. As I said, it is a good idea, but what has the government done? The government has put together a large portfolio of measures. I will not go back over the area that the member for Heysen has just covered, but I totally agree with her sentiments.

I thought one of the wiser things that former premier Rann said was that the Parklands—yes, I know; the member for Heysen is now frowning because between us we did not hear very many wise things. However, he did say something sage when he said the Parklands should not be seen as cheap land. That land was invaluable, in that it had no value; it was inestimable, and it should be preserved to eternity for the people and the future of this state.

I totally agree with the member for Heysen on the points that she made with regard to that. Buried within this particular piece of legislation is a whole host of measures which I think should be dealt with by the house in a completely different way. I think we should have been presented by the government with a suite of redundant matters which we could have dispensed with very quickly and got out of the way in order to tidy up our statute book and get rid of redundant regulations to make life a bit easier for the people who suffer at the hands of overly burdensome regulations.

That was the good idea. This government, because it continues to fail, does not understand what its task is. It has filled this up with little matters, as has been raised by the member for Heysen, and matters which bring in new law and allow new things to happen. It is not about getting rid of redundant stuff. Interspersed throughout this, I suspect there is a whole range of things. I have only been able to identify a couple, and that was one of them.

Another matter I identified is within the Fisheries Management Act in relation to the burden of proof. In this bill, the burden of proof is reversed and an alleged offender will, all of a sudden, be assumed to be guilty and will have to prove their innocence. One of the fundamental principles of our criminal law in South Australia, and indeed in Australia, is that the citizen is innocent until proven guilty.

I recently read a most interesting book on the Magna Carta in Australia. One of the original copies of the Magna Carta is held in Canberra, in our federal parliament. I do not think it is the 1215 copy, but it might be the 1225 or 1227 copy. The book talked at length—it was a series of lectures, actually—about the relevance of the Magna Carta. I think that a lot of our criminal law goes back at least that far, and the idea of burden of proof and that a man is innocent until proved guilty of an offence by his peers goes back to those days.

Here we have, buried deep within this supposed bill, entitled Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Bill 2016, the introduction of new measures that are not to simplify matters for the citizenry of our state: the reality is that this is to simplify matters for the bureaucracy. This is to make life easier for the bureaucracy, and in this case it saves the bureaucracy from having to prove certain elements of a case they have against somebody they allege has been doing the wrong thing in the fisheries.

That is not what simplifying legislation and our statutes should be about. It should be simplifying it for the citizenry of the state, not simplifying it for the bureaucracy. Indeed, that very measure would make it easier for the bureaucracy but more burdensome for the citizen. Somebody charged with an offence under that particular part of the Fisheries Management Act would have a greater burden on them in proving their innocence—indeed, almost an impossible burden. I do not think that our criminal law should be treated in such a way. I do not think that we should be making changes to serious bits of law introducing new thoughts and ideas through such a measure as this.

I particularly want to talk about the amendment of the Stamp Duties Act with reference to clause 130 of the bill, which amends section 67 of the Stamp Duties Act—Computation of duty where instruments are interrelated, and deletes paragraphs (b) and (c) from section 67(2). I brought a measure to the house, bill No. 112, which is still on the *Notice Paper* and which I introduced into the house on 24 March this year. It also seeks to amend section 67(2) of the Stamp Duties Act to correct an anomaly that has arisen in the act over the years and make the act do what the house was promised it would do when that section was amended way back in 1993.

I am not going to go through the whole argument again, but I want to remind the house that then minister Blevins, in response to the opposition's amendment to this clause to make a clarification, said to the house that the measure was never used for that purpose in the past, that there was no intention for it to be used for that purpose in the future and that it would not be.

Lo and behold, earlier this year the Treasurer informed the house that in around the year 2000 crown law advice to RevenueSA was that they thought they had a defensible position by interpreting section 67 of the act in a way in which it was never intended to be interpreted. That is why I brought the bill, which is bill No. 112 on the *Notice Paper*, back in March of this year to overcome that anomaly and put the act back to where I believe it should be.

If any government wants to change the interpretation of the act or becomes consciously aware that there has been an interpretation that the house was specifically told would not occur, I think the government of the day should indeed fix it up or bring back to the parliament a measure to specifically insert in a clear way a measure so that the parliament can discuss the point. The point was that I have a constituent who purchased a number of properties from different vendors in unrelated sales and, under the Stamp Duties Act, the Commissioner of Stamps judged that it was one transaction. He accumulated the total value of the separate transactions and charged the stamp duty at a higher rate. That cost my constituent some thousands of dollars.

As far as the parliament was concerned, it was specifically told way back in 1993 that that interpretation would not be used, and we find that it has been used. I am really disappointed because certainly the Hon. Gail Gago in another place indicated that the government was looking at the measure I brought to the house and suggested in the last budget that was brought down this year that the Treasurer may indeed address this particular matter. I see in clause 130 of the bill before us that there is an amendment to section 67, but it is not an amendment to address the matter I have brought to the attention of the house.

When we get to the third reading, I may well introduce my amendment, which currently appears in bill No. 112, and test the government. I will certainly be pushing that matter in the upper house, and I would be reasonably confident that I could get support for the measure in the other

place. It beggars my imagination why the Treasurer did not do anything to fix it up. Indeed, I thought the Treasurer was quite disingenuous in what he did because, when I first brought this matter to his attention, it was in a budget bill late last year (I think it was on the last day of sitting) and the Treasurer pleaded with me to give him an opportunity to have another look at the matter.

He subsequently wrote to me, and I think I got the letter on 23 December or it may have been signed by him on 23 December. I know that it was very close to Christmas that the matter was addressed with me by the Treasurer. It became evident to me that the Treasurer had not looked at the matter any differently from the opinion he had expressed earlier in the house. I do not think he even bothered to look at it again, to be quite frank.

I will certainly be seeking to make an amendment to fix up the Stamp Duties Act. I have not gone through the bill with a fine-toothed comb—I hope some of my colleagues in other areas of legislation that they are interested in have been able to do that—because, as I said at the outset, I think that this is a good idea that has been marked up by a lazy government. It is a good idea that I think should be an annual event. However, I do not think that it should be a tool or an instrument for introducing new ideas or new matters. It should simply be a matter for getting rid of anomalies and redundancies. Having said that, I will conclude my remarks there.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (17:29): I had not planned to speak on this bill, but I have been asked by the shadow minister for mineral resources and energy, who unfortunately is tied up in another meeting, to make a few points on his behalf, so I will keep the house for another couple of minutes. The points that need to be made are that in October 2014 the government published its final report on the review of boards and committees. The 2014 final report included in the list of 107 boards to be abolished the Industries Development Committee (IDC).

The Industries Development Committee comprises four members of the Economic and Finance Committee and the Treasurer. That committee has not met since 2006. Despite the decision in 2014 to abolish the IDC, the government decided against abolishing the board in the legislation at that time, the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Bill 2015, as more time was required to seek advice on the responsibilities of the committee under various other acts. On 15 November, the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Bill 2016 was introduced by the government, and part 15 abolishes the IDC.

Given that the IDC will be abolished in the bill, other acts referencing the IDC require amendments to remove the relevant sections relating to that committee. Section 22 of the Natural Gas Authority Act 1967 requires the Treasurer to brief the IDC on the terms and conditions of a proposed agreement, giving the briefing or answering questions on written briefing papers. Therefore, clause 94 of the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Bill 2016 deletes section 22 of the act. It is also worth noting that section 23 of the Natural Gas Authority Act 1967 requires the Treasurer to ensure that the Auditor-General is kept fully informed about the progress and outcome of negotiations for a sale agreement under the act.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (17:31): I would like to thank all the members who spoke on this Simplify Day bill. It is the government's first Simplify Day, which we had on 15 November. It is something that the government has committed to making an annual event, which I think is going to be very important. It might not be the most glamorous or the most exciting bill this government passes, but it is certainly something that is important. It is important for us to continually review and refresh our legislation to make sure that we are making our legislation simple for businesses and consumers to interact with and that we are keeping it modern and up to date.

This process started in July this year when the Premier announced that we would be having this day. To be honest, it has been very fast work over those four months. Members would be aware that drafting legislation usually takes a significant amount of time, and this was brought to the house within four months of that first announcement. That is a very good first step, but we have now committed to making this an annual day, and we will continue to bring back bill after bill aiming to simplify and streamline our legislation. I would like to thank the members who spoke—the members for Mitchell, Hartley, Hammond, Schubert, Heysen, MacKillop, Flinders, Colton and Fisher—who all made contributions on this bill.

I would like to address a couple of things that were mentioned during the debate. Firstly, in regard to what the member for Mitchell discussed in terms of the consultation aspect of this bill, I would like to clarify the approach the government has taken because it is something I think is very important. After the Premier announced that we would have a Simplify Day, the government contacted a large number of organisations, businesses and other NGOs across the community, as well as putting the call out to all government departments. They came back with a good number of ideas from the community, and some of them are up on the YourSAy website. I am advised that some people did not give permission for their ideas to be on the website, and that is why they are not there.

We looked through and considered every single idea brought to our attention. There are certainly some things we have seen that we have been able to act on very quickly, and so they have been addressed either in this bill that was introduced couple of weeks ago or in the regulations that were given assent by the Governor on the same day to remove a significant number of regulations that were in place.

A large number of good ideas have been brought to us, but because either more work needs to be done in terms of the drafting to get things in order or there is more work to do in some of the consultation that needs to take place, we have listed all of those things as future reforms. We look forward to, hopefully, bringing the vast majority back to the house next year. I note that a large number received support in contributions from the other side so, hopefully, we will get broad bipartisan support for a lot of them.

Once we worked out what were going to put in this bill, we produced a Simplify Day booklet that outlined all the different proposals we were working on that were in this bill, the regulations or in the future reforms. We have sent that out to all the people who had contact with us during that consultation process. As we go into the next stream of work with future reforms and other ideas that are coming forward to us, we will continue to make the call open to the public and to those key non-government organisations to make sure that we have their input in its planning.

The member for Mitchell outlined a couple of things that he said he was supportive of, whether it was bus lanes, Segways, some of the six-month licences or a significant amount of transport reforms that have been flagged for future work. He said that he supported them but asked why we were not doing them quickly enough. That is because some need more work on their drafting and others need more consultation before we bring them back to the house. Credit goes to the Minister for Transport, who has been very willing to look at some innovative ways to reduce red tape in this area.

There was also discussion about the removal of some of our redundant acts. I think that nine pieces of legislation have been slated for complete removal, and we are always looking for more ideas if people have them, and we are willing to consider them. The member for Schubert's contribution questioned what this was really doing, getting rid of these acts, and that maybe we should not bother at all. I was interested to note that one act he highlighted as serving no actual purpose in getting rid of was the Y2K legislation, otherwise known as the Year 2000 Information Disclosure Act, which we are looking to get rid of. He questioned whether this would make a difference and whether we should be bothering with it.

I note that the South Australian Liberal Party previously announced that this was something that they would want to get rid of, so I thought it was an interesting contribution. Their press release, 'Reducing red tape for business', states:

> State Liberal Leader Steven Marshall has today released a policy to repeal redundant and out-dated laws if elected to government in 2014.
>
> Still on the Statutes are antiquated laws such as the Year 2000 Information Disclosure Act 1999.

The member will be well reassured, I hope, that that is something that is own party was supporting only a couple of years ago. Hopefully, that puts his concerns to rest.

The contribution from the member for Heysen ranged over a wide variety of areas, shall we be clear. She said that she will oppose the bill even though the opposition said that they will allow its passage through this house. Yet again she is putting herself at odds with the rest of the party.

Certainly, a large number of her comments were about crown land law, suggesting that somehow our changes are a part of some sort of conspiracy to dispose of the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site as part of its redevelopment.

I have sought some very quick advice because this was certainly news to me. I have never heard of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and this section of the act being mentioned in dispatches. The Royal Adelaide Hospital is not currently listed as crown land; it is currently listed under a title. Even if it were to change and be transferred to crown land in the future, it would still fall under the provisions of the Adelaide Park Lands Act, which has a series of provisions that need to be met about that land. This simply tries to address some of the processes in regard to the Crown Land Management Act. This has nothing to do with the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I hope that she will be reassured, although I suspect that she will not be.

It is important to note that this is part of a suite of work that the government has been doing over number of years. One of the big things we have done over the past 12 to 15 months, of course, has been the planning legislation that addresses a large number of red tape issues that developers and people in the property industry have found. The government has recently announced significant changes in terms of liquor licensing reforms as well. Of course, with the changes we have achieved in terms of small bars, we can see what an impact removing some of the red tape there has had. Likewise with another bill I brought to the house, we are hopeful of seeing similar changes in terms of removal of food truck red tape as well.

So it is not just this bill; we are working on a whole range of other things across the government, but this is certainly an area where we are looking to pick up any of those minor works to bring them to the parliament to try to simplify those areas. We are always very happy to consider more ideas, and we have a Simplify unit, a Simpler Regulation Unit, in the Department of Treasury and Finance. They are available and very keen to talk to any business or NGO out there who has ideas.

I would particularly like to thank those members of the unit, headed up by Julie Holmes, as well as Aaron Witthoeft, Tyson Miller, Kate Jackson, Burcu Subasi, Giselle Oruga as well as other people from the Department of Treasury and Finance such as Stuart Hocking, Wayne Hunter from the Premier's office, Bia Delaney and Callie Bryson as well as Gemma Paech from my own office, who did a tremendous amount of work on this bill.

We look forward to consideration of this matter both here and in the Legislative Council. I know members have raised a few issues they would like to deal with in the other place, particularly in regard to some of the fisheries matters, and that is something we are very happy to continue discussions on and provide whatever briefing information we can to make sure there is full understanding of the changes we are looking to bring in.

I hope this piece of legislation will go a long way to being the start of our Simplify Day process, which we hope will be a very successful annual event in making South Australia the best place to do business. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

ELECTORAL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2016.)

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (17:43): I rise to speak to the Electoral (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 and indicate that I will not be the lead speaker for the opposition. Whilst the bill is likely to

pass this house, I wish to advise that we will be introducing amendments at some stage. We reserve our rights as to the timing of those amendments, but they may happen in this place, between the houses or in the other place.

I note that the bill proposes a whole range of amendments to the Electoral Act 1985, to which I will refer. The bill actually responds to some recommendations made by the former electoral commissioner in her report on the 2014 state election, and it is important to note that the government has aimed to include and implement some of those recommendations. Other recommendations have been completely ignored and I know a number of my colleagues may also wish to speak on those.

The bill responds to a variety of recommendations made by the former electoral commissioner in her report on that election and seeks to, amongst other things, in some instances, curb the increase in pre-poll voting. It always worries me when the government puts forward a bill seeking to prevent pre-poll voting in any form. We must look at that in fine detail before even considering it. The Liberal Party remains opposed to restrictions on pre-poll and also postal vote application reform in the way the Attorney has proposed it—in particular, restrictions on pre-poll timing and exclusion zones.

The premise of pre-poll as a notion and postal vote application is that electors for whom it is compulsory to vote are able to cast their vote when situations arise that make it nearly impossible for them to vote on election day. Let us look at declaration votes. The Electoral Act makes provision for electors to make declaration votes for various reasons. They include electors:

- who will not, throughout the hours of polling on polling day, be within eight kilometres by the nearest practical route of any booth;
- who will be travelling under certain conditions that preclude voting at a polling booth;
- who by reason of illness, infirmity or disability are precluded from voting at a polling booth;
- who, by reason of caring for a person who is ill, infirm or disabled, are precluded from voting at a polling booth;
- who by reason of advanced pregnancy are precluded from voting at a polling booth;
- who, by reason of a membership in a religious order or by religious beliefs are precluded from attending at a polling booth or preclude them from voting throughout the hours on polling day or the greater part of those hours;
- who, for a reason of a prescribed nature, are precluded from voting at a polling booth;
- who will be working in their employment throughout the hours of polling. This is quite common because obviously the election is on a Saturday. It will continue to be on a Saturday in the near future and many people work on the actual day of the election;
- who cannot be reasonably expected to be absent from work for the purpose of voting;
- who are inmates of a declared institution;
- whose name as a result of an official error does not appear on the certified list of electors for a district;
- who appear from a record erroneously made under the act to have voted already in the election;
- whose address has been suppressed from publication under part 4 division 2.

There are various reasons for making a declaration vote and it makes clear the benefits of having reasonable access to pre-poll voting for electors, which begs the serious question why the government would wish to curb an increase in pre-poll voting.

One thought is that perhaps the government believes that reducing the number of people able to vote prior to the days close to the election will favour them. I take you back to the last election campaign. Many know the common Labor election strategy which is known as dropping a grenade—

figuratively speaking—in the final days before the election, as we saw targeted at the Liberal candidate for Elder, Carolyn Habib. We know that that was an atrocious, despicable act that is not acceptable in any way, shape or form.

We also saw federally the 'Mediscare' campaign where a grenade was thrown late in the piece to the benefit of the Labor Party. We know that these kinds of tactics are employed late. Often it is very difficult to respond to them, but they do have negative connotations. Unfortunately, they have been effective for all the wrong reasons. Changes to postal voting and changes to pre-poll voting the way the Attorney has worded the legislation would certainly be likely to favour the Labor Party. In my humble opinion, this may be a leading factor in why the Attorney has chosen to curb increases in pre-poll voting.

While the bill before us today takes on some of the recommendations made by the former electoral commissioner, it actually overlooks 14 recommendations. If the Attorney is serious about reform in this area, he should at least have the courtesy to look in greater detail at these various other recommendations instead of ignoring them. Let's have the full debate, let's talk about them, let's consult with the community and let's hear what people want to do as well. The government has provided the Liberal Party with reasons why the 14 other recommendations were overlooked. I note that, in a cover letter from the Attorney-General, it was his view, and I am quoting here:

> …that the proposed changes were either unnecessary or not a priority at this time. In other cases I do not support the recommendation that has been made.

I would now like to draw the house's attention to recommendation 14 of the Electoral Commissioner's report regarding the right of an elector to receive a ballot paper:

> s78
>
> Consider strengthening the democratic process by requiring electors to provide proof of identity in support of their entitlement to vote prior to being issued their ballot paper where they attend a polling booth or apply in person to make a declaration vote.

The government does not support this recommendation on the ground that requiring the provision of proof of identity could disenfranchise voters. What a load of rubbish! The government is saying that requiring someone to provide proof of identity, to prove they are actually the person who is about to vote, could disenfranchise voters. Give me a break. That is an absolute joke.

It seems unlikely that it would disenfranchise voters. In fact, I know many voters who would prefer that it is known who is voting. I do not think it is an unreasonable request at all for someone to provide identification before voting, given that identity is required for any other government services—for example, obtaining a driver's licence.

I recommend that the government revisit this recommendation and consider the benefits of requiring proof of identity and ensuring that those entitled to vote are indeed those who are filling out the ballot papers, in an effort to strengthen our democratic process. I might add that I will be very concerned if this recommendation falls under those that the Attorney-General deems not a priority, especially when the Electoral Commissioner has called this a step towards strengthening democracy. I would also like to draw the house's attention to the Electoral Commissioner's 24th recommendation relating to misleading advertising, which is also overlooked in the bill before us today:

> s113
>
> Consider removing this provision as no other State in Australia has truth in political advertising. The Australian Parliament has determined that the Commonwealth *Electoral Act 1918* should not regulate the content of political advertising.
>
> There is an ethical question as to whether the Electoral Commissioner should be responsible for deciding whether political messages published or broadcast during an election are misleading to a material extent…

And it goes on. In response to this, the government has amended the penalty in the bill before us today, implementing a substantial increase in fines for misleading advertising. This seems to me to fly in the face of the recommendation of the commissioner, and I suggest that the government also look at this area.

I have another brief point to make before I adjourn. Another concern I would like to raise on this side of the chamber is the government's overlooking of recommendation 30. Recommendation 30 of the commissioner's report relates to injunctions, and it reads:

s132(2)

The provisions under this section preclude injunctive relief in relation to contravention of, or non-compliance with, all of Division 2 of Part 13 of the Act. The only injunctive relief available in that Division relates to electoral advertising under s113.

Amend so as not to prevent injunctive relief for those other sections within Division 2 of Part 13, including special provisions relating to how-to-vote cards under s112A, where a person may distribute a how-to-vote card in breach of the requirements.

The Liberal Party's position is that we should at least be looking at this recommendation in a potential reform of the bill, as an amendment I believe would seek to be meritorious in nature. Late in the piece, when these last-minute campaign tactics are employed, I can certainly see the benefit of having some kind of injunctive relief. I think the Attorney should at least be open to this form of injunctive relief to protect the integrity of the election process, especially late in the piece.

I also note that, while data is available on the overall pre-poll and postal votes cast at the state election, it is disappointing not to readily see a breakdown of these statistics in greater detail. I think that if we did have greater detail, we would certainly be able to identify more trends. I note that there has been quite a substantial increase in pre-poll votes and postal vote applications over time. This is something that is certainly not unique to South Australia.

To reiterate what I said about the bill, obviously it will likely be passed in this house. We will be introducing amendments. We will reserve our rights as to the timing of those amendments, but they will occur in this place, between the houses or in the other place. I conclude my remarks by suggesting that the government certainly consider amendments in the areas that we have raised to oppose the pre-poll restrictions and PVA restrictions and also the increase in fines. We do reserve our right to consider further amendments consistent with the recommendations of the Electoral Commissioner and as will be identified by some of my colleagues in this place. I commend the bill to the house.

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

NATIONAL ELECTRICITY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (AUSTRALIAN ENERGY REGULATOR - WHOLESALE MARKET MONITORING) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:57 the house adjourned until Thursday 1 December 2016 at 10:30.