

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday, 12 April 2017**

The SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson) took the chair at 11:00 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***PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:01): On behalf of the member for Elder, I move:

That the 562nd report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2015-16, be noted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: On behalf of the member for Elder, I move:

That the 563rd report of the committee, entitled Hope Valley EL170 Tank Structure Renewal Project, be noted.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MORGAN WATER TREATMENT PLANT BALANCING STORAGE PROJECT

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:03): On behalf of the member for Elder, I move:

That the 564th report of the committee, entitled Morgan Water Treatment Plant Balancing Storage Project, be noted.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:03): The opposition had no hesitation whatsoever in supporting this project. Once again, it is a project badly needed in the Riverland. Even though it has been some time since we discussed it, there was really no conjecture or anything to be argued about it. The department did a good job in explaining the project to us and it went through with almost indecent haste. I support the project.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:04): On behalf of the member for Elder, I thank the member for Finniss for his contribution.

Mr Treloar: He's good on his feet.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the member for Flinders is correct.

Motion carried.

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REVIEW

Adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. T. Piccolo:

That the second report of the committee, entitled 'Annual Review of the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee into public integrity and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption', be noted.

(Continued from 29 March 2017.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:04): I believe I am part heard on this matter, so I will only have a few minutes remaining. I would like to acknowledge in this report the outstanding work that has been alluded to that remains outstanding, and that is of the Ombudsman in his report of May 2014. At that time it, was Mr Richard Bingham, and he undertook an audit of the state government departments' implementation of the Freedom of Information Act 1991 (SA).

He had revealed that he had conducted an audit of 12 government departments and agencies and found that, despite the state government's policy initiatives of being proactive in the

release of information in a timely manner, there was a disconnect between these initiatives and the act. He found that, in respect of the agencies' approach to information disclosure on the act that it was not only outdated but also that its implementation of the act was wanting and, I quote:

...demonstrates a lack of understanding or commitment to the democratic principles which underpin the Act.

The audit that he undertook revealed some extraordinary things. One of the most concerning was his finding, and I quote:

- it is common practice across all of the agencies to provide copies of FOI applications, determinations (draft or otherwise) and documents to their Minister to 'get the green light' prior to finalisation of access requests. While the Act permits a Minister to direct their agency's determination, evidence provided to the audit strongly suggests that ministerial or political influence is brought to bear on agencies' FOI officers, and that FOI officers may have been pressured to change their determinations in particular instances. If a ministerial decision or direction is involved, it should be clearly set out in the agencies' determinations

He went on to say:

- the agencies' Chief Executives are not providing FOI or pro-information disclosure leadership.

Consequently, one his recommendations was to introduce a regime of offences for those who might be, and I quote:

...improperly directing or influencing a decision or determination made under the Act.

That was recommendation 26. He went on to say:

A uniform protocol should be created for use across all agencies which codifies the requirements for accountable and transparent communication between ministerial offices and agency FOI officers in relation to access applications under the Act.

This recommendation, along with a number of others in respect of a reform under the freedom of information law, has been utterly rejected in the sense of any advancement by this government.

Here we are, three years later, and there has been an utter failure on the Attorney-General's part. Worse still, when the member for Hartley introduced legislation, it was smashed. More recently, he introduced legislation that had been passed in the upper house: it was smashed by this government. They do not have any desire whatsoever to be open and transparent.

I congratulate the member for Unley, who recently obtained a judgement by SACAT, the new court that now deals with reviews under the FOI Act. In this case, the Department of State Development v Pisoni, which is now forever in the chronicles of the law, his counsel was successful in arguing in respect of the definition that is to apply and the exemptions available in dealing with the concealment of documents created for the purposes of cabinet consideration. That is an important judgement for a number to read; nevertheless, week by week, we have to keep fighting for the disclosure of documents.

This week, we received the Ombudsman's report, which directed, in this case, that the TAFE SA Board disclose their agendas and minutes and not hand me piles of documents with black pages all through them with redactions that are utterly absurd, including some, I might say, where an apology is noted or there is an indication that someone has been granted employment or an award.

For goodness sake, these people are covering our public records with secrecy and we have to go through this very expensive process, ultimately through the courts, to get disclosure of information in documents that the government are hell-bent on keeping secret. When they have right in front of them a report that says there is clear evidence that there is ministerial and other interference with the FOI process, they have refused to deal with it.

I ask the government to again read this report, as it will remind them what the Ombudsman recommended three years ago, and to take notice that they represent the people and that it is their money that is being wasted in courts to have to expose these things.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:11): I also rise today to speak to the annual review of the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee into public integrity and the Independent Commission Against Corruption report. I note that the CPIPC (Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee) was actually established under the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. This committee has various functions,

but one of them is to consider the day-to-day operations of various integrity bodies in South Australia—for example, the ICAC.

Of course, we remember that the government originally did not support the creation of the ICAC. It is no surprise why when you see in recent times that it appears that government and government agencies—as I read in today's *Advertiser*—have unfortunately kept the ICAC quite busy. I read in today's paper, in the news on page 7, that a very prominent leading QC, David Edwardson, on behalf of someone affected by proceedings brought on by this body, says that it appears that certain people involved in ICAC—ICAC investigators—were 'desperate to land a big fish', which is interesting feedback. We will wait and see how that plays out in the coming days.

Of course, we also had the instance of Gillman. We all remember the Gillman land deal and where that landed the government. We also have the Office for Public Integrity, which obviously leads and assesses many complaints and reports about potential matters of corruption, misconduct and maladministration in public administration. There is the Ombudsman SA, whose office investigates complaints about local government agencies and also SA government agencies as well.

We also have the Police Ombudsman, which provides oversight of SAPOL, as well as the Anti-Corruption Branch of SAPOL, which ensures that allegations of corruption in public administration referred to the police by the ICAC are appropriately investigated. I would like to thank the Commissioner of Police, who came in during the week to see the committee and provided us with some useful information about the most recent annual report, especially in light of serious and organised crime. They have come in on several occasions since I have been involved in the committee.

I note that, during the period of review from April 2015 to June 2016, this committee actually considered various reports that were tabled in parliament, not only from the ICAC but also from the Ombudsman, the Police Ombudsman, the Commissioner of Police and also the independent reviewer of the ICAC. As I pointed out, the committee was established to examine many of these reports and also to inquire into and consider the operation and effectiveness of the actual act of the ICAC itself. In particular, the committee should consider the performance of functions and exercise of powers by the ICAC and the OPI, but also look at the performance of functions and the exercise of powers by the Ombudsman and report to parliament on any other matter arising of public policy.

One of these issues of public policy concerns the freedom of information system and the way it operates. We have seen an independent report by an ombudsman a little while back that pointed out that the FOI Act in this state is truly flawed. It is truly flawed for several reasons. We have seen a number of bills brought in by the opposition to address these flaws, but the government, in all its arrogance, continues to ignore this.

During the review period, we at the committee heard evidence from a number of sources, including the ICAC commissioner, Bruce Lander. I thank the commissioner for his insight. I also thank the independent reviewer of the ICAC, the Hon. Kevin Duggan; the Acting Police Ombudsman, Michael Grant; the Ombudsman, Wayne Lines; and SAPOL, namely, as I have pointed out, Commissioner Grant Stevens; Assistant Commissioner, Crime, Linda Fellows; and Chief Superintendent Doug Barr, from the ethical and professional standards area.

The committee made nine recommendations relating to matters of public policy. Firstly, there should be an obligation on a person executing a search warrant to provide a copy of that warrant to the occupier of the place or to the owner or driver of the vehicle to which the warrant applies, which I would have thought was common sense. Secondly, the penalties under the ICAC Act might be too low to provide an adequate deterrent, specifically in the new section 54 confidentiality provision but also in the schedule 3 procedure for resolving legal professional privilege claims. These penalties should be reviewed.

We also spoke about the local government code of conduct and how that should be looked at to address many concerns expressed by the ICAC and the Ombudsman. Not only that, we also looked at the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 and how that should be amended to allow the ICAC, as a law enforcement agency, to make submissions in sentencing proceedings where the person has cooperated with the ICAC's investigation. We also spoke about how potentially a detailed

analysis should be done in accordance with the terms of reference of the independent reviewer to ascertain the actual efficiency of the ICAC.

We looked at the potential overlap in jurisdictions between the Ombudsman and the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner and whether that relationship should be looked at, reviewed and clarified. Given that the ICAC will no longer be given power to issue direction to the Ombudsman, we believe that consideration should be given to whether the ICAC should remain in power to examine practices, policies and procedures of the Ombudsman. It may be more appropriate for an independent reviewer to do that function.

Of course, we looked at the Freedom of Information Act. We believe, and we have pointed out time and time again, that this act needs looking at. In accordance with the recommendations made by the Ombudsman some time ago, we believe that the public interest test should be fleshed out and given more clarification as well. We also looked at a range of potential impacts of the reform package in the future, comprising the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2016, the Police Complaints and Discipline Act 2016 and the Public Interest Disclosure Bill 2016. We note that such reform has been addressed in part.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank each and every one of those who provided evidence to the committee. I thank the members of the committee, with particular mention of the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars MLC, who was the presiding member of the committee for some time. I also thank the Hon. Dennis Hood MLC and my colleague the gallant Hon. Andrew McLachlan MLC, CSC, as well as the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, a former member of the committee. I thank the committee support staff for supporting the committee through the review, and I commend the report to the house.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:19): In the absence of any other speakers, I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO THE LABOUR HIRE INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Odenwalder:

That the 93rd report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Labour Hire Industry, be noted.

(Continued from 1 March 2017.)

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:19): I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: PINERY BUSHFIRES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.W. Key:

That the 116th report of the committee, entitled Pinery Fire Regional Fact-Finding Trip, be noted.

(Continued from 1 March 2017.)

The SPEAKER: I am always interested in regional fact-finding reports.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:20): This was a very important occasion for the Natural Resources Committee and other members who went on this particular fact-finding trip. Despite the devastation and the dreadful situation, the community in the Pinery area has come through. I am pleased to say that there have been some very positive lessons learnt and also ongoing support for people in that community. I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: UNCONVENTIONAL GAS (FRACKING) INTERIM REPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.W. Key:

That the 106th report of the committee, entitled Unconventional Gas (Fracking) Interim Report, be noted.

(Continued from 22 June 2016.)

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:21): Members will remember that we introduced this report because of the huge number of submissions and witnesses we had in this particular inquiry. It seemed important, particularly at the time when we introduced the 106th interim report, that we acknowledge the fantastic effort on the part of industry, people who live in the South-East region and also experts in the field. We wanted to publish more or less a bibliography of the contribution thus far. This particular interim report is now done and dusted because we did deliver our final report. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: O-BAHN CITY ACCESS PROJECT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 533rd report of the committee, entitled O-Bahn City Access Project, be noted.

(Continued from 28 October 2015.)

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:22): I rise to speak on this very important piece of infrastructure. I support public transport and improvements to public transport, and the O-Bahn, being a good Liberal initiative, is a great piece of infrastructure for the greater public good. However, prior to the 2014 election, the government's transport priority was the electrification of the Gawler railway line, which it had already announced twice and abandoned. By cancelling the Gawler electrification project, we lost the commonwealth funding of \$76 million and will pay an estimated cost penalty of \$70 million to restart the project in the future.

The Auditor-General also wrote down the asset by \$40 million—that is, the Gawler line that already had the poles put in—as an underutilised piece of infrastructure. Thus, \$70 million, plus \$76 million, plus \$40 million equates to \$186 million being lost by cancelling the Gawler electrification. The reason given for abandoning this project was a lack of funds, yet in the lead-up to the last election the government miraculously found \$160 million to put the O-Bahn project on the agenda because there were some marginal seats in the north-eastern suburbs.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Ms SANDERSON: Yes, says the member for Newland, who benefits from this. The report claims a cost-benefit ratio of 1.6, but there is no detail on how this is calculated—no assumptions and no explanation. I believe it was Rod Hook who said that these cost benefits are pretty flexible, depending on what you include or do not include. Whether or not you want the project to go ahead, you can actually add in benefits. For example, going through the Parklands could have some health benefits that could be included. It is pretty flexible. Let's just say that it is not an economic rationale-based cost-benefit analysis that you see with government projects.

I question whether a saving of two to four minutes of travel time by spending \$160 million was the best use of taxpayers' money, particularly when it meant losing \$186 million by not electrifying the Gawler line, which the department spent several years working on, engineering and gearing up ready to implement. Also from Rod Hook's statement, I believe, to the select committee, a project such as an O-Bahn tunnel should have been announced ready for the 2018 election because of the amount of time that the department really needed to do a good job with this.

Having seen the tunnel, they seem to have managed to pull together what looks to be quite an amazing project and, yes, I am sure that people will love the look of the tunnel. I do not think that residents in my electorate and the users of the Parklands will ever be happy with the fact that we lost so many of our beautiful significant trees in the Parklands and that it is not so much a tunnel but more a cut or a gouge that will be like a scar through the Parklands forever.

We also heard at the select committee hearing of many other ideas that would have sped up the time for users of the O-Bahn, which would have cost far less money. One of the ideas that is still very popular with the north-eastern suburbs and the users of the O-Bahn is a park-and-ride facility. I have spoken to some of my colleagues who have caught the O-Bahn to work because they live out that way. To get a car park in the morning, they have said that they have up to a five-minute walk

from the car park to get on the bus. So, the two minutes that they just saved by speeding up the tunnel were lost because there is nowhere to park.

It also reduces the amenity to all the residents living in the area. For example, residents in North Adelaide have patients and staff parking in the streets due to the lack of high-rise car park availability at the Women's and Children's Hospital. I know that causes residents some disturbance and a lack of amenity to their area. So, I imagine the same thing happens in the north-eastern suburbs where you have workers parking in your street all day because there is inadequate parking.

It is also unsafe. If you park five to 10 minutes away from your bus, it is dark at 6 o'clock now in winter and it is completely dangerous for people to be walking back to their car. The government could have saved the \$160 million, they could have built a park-and-ride, people would have been safer and it would have actually cut more time off their travel time. But, no, the government needed something big and shiny to try to win the marginal seats of the north-eastern suburbs.

Other ideas that could have sped up the O-Bahn that would have been less costly could include having gated stations on Grenfell Street to speed up validation and allow entry via both doors and modifying the buses to travel at 100 km/h on the existing O-Bahn track, as was originally intended. I believe it is only due to a lack of maintaining the track that the buses are reduced in speed to 80 km/h.

Perhaps repairing and maintaining the existing infrastructure—certainly you cannot get a big two-page spread in the paper for doing that as you can for a school or a new tunnel—would be more practical. It would be more valuable to our community to maintain what we have so that we do not have crumbling bridges, as we have seen, and we have several of those.

The government seems more concerned about getting something shiny that it can promote, rather than maintaining and doing the right thing. It could have extended the right-hand turn bus lane on Hackney Road for inbound traffic. It could have added a second left-hand turn lane from North Terrace into Hackney Road. It could also have managed the intersection at North Terrace, near the Botanic Hotel. You could have somebody watching the intersection during the peak hours, which is only two hours in the morning and an hour and a half or a maximum of two hours in the evening.

It would be very easy to have someone monitoring the intersection to make sure that the buses have priority and that they can all get through, which would be far cheaper and maybe give someone else a new job. There are also many practical issues. There are hundreds if not thousands of residents along Grenfell Street. There are 10 different residential driveways along Grenfell Street that currently the O-Bahn does not travel along, but it will.

It is 30 extra buses per hour along Grenfell Street. Many of the North Terrace stops will now be redirected to Grenfell Street and there will be far more traffic along Grenfell Street, where we have been encouraging people to move into. We have Garden East, which has been around for 20 years or more. I remember all the plans for that when I was at university in the eighties, so it is coming on to 30 years. There are a lot of people living in that area—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: That's not true; it can't be that long.

Ms SANDERSON: It can't be, I know, I feel far too young. A lot of residents who live in that area are very concerned about the safety of getting in and out of their driveways. They have been encouraged to move into the city for the amenity and then suddenly they are living on a busway, basically. Rymill Park is a wonderful park, probably one of the most beautiful parks in the Parklands, and it will now have a gouge right through the middle of it, which is certainly very upsetting to many people.

There are also other concerns; for example, people visiting the Botanic Garden and the Zoo, the new high school, and parking. There are 93 car parks along Hackney Road that have been reduced. I believe some have been reinstated around the National Wine Centre. I am not sure how that will work or what costs will be involved. There are certainly concerns expressed by St Peter's College about their students crossing the road. There will also be concerns about the new high school for many people who live north-east of the city who are now in the school zone; for example, Medindie, Walkerville, St Peters. Many of those will be using Hackney Road to access the school through the Botanic Gardens.

The extra traffic on Hackney Road, and the ability to get across Hackney Road, is a concern. I know that St Peter's College was requesting a footbridge over the road for safety. I guess we will see whether the government will find money for that when another 1,250 students are accessing that area. Lots of businesses along Hackney Road will be disadvantaged during the one or two years that this project will be going for.

There have been so many traffic concerns. It takes so long in the morning if you are trying to use Hackney Road. You wonder sometimes about the two minutes that some people will save. Thousands and thousands of car users and truck drivers will lose a lot of minutes because of the changes to Hackney Road, and I know that Hackney residents are also concerned about access to the city.

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired. The member for Adelaide's slashing speech in opposition to the O-Bahn tunnel was heard in silence. I will expect the same privilege accorded to the member for Wright.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (11:33): I did restrain myself considerably during the—

Ms Sanderson: No, I could hear you.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I only spoke once—contribution of the member for Adelaide. I am compelled to stand up and speak as a result of the contribution made by the member for Adelaide. Understandably, she is concerned about her residents. She does not want them disturbed by roadworks so she wants—

An honourable member interjecting:

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

An honourable member: She's not here.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: She is not here, sir. She has exited the chamber. She does not want to hear what I have to say.

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is called to order for drawing attention to the absence of the member for Adelaide from the chamber.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: It is a convention that we are all here at all times.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. I am sure she will be listening. The O-Bahn transports into the city from the north-eastern suburbs something like 30,000 people a day, more than the entire train network, and there are about 1,000 bus movements every day through the Hackney Road intersection that the member for Adelaide was so concerned about. Those bus movements in the main will be removed from the Hackney Road intersection, so for the member for Adelaide to assert that there will be more traffic on Hackney Road is simply incorrect. As to the flow of vehicular traffic, cars will have a much easier flow through that part of the city.

Importantly, when the member for Adelaide talks about three to four minutes being saved as a result of a \$160 million investment, let me make it very clear: the three to four minutes is the average saving over 24 hours. What will occur during peak hour is those mums and dads, those workers who are coming from Golden Grove, Tea Tree Gully, Wynn Vale and Modbury, will save something like 15 to 20 minutes each way during peak hour. For a family, that may be a mum getting home, a mum who will be saving 40 minutes of a working day over a five-day week. It is a huge amount of time and, as I said, something like 30,000 people are being transported into and out of the city every day.

As to the time taken by the member for Adelaide's constituents, they can walk to work faster than people on the O-Bahn can now travel from Hackney Road into the city. They are concerned about a bit of disruption over a couple of years to have this tunnel.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: It is going to be opened this year. That's right, just like the Torrens to Torrens. We have the member for Chaffey—

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright will not respond to the member for Chaffey's—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Whining in the corner, sir?

The SPEAKER: —interjections.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I apologise, sir.

The SPEAKER: He is called to order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: This O-Bahn tunnel is going to be just like the Adelaide Oval development, people in the city having a big whinge while it is under construction, but it is actually going to benefit something like 30,000 people every working day—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Twice a day.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Twice a day—living in the north-eastern suburbs. I have had the opportunity to have a walk-through of the tunnel. It is an absolute engineering marvel. It is going to be like when the O-Bahn opened. I was riding the O-Bahn on its very first day; I suggest the member for Adelaide actually have a go at riding the O-Bahn. I am sure she has not ever needed to hop on the O-Bahn and ride a bus. Like her constituents, she can walk into work. There was great excitement on that very first day, and there is going to be great excitement when this tunnel opens.

We are working, the government is working, to make the lives of working people in South Australia better. We are trying to keep South Australia moving. You see it, sir, in your electorate with the Torrens to Torrens, and I know you watch every little improvement with great detail. It is the same with members in the north-eastern suburbs—the member for Newland, the member for Torrens, myself, the member for Florey—who are all very keen to see the completion of this tunnel which I understand is on time and likely to be opened a little later this year. It is a fantastic initiative that will benefit 30,000 people twice a day in the northern suburbs when it opens.

We also heard the member for Adelaide provide a range of other options that the government could have spent this money on, and I am sure the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure will look carefully at her speech and be most appreciative of her engineering expertise about what should have been provided instead of this O-Bahn tunnel. It was quite an interesting little contribution, I have to say. She refers to the O-Bahn tunnel as providing South Australians with something shiny. Well, goodness gracious me! What it is doing is providing an opportunity for a busy traffic area in the city to be freed up so that cars can flow more freely, buses can get into the city more easily—and shock, horror, if someone should sell up, move into the city and have buses going past their apartment buildings.

The next thing the member for Adelaide is going to want is not only Barton Terrace to remain closed but buses removed from the city streets so that her constituents do not have the inconvenience of a bus going past their front door. It was a ridiculous contribution. As I said, 30,000 people will be welcoming this initiative of the South Australian government. We are building South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I do seem to recall that Councillor Anne Moran said that the railways were constructed on parkland. The member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:40): Thank you, sir. I do not intend to sit here and castigate the member for Wright as she castigated the member for Adelaide. It is interesting that, in the decaying last days of the Corcoran government, the prospect of a transport plan for the Liberal Party was put together by Michael Wilson and Dean Brown predominantly. I have heard the story on several occasions. When David Tonkin won government, he came in largely as a result of a bus strike on the Friday before the election, as I recall, sir, and I am sure you do as well—

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr PENGILLY: —and of course the O-Bahn grew out of it. The O-Bahn was very much a Liberal Party in government initiative. It has been highly successful for decades now. It continues to be highly successful. I think the pity of it is that it has not been replicated in other parts of Adelaide,

because it was wonderful. I have actually called for an O-Bahn-like system to be put in place from Seaford or Aldinga down through to the South Coast. I think that would be a terrific outcome that would solve a lot of problems and take a lot of people off the road.

It is important to remember, particularly for the member for Wright's benefit, that the Liberal Party actually supported this O-Bahn extension project in the Public Works Committee. We did not refuse it: we supported it. Indeed, only a couple of weeks ago, the Public Works Committee did a site inspection on the new part of the project, walked through the tunnel and will be pleased when it comes into being. I say that just for the record because I am well aware of the concerns that were raised by residents, schools and whatnot in the lead-up to the project.

They were justified in raising those concerns, and the member for Adelaide was most justified in putting those views on her constituents' behalf. That is our job. That is what she is there for, that is what I am here for and that is what we are all here for, quite frankly. When South Australians have concerns about something that is going to be instigated, sometimes it is the fear of the unknown, but the place to raise those concerns is in this place where we have the benefit of being able to talk about these things and put them well and truly on the record.

I found the walk-through a couple of weeks ago most interesting. It is a significant tunnel. I was highly impressed with the skill of the workforce and the people who are working on it, in particular, the project managers, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and the DPTI officers who are assigned to it—people like Mr Jon Whelan and Co. who take great pride in their work. The upshot is that when it does open, and when it is serviceable, it will be beneficial to those who use it. There is no question about that. I know it is a bit of an attempt to save the member for Newland next March. Be that as it may, we will live with that, because it will be put in place.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: It has come at enormous cost. Time will tell how that is all going to be paid back, if at all. I am not sure where this government is coming from on their solutions to public transport.

I came in by bus this morning, as I do quite often, from down Glenelg way. Along Anzac Highway, which has become a complete jungle of cars in the morning, bogged down, restricted now around Ashford Hospital onwards to two lanes, it is a nightmare. In the bus this morning, it was not so bad—it was quite good actually because we just sailed merrily up the road—but not for those commuters who, through no fault of their own, have to come in by car.

Not everybody can come in on a bus or a tram, it just does not work that way; if they are farther away, they can come in on the train. I am not going to comment on members who have electorates that go up there, but I can tell the house that at the moment there are thousands and thousands of dissatisfied motorists tearing their hair out about how to get into the city by Anzac Highway each weekday to come to work. It is ridiculous. Getting back to the subject of the day, which is the O-Bahn, if that works—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Are you saying you want an O-Bahn from Glenelg?

Mr PENGILLY: Now, Tom. If it works, which we hope it does, it will be beneficial, but I make the point again that it was always a Liberal initiative, the O-Bahn system; the light rail, or whatever they call it, was a Liberal initiative. To this date it has been highly successful and it will be successful into the future. With those few words, I support the motion.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:46): I rise to speak on the 533rd report of the Public Works Committee relating to the O-Bahn City Access Project. It has taken a long time to get this debate to the house. It has been on the agenda for quite some time. It was at a time when I was on the Public Works Committee, which was an absolute pleasure. It is a very hardworking committee and a very interesting committee with a great group of members to work with.

Some of the brief summary of this project, when it went through the Public Works Committee, was that the Adelaide O-Bahn is a 12-kilometre network in length, and we were told it is the most highly patronised metropolitan public transport corridor in Adelaide, with 30,000 people utilising the service daily. It was built in the mid-1980s and was a great Liberal initiative. The O-Bahn busway

consists of three interchanges along the length of the corridor and connects the north-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide to the central business district.

The committee was advised that between Hackney Road and Grenfell Street the efficiency of the bus services is significantly compromised by the heavily congested traffic conditions which impact on bus services by increasing travel time, and it can take almost twice as long as necessary. We have been told that average bus speeds along the on-road section of the journey can be as low as 20 km/h, and that 25 per cent of the travel time can be due to delays at intersections.

The Hackney Road/Botanic Road/Rundle Road/Dequetteville Terrace intersections on the inner ring route are currently at or approaching capacity, with approximately 79,000 vehicle movements on average each weekday. During the hearing, we were told that greater than 60 per cent of crashes recorded along Hackney Road have involved vehicles attempting a right turn manoeuvre. The cost of the project started at \$160 million. I am sure it has gone a little above and beyond that but we will see, once the project is completed.

During the hearing I did raise a couple of concerns, one being the reduction in car parks. I was told by one of the witnesses that, based on the scheme we have been working on with the Botanic Garden to offset parking between Plane Tree Drive and Botanic Drive to relocate them closer to the wine centre and the Goodman Building, at the conceptual level there are approximately 70 fewer car parks. So there will be an inconvenience for people using those carparks.

We were later advised that the project would result in a total net loss of approximately 93 parking spaces along the western side of Hackney Road between North Terrace and Bundeys Road. It is obviously an area of concern for businesses and customers requiring parking during those busy times.

We also asked whether there was any record of Australian steel being used in this project. We undertook an FOI process, but there is no record. I managed to go out to a holding yard up the road from the Barossa Fine Foods manufacturing plant to the north of Adelaide. I had a look at the store yard and the sheet pile and it definitely was not made in Australia. There was no indication that any of the reinforcing steel had come from Australia, so that raised my blood pressure.

There were safety concerns about the O-Bahn tunnel, and that there was no footbridge was a contentious issue for quite some time; that is, there was no provision for a footbridge for people crossing over. We asked the minister whether he would consider a footbridge and he said no. We all know that it was the Treasurer's pet project. We all know that, potentially, the minister had gone to the Treasurer to ask him for more money for a footbridge and he was obviously told no.

The digging up of the Parklands was also an issue that every person around Adelaide and the Parklands community was very alarmed about. There were other questions about the impact of the project on the 400 homes. One of the department witnesses said the following:

I think one has to look at this on balance. We are empathetic with the 400 residents who live there regarding issues. What we need to look at are options that are safe. On balance, we have 45,000 to 50,000 vehicles a day and we have 1,000 buses a day travelling an important part of this network so we have to balance that in terms of you indicating what else you can do adding lights. You can introduce lights all over the city, but we know the frustration that causes.

To August 2015, almost \$7 million of the \$160 million budget had been spent on planning, investigations, approvals, reports, design work, site investigation, service investigation, design of service relocations, estimating, surveying, contracts, project management and procurement. It is also interesting to note that at the time approximately \$11,000 had been spent on printing and distributing flyers. Again, the government are masters at self-promotion and they are masters at spending taxpayers' money to justify their spend.

I also note that this project passed the Public Works Committee and that it was endorsed by all its members, so I welcome the report to the house. When witnesses came to the Public Works Committee, I took note and went out and spoke to some of the local residents and local businesses that were going to be impacted. I spoke to the owners of the Royal Hotel, and they had noticed a significant impact on their business and on patronage.

It really alarmed me that, when they came some mornings, they had glasses and bottles that had rattled off the shelf, hit the ground and were broken. What really concerns me today is that that hotel has closed and is no longer in existence. It is all very well for the member for Wright to rattle on about what the member for Adelaide is concerned about for her constituents, but this has caused damage to a longstanding business in South Australia and in Adelaide, and that hotel has now gone.

They were impacted with regard to patronage. They were worried about how people were going to utilise their car park because of the lack of 92 car parks the tunnel was going to create, and it painted a very concerning picture. Upon speaking to the owners of the Royal Hotel, that business has gone, sadly. The Leader of the Opposition, the member for Dunstan, spoke about the ongoing burden to approaching or getting on to Hackney Road coming down North Terrace as the continuation of Magill Road. It means that people have to turn left at Dequetteville Terrace and then crack a U-turn onto Hackney Road so that they can progress north on Hackney Road.

Where is the common sense there? A couple of issues were never addressed, but the government was hell-bent on pushing this project through for all the reasons we have heard from previous speakers. However, all in all, the Public Works Committee approved the project and I welcome the 533rd report to the house.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:54): I rise to support the report, of course, and to welcome the O-Bahn project. It is an excellent project and will be an excellent improvement to public transport services for people in my electorate and in the electorates of other members to the north-east—Wright, Florey, Torrens, Dunstan even, I think, with Klemzig, and also Hartley. A number of those of us whose electorates are on that north-eastern corridor know that our constituents will be much better off as a result of this project.

I agree with the member for Wright that it is four minutes on average when taken over a 24-hour period, but anybody who has caught that bus in peak hour in the morning knows that it can take as long to get from Hackney to Grenfell Street as it takes to get from Tea Tree Plaza to Hackney. That wonderful trip along the river valley is beautiful, especially in the morning. You come in at a very good speed, then you suddenly hit Hackney and life gets a lot slower and a lot more frustrating. That will be eliminated.

Of course, the effect of that is that you will have buses circulating a lot more quickly and it will in fact bring a de facto increase in capacity into the system because of the way the buses will be able to circulate and the speed with which the buses will be able to circulate between the city and Tea Tree Plaza. I am looking forward to that extra capacity and, hopefully, seeing increased usage of what is already the most popular public transport system in South Australia.

I have toured the tunnel. As the members for Finniss and Wright have said, it is a very impressive engineering feat. I am looking forward to the rehabilitation of the surface. Imagine, in a few years' time, with the skill of the Adelaide City Council gardeners, no-one will know it is there until a bus pops up almost right in front of them in a couple of parts. I am sure it will be rehabilitated well and I am looking forward to that. I see that, even in the midst of the construction, the Garden of Unearthly Delights was able to function.

I acknowledge the inconvenience to those people in the City of Adelaide and other seats that are affected by it and I thank them for their patience. Most people are sensible and know that it is inconvenience for a short time for a long-term public good, and they welcome it. I am very much looking forward to making that trip on one of the first buses, if not on the very first bus, and seeing just how much quicker it is, how much more convenient it is and how much better it is for those residents in the north-east who use that public transport every day. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (11:57): Before we move on to the next item, I would like to add a few comments. I have done this at the end, so as not to influence the debate. Having listened to the contributions, of course, the project is a marvellous and welcome addition to our transport system for the residents in the north-east. However, I do hope it will not be at the expense of paying attention

to the parking needs that are ongoing at various stations and to the other items of concourse safety. I, too, commend the motion to the house.

Bills

**HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA)
(MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (12:00): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (12:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010 sets out the legislative provisions for the operation of the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme. This national scheme provides for the registration of practitioners across 14 health professions across Australia and the regulation of these practitioners under nationally consistent registration standards and codes for their professions. As at 30 June 2016, 53,119 health practitioners in South Australia were registered under the national scheme.

The act also covers the regulation of other related matters in South Australia that are not part of the national scheme. These matters include the registration of pharmacy premises and pharmacy depots, and provisions to ensure that optical appliances are prescribed by qualified persons only.

The amendment bill before the house today makes changes to the act to give effect to an increase in the number of pharmacies that the Friendly Society Medical Association Limited may own; simplifying the regulatory requirements for manufacturers and retailers of ready-made spectacles; and the merger of the CrimTrac Agency with the Australian Crime Commission. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

I will now outline these changes in detail for the benefit of Members.

Increasing the number of pharmacies that the Friendly Society Medical Association Limited may own

Part 4 of the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010* includes provisions for the regulation of pharmacy premises and pharmacy depots in South Australia. As part of these provisions all pharmacy premises, and their owners, must be registered with the Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA. These provisions ensure that pharmacy premises are suitable for the safe storage and supply of medications to the community, and that the owners of pharmacy premises are 'fit and proper' persons to operate these premises. All other jurisdictions have similar regulatory provisions for their pharmacy premises to ensure that the safety of the public is protected.

Included in these regulatory provisions is a limitation on the number of pharmacies that an entity may own. The current capped numbers, which have been in place since 2007, allow the Friendly Society Medical Association Limited (which trades as National Pharmacies, and I will continue to refer to them by this name) to own 40 pharmacies, all other friendly societies to own nine pharmacies in total, and a person other than a friendly society to individually own up to six pharmacies. In this latter category will be the community pharmacists that most of us are familiar with.

The limitation on the number of pharmacies that an entity may own has been in place in some form in South Australia since 1947. Other jurisdictions have similar provisions in place, although the numbers of pharmacies that may be owned differ. Restricting the number of pharmacies that an entity may own allows a number of operators and service models to operate in the market thereby creating competition.

Some time ago I was approached by National Pharmacies for an increase in the number of pharmacies that they may own. National Pharmacies outlined to me that the current cap on pharmacy numbers, along with the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) reforms of the Commonwealth Government, were having a detrimental effect on their business. An increase in the number of pharmacies that they may own would offset the effects of the PBS reforms on their business. The proposal put to me by National Pharmacies was for an increase of five pharmacies in three increments over the next 15 years.

I was told that the Pharmacy Guild of Australia (South Australian Branch), which represents community pharmacists, would be unlikely to support an increase in the number of pharmacies of this magnitude, and I asked National Pharmacies to meet with the Guild to see if a compromise could be achieved. Unfortunately both parties could not agree. I then offered to National Pharmacies those pharmacies that had not been taken up by other friendly societies as a means to increase their holdings. I had hoped that this offer may be a compromise to all parties as it would not change the overall number of pharmacies that may be owned by friendly societies in South Australia.

I wrote to the major pharmacy interest groups on this proposal. The United Friendly Society Pharmacy at Mt Gambier, which is the only other friendly society that operates a pharmacy in South Australia, wished to reserve their right to own additional pharmacies and did not support a transfer of all the unallocated numbers to National Pharmacies. While National Pharmacies was supportive of the increase in numbers it was not to the magnitude that they requested, and it was likely to result in another approach in five years for an increase in the number of pharmacies that they may own. The Guild was not supportive of any change to the current cap numbers.

I am reminded that when my predecessor, the Hon. John Hill, introduced the Pharmacy Practice Bill into Parliament in 2006 he spoke of the difficulties in trying to get all parties to agree to the number of pharmacies that each entity may own. The basis of the numbers as he outlined was based on a compromise reached some time ago between the number of pharmacies that friendly societies may own and the number of pharmacies that community pharmacists may own. The numbers in that Bill, and which form the basis of the Bill before Parliament today, are based on the market share between friendly societies and community pharmacies when the cap numbers were first introduced.

While I am aware that the Guild does not support the increase to National Pharmacies in the Bill, I believe that it is a reasonable compromise to all parties. The increase of five pharmacies to National Pharmacies is from the current number of pharmacies allocated to friendly societies in South Australia but which have not been taken up; they are not new places, and so the market share between friendly societies and community pharmacies is still maintained. I believe that this is a reasonable compromise between National Pharmacies and the Guild.

I have decided to bring this amendment to the House ahead of the outcomes of national discussions around competition policy more broadly that may impact on pharmacy regulation in the future, including any recommendations that may come from the Review of Pharmacy Remuneration and Regulation commissioned by the previous Commonwealth Minister for Health. While the outcomes from these discussions may impact on Commonwealth and State and Territory laws, I am told that any changes would be unlikely to be implemented until after the expiry of the Sixth Community Pharmacy Agreement in 2020.

Given this timeframe I believe that it is appropriate for the South Australian Parliament to consider an increase in the number of pharmacies that National Pharmacies may own ahead of any outcomes at the national level.

Simplifying the regulatory requirements for manufacturers and retailers of ready-made spectacles

Part 5 of the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010* includes provisions for the regulation of optical appliances in South Australia. This includes spectacle lenses and contact lenses. Any optical appliance cannot be sold in South Australia unless it is prescribed by an optometrist or ophthalmologist. This is to ensure that the optical appliance is to the right strength to correct the eye defect and fitted properly. If this does not occur there is the potential for damage to the eye that may lead to blindness.

However, if glasses are purely for magnifying, commonly called ready-made spectacles, they can be sold without a prescription provided that a warning label is attached to the glasses stating that they are not prescription glasses, and recommending that the purchaser should consider an eye examination by an optometrist for an assessment. There may be underlying medical reasons such as glaucoma and macular degeneration that may be causing difficulty in reading, which if left untreated, may lead to blindness. The purpose of the warning label is to alert the purchaser to consider an examination to determine whether there is an underlying eye problem which is contributing to their vision difficulties.

The act currently requires the warning label to be affixed to the glasses in a prescribed manner. Previous regulations have prescribed the warning label to be affixed by cotton twine. In drafting a new regulation to prescribe the warning label it was considered that prescribing the attachment of the warning label by cotton twine may be an unnecessary impost on businesses, particularly if they have come up with an alternate method that is more cost-effective e.g. adhesive sticker on the lenses or plastic tie attached to the frames.

The intent of the regulation is only to ensure that the purchaser is aware that the ready-made glasses are not prescription glasses, and that they are only a temporary fix to their vision problems. As long as this warning label is attached to the glasses at the point of sale, and in such a manner that the purchaser needs to physically remove the label, then the objective of the legislation is met. The amendment before Parliament removes the requirement about the manner in which the warning label is to be affixed to the ready-made spectacles.

Optometry South Australia has been consulted on this revised provision and supports the proposed amendment.

The merger of the CrimTrac Agency with the Australian Crime Commission

This amendment is a minor and technical amendment to give effect to the merger of the CrimTrac Agency with the Australian Crime Commission.

The *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law* uses the CrimTrac Agency to receive criminal history information to determine whether a person is 'fit and proper' to practise as a health practitioner in Australia. The National Law also provides that a health profession regulatory board may at any time request the criminal history of an individual practitioner. Section 79 of the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010* authorises the South Australian Commissioner of Police to provide a criminal history report when requested to a health profession regulatory board, the CrimTrac Agency or another police force or service of the Commonwealth or another State.

The proposed amendment changes all references from the CrimTrac Agency to the Australian Crime Commission as the authority to provide the criminal history reports. While references to the CrimTrac Agency in the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law* will be amended later this year I have decided to progress the corresponding amendments in the National Law as it applies in South Australia to remove any doubt that the Australian Crime Commission is the authority to provide criminal history information now that the CrimTrac Agency no longer exists. I believe that this is an appropriate course of action to ensure that the South Australian public is protected from persons that are not of good character to practise.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010*

4—Amendment of section 42—Restriction on number of pharmacies

This clause amends section 42 to provide that—

- (a) Friendly Society Medical Association Limited must not provide pharmacy services at more than 45 pharmacies in this State (currently the limit is 40); and
- (b) a friendly society other than Friendly Society Medical Association Limited must not commence to provide pharmacy services at a pharmacy if friendly societies other than Friendly Society Medical Association Limited already provide pharmacy services at 4 pharmacies (subject to a different number in the regulations) in this State (currently the threshold is 9).

5—Amendment of section 74—Unauthorised dispensing of optical appliances

This clause amends section 74(2)(d) to remove the requirement that a prescribed warning is attached to the glasses in the prescribed manner. The requirement on amendment will be that a prescribed warning is attached to the glasses at the time of sale.

6—Amendment of section 79—Commissioner of Police may give criminal history information

This clause amends section 79 to update the reference to CrimTrac to the Australian Crime Commission established under the *Australian Crime Commission Act 2002* of the Commonwealth.

7—Amendment of Schedule 2—Health Practitioner Regulation National Law

This clause amends the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law to update references to CrimTrac to the Australian Crime Commission established under the *Australian Crime Commission Act 2002* of the Commonwealth and to delete the definition of CrimTrac.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

RETURN TO WORK CORPORATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (CROWN CLAIMS MANAGEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister

for the City of Adelaide) (12:03): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Return to Work Corporation of South Australia Act 1994. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I am introducing a bill to make amendments to the Return to Work Corporation of South Australia Act 1994 to allow for the management of return to work claims of employees of the state government to be administered by ReturnToWorkSA. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Employing over 100,000 South Australians, our public sector is a significant employer in the state. The changes proposed in this Bill will bring the Public Service in line with the rest of the state with regard to return-to-work outcomes and services, resulting in greater consistency and transparency.

In the unfortunate event of a workplace injury, all South Australian employees should expect to receive the same level of support in order to facilitate their return to work no matter where they work. Our aim is to ensure a consistent approach across the state.

The current arrangements do not support this consistency, and unless we change the status of the government's injury management service to align with our private sector employers, this inconsistency will remain.

Currently, there are twelve separate injury management units across government that provide claims administration services to injured employees. This can lead to differing approaches with varying practices and systems. The arrangement provided for in this Bill will lead to improvements over time, given workplace injury insurance is ReturnToWorkSA's core business.

In addition, ReturnToWorkSA has a sophisticated data analytics capability, which they use as a risk management tool. This level of data capability and analysis will allow for return to work policy development, which also encompasses the public sector. It will also make it easier to gather evidence on public sector wide trends, enabling greater benchmarking.

There are also obvious economies of scale arguments in favour of ReturnToWorkSA becoming the state government's work injury insurance provider. These gains are consistent with the government's economic priorities for South Australia, as outlined in the state's Strategic Plan, promoting our state as the best place to do business, and enabling innovation through improved data collection and analysis.

The Government's intention is that the transfer of the injury management of all new Crown employee claims to ReturnToWorkSA take place on 1 July 2017. However, the Bill provides flexibility with regard to certain agencies and instrumentalities of the Crown. Minda, the Royal District Nursing Society and the Royal Society for the Blind require particular attention and are likely to have need of a later date of transfer in order to ease their transition.

The government's aim is to provide a streamlined service which will ensure all South Australian employees achieve their return-to-work outcomes in a consistent and timely manner. This is not only good for workers, but also benefits the economic and social stability of our state. This approach will help to achieve the goal of a more consistent and transparent return-to-work system throughout South Australia.

In summary, this Bill makes changes to the *Return to Work Corporation of South Australia Act 1994* to facilitate the administration of all new work injury claims to ReturnToWorkSA promoting consistency, efficiency and equity in the scheme.

I commend the Bill to members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Return to Work Corporation of South Australia Act 1994*

4—Insertion of Part 5A

This clause inserts proposed sections 24A and 24B.

Part 5A—Crown employment

24A—Cessation of registration of Crown as self-insured employer

The proposed section operates to cease the operation of the deemed registration of a Crown entity as a self-insured employer under section 130 of the *Return to Work Act 2014* either on the commencement day (in the case of a Crown entity that is not a designated Crown entity) or on a day specified by the Minister in the case of a designated Crown entity.

A delegation of powers and discretions of the Corporation under section 134 of the *Return to Work Act 2014* may continue in relation to injuries occurring before the day on which the relevant deemed registration ceases until a specified day.

Proposed subsection (3) sets out the power of the Minister to specify different days in relation to different entities for the purposes of subsection (1)(b) and subsection (2).

Proposed subsection (4) defines certain terms for the purposes of the measure.

24B—Transitional Regulations

The proposed section inserts a power to make regulations of a saving or transitional nature. Regulations may be made to make provision in relation to when injuries are to be taken to have occurred for the purposes of section 24A(2).

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 April 2017.)

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:04): I will continue my remarks. I was talking about the minister's announcement yesterday of \$110 million of state money going into water re-use north of Adelaide.

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just a moment, member for Chaffey, the Attorney has something to say.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I did let this go a bit yesterday, but it may well be that in terms of a grievance conversation, or indeed a supply conversation, which we will be able to have immediately after this, all the comments that are being made by the honourable member are completely relevant and completely appropriate. However, this bill is about a very narrow question about the jurisdiction of the Employment Tribunal. It is not an invitation to have a broad-ranging conversation about the issue of employment statewide—and I am not saying that that is not an important issue; I do think it is an important issue, but I just make the point to the member that there will be—

Mr Bell: An impromptu speech.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am just trying to listen to what he is getting to say.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —a debate later today and tomorrow about the Supply Bill, at which time all members will have an opportunity pretty much to say anything they want about pretty much anything.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: So, your point is relevance, really.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Relevance, indeed.

Mr Bell: A bogus point of order; kick him out.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, we will not kick him out, but I will listen to the member for Chaffey in the light of all of that.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I will continue my remarks. What I want to continue speaking about is jobs. The government has said that the project at Bolivar, north of Adelaide, will create 3,700 jobs and attract \$1.1 billion in private investment. What I was getting to was that the skilled jobs that will be needed for the new technology that revolves around this project—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We do need to try to draw you back a little bit, member for Chaffey. You are drawing back to the topic, thank you.

Mr WHETSTONE: Essentially, what I want to get back to is that, on 1 July 2015, the Return to Work Act 2014 replaced the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986, and the SAET was established for the 'resolution of workers compensation matters, including:'

- disputes about workers compensation claims
- undue delays in decisions on workers compensation claims...

As an employer, I have been on the tail end of these compensation claims and I know how much arduous work—paperwork, time and effort—goes into a family-run business and of the distraction from the main game of trying to help South Australia's economy and creating jobs. However, being part of a good news story is often hampered by compensation claims, particularly the tardiness in processing claims and getting the employee rehabilitated and back into the workforce and back into production. The SAET was also established for:

- disputes about an employer providing suitable employment for a worker who has been incapacitated for work as a consequence of a work injury.

Yes, that is very notable; however, when an employee has a charter, whether they want to get back into the workforce or prolong getting back into the workforce, there needs to be much more scrutiny put on the employee and not the employer, who is often doing everything in their power to make sure they have a productive employee back in their workforce, fully rehabilitated, so that they can create efficiencies within that business. According to the SAET Annual Report 2015-16:

...3,829 disputes were resolved with an average time from lodgement to resolution at conciliation being nine weeks and 25 weeks at hearing and determination.

Again, nothing happens very quickly in relation to determination and getting people back into the workplace.

Since opening on 20 July 2015, the SAET has had 4,904 applications successfully processed, resolved at conciliation; in 2015-16, 71 per cent were resolved at conciliation and 7 per cent through hearings and determination. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:10): I thank those who have contributed, albeit expansively, on the topic of this bill and I hope that it is dealt with swiftly.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: When did the Attorney become aware of issues that required legislative reform before the implementation on 1 July?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that it came to the attention of the legislative services people in the last couple of months.

Ms CHAPMAN: Who alerted the government to the deficiencies in respect of the current law?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Just so that it is clear for the official record, I am advised that in effect the bill has only five operational parts, it would seem: the short title, the commencement and the

amendment of provisions, so I would have thought it not particularly relevant. We are really dealing with the balance of the bill in terms of doing things.

In relation to part 2 of the bill, which is the amendment of section 45 regarding pre-hearing conferences, I am advised that the issue in that space was one that was raised by the Employment Tribunal itself. As to the next matters, which are contained in the first schedule, I am advised that the first of those was raised by the AEU, and it was done so on the basis that it somehow would have limited the capacity of the jurisdiction of the Teachers Appeal Board to be adequately decanted into the Employment Tribunal.

I am advised that the balance of those, which I think are fairly described as rats and mice matters, were discovered by either legislative services or parliamentary counsel in terms of going through the legislation again, and these are in the nature of tidy-ups. That is my advice about the background to all of those.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Ms CHAPMAN: As the Attorney has pointed out, the six changes to legislation are all in clause 3. First, I wish to go to the Employment Tribunal amendment to the principal act on pre-hearing conferences. I think, Attorney, the information is quite clear in your second reading as to why it is necessary to remove that as being mandatory. My question is: in light of the bill you have just introduced to the parliament, which will transfer the government work currently managed by government to ReturnToWorkSA, does that produce any other workload on the Employment Tribunal, or are all those claims currently going to that tribunal in any event?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Good question. The situation presently is that the government, through its various agencies and instrumentalities, operates in the same fashion as a self-insurer under the Return to Work Act. The changes we foreshadowed in the bill that has just been introduced would have the effect of ceasing the de facto self-insured status of individual government agencies and then becoming, in effect, premium paying customers of ReturnToWorkSA, albeit in a separate pool of funds in a way not dissimilar to the private sector people who are insured under the scheme.

The fact is that everybody who has a dispute under the scheme, whether they be an insured private sector person, whether they be a self-insured private sector employee, or whether they be a government employee now or post this change, will continue to have the opportunity to have any dispute under the structures of the return-to-work scheme determined in that tribunal. There should be no difference whatsoever as far as the employees are concerned.

The real difference is probably best characterised by a very summarised description of claims management that will be managed, I guess, through ReturnToWorkSA rather than through elements of individual agencies. In terms of the way in which that impacts on the individual employee of the government, they will have exactly the same rights as they have always had and those rights will be determined in this tribunal as it presently is.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have no question in respect of the Education Act, and the Equal Opportunity Act similarly. I would like to move to the Technical and Further Education Act amendment, which is described at about point 5 on that page of the bill. Here, there looks to be a minor change. I would like some explanation as to what it is salvaging and who alerted you to it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thank the member for Bragg for her question. I will provide my advice in relation to this to the house. A new section 18A will be inserted in the Technical and Further Education Act 1975 on commencement of section 139 of the Statutes Amendment (SAET) Act 2016. As is currently the case under 17A of the TAFE Act 1975, in respect of the powers of the Teachers Appeal Board, section 18A was intended to have the effect that on hearing of a review concerning the termination, retrenchment, transfer or retirement of a TAFE officer, SAET may revoke the relevant decision and reinstate the officer.

To have the effect intended, section 18A(2) must be amended to replace the words 'in this section' with the words 'this division', so that the relevant phrase reads, 'Proceedings for the review

of a determination or decision that has taken effect under this division', instead of under this section. It means division 2 of part 3 of the TAFE Act, which contains sections 15A, 16 and 17—the relevant provisions to terminate, retrench, transfer or retire an officer. If section 18A(2) is not amended, as intended by this bill, SAET will not have the power to reinstate a TAFE officer should it revoke a decision on review.

Ms CHAPMAN: That has answered both questions. The next question is on part 4, which is, again, an amendment to the Statutes Amendment (South Australian Employment Tribunal) Act 2016. I would like you to explain what that does and what it will protect against.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that if you have a look at the relevant section in the definitions passage—this is in 100(1)—you will see that the word 'tribunal', for the purposes of that section, is defined as meaning the Equal Opportunity Tribunal. If you go down a little bit further to subsection (7)(b), you will see there is a reference to the tribunal.

But for this amendment, that might be actually pointing us off in the direction of the Equal Opportunity Tribunal, where in fact it is meant to mean the Employment Tribunal. The word 'tribunal' in (7)(b) is intended to mean the Employment Tribunal, not the Equal Opportunity Tribunal. But for this amendment, having regard to the definition in subsection (1), we would be mistakenly pointing the finger off towards the Equal Opportunity Tribunal instead of the Employment Tribunal, so it is just to clarify that.

Ms CHAPMAN: Looking at the brief comment you made in your second reading and the information that was provided at the briefing, I understood it was necessary to protect the lapsing of part-heard matters.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That is right in the sense that the general import of that section, in particular subsection (7), is to enable things which were received in a part-heard manner to continue to be received as evidence—that is correct. But the only point, I am advised, is that where it says, 'Adopt any findings or determinations of the tribunal that may be relevant to proceedings before the tribunal', in that instance, if you go back to the definition, what that is actually saying is, 'adopt any findings or determinations of the Equal Opportunity Tribunal that may be relevant to proceedings before the Equal Opportunity Tribunal', and that is not what was meant. What was meant was, 'adopt any determinations of the Equal Opportunity Tribunal that may be relevant to proceedings before the Employment Tribunal'.

Ms CHAPMAN: In relation to the Equal Opportunity Tribunal, at this stage we are already removing the presiding officer of the Equal Opportunity Tribunal from setting their own rules and now the SAET is going to be undertaking that role—this is the way I understand it. Is there some reason why the presiding officer of the Equal Opportunity Tribunal should not be setting her—usually her, or of course it can be his—rules like every other tribunal?

There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:

The CHAIR: Would the person in the gallery sit down, please?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: My advice is that between now and 1 July, the presiding member of the Equal Opportunity Tribunal, who is a senior judge of the District Court, Justice Evans, is able to do that. From 1 July, the Equal Opportunity Tribunal's jurisdiction will be folded into the Employment Tribunal, so there is no work for it to do.

Ms CHAPMAN: Finally, the sixth rats and mice amendment here, as described by the Attorney, is to deal with the Teachers Appeal Board. In respect of that, what is being salvaged and why?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Again, this is not dissimilar to the problem we encountered with the word 'tribunal' before. If you go to section 142 of the primary act, you would see that in subsection (1) the tribunal in this case is defined as the South Australian Employment Tribunal. If you read subsection (2) accordingly, it provides:

The Appeal Board under the principal Act is dissolved by force of this subsection (and so the commencement of this subsection brings to an end the appointment of a person as a member of the Tribunal).

That does not make any sense because 'the tribunal' means the Employment Tribunal. It should have said 'the appeal board'. Again, it is a drafting oversight.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, the consequence is that if this is not remedied, you will have accidentally got rid of the Employment Tribunal?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If there were any risk of that, we would not be commencing that provision, but, yes, it could create all sorts of silly, unintended outcomes.

Ms CHAPMAN: I do not have any other questions, but I just want to remind the house that these are not rats and white mice amendments: they are significant. They are meritorious, and I am glad that they have been identified and are being remedied, but I would ask the Attorney that, in future, if he wants to come in here and ask us to have technical amendments, he tell us the whole of that in his second reading contribution and give that explanation not just for one or two of them that he considers to be meritorious.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (4), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:28): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION (VETERANS' ADVISORY COUNCIL) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 March 2017.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12:29): I am not the lead speaker. The member for Bragg will be our lead speaker; I am just going to add a small part to the debate. Can I say how much I have enjoyed my association with the many veterans in South Australia and working with the Minister for Veterans' Affairs.

Everybody in this house is very well aware of the need to ensure that we look after our veterans in South Australia. I thank the South Australian Department of Veterans' Affairs and particularly Mr Robert Manton for his unwavering support of both me and the veterans in South Australia. The government department may be quite small in number, but it is a very powerful department in that it does ensure that all veterans in South Australia are well and truly looked after. There is no better example of this than the results of the work that the Veterans Advisory Council does and the magnificent representation from people like Sir Eric Neal and the current members of the Veterans Advisory Council over the last few years.

We need to make sure that our veterans are remembered. Every ANZAC Day—and it is coming up very shortly—we always say, 'Lest we forget,' and we never forget in this place. We need to make sure that we do actually put our money where our mouth is, and that is important. I am very proud to say that I had a part to play in securing funding for the wonderful ANZAC walk on Kintore Avenue. If members have not been down there, they should go and have a look at it.

I invite every member of the public to go and have a look at that wonderful display of artwork that commemorates a whole range of campaigns that our veterans were involved in. I thought the artwork was computer generated, but it is all hand done on South Australian granite. When you look from a distance, it looks like a photograph, but when you get close up it is tiny hand-wrought chips

in the granite. It is just one example of the way in which money is being spent in South Australia to commemorate our veterans.

The ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund is a significant amount of money, which was boosted to \$350,000 during the centenary of ANZAC. We need to make sure that we spend that money as effectively and wisely as possible to commemorate the deeds of our ANZAC veterans in particular, and that has been working. This change to the legislation will ensure that the results from that spend are not only what we would desire but also what veterans would desire, because it is about the veterans and the families who cherish their memories.

I was very fortunate a few years ago to accompany the minister and other members of parliament, including you, Deputy Speaker, to the Gallipoli Peninsula for the centenary of Lone Pine. We were able to go to those places where so many brave Australian young men and women fought and died. It really brings home the fact that we need to make sure that we are doing them proud in remembering their sacrifice. To me, the task before them was completely unimaginable in order to fulfil their orders, to go into that terrain and to try to complete the campaign that the generals, sitting back in their offices, had given to these very brave people.

According to this legislation, the requirement to ensure that the fund is being spent wisely is now in the hands of the minister, but that will still be referred back to the Veterans Advisory Council. I think that is a reasonably safe way of making sure that, if there are any concerns or questions about decisions that are going to be made, they are then referred back for a second opinion, so to speak. I think all veterans can rest assured that the fund is going to be in good hands.

In 12 months' time, when we hopefully will have Liberal government in South Australia, I look forward to continuing the work that has been done by Veterans SA. Again, I would particularly like to thank Mr Rob Manton for his kind support over the number of years that he has been there not just of me and not just of the minister but for all veterans in South Australia.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:34): The ANZAC Day Commemoration (Veterans' Advisory Council) Amendment Bill seeks to amend the ANZAC Day Commemoration Act 2005, to transfer the functions of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council to the Veterans Advisory Council and the Minister for Veterans' Affairs following the 2014 review of boards and committees.

When Australian and New Zealand forces landed at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915, the young men would have had little idea of their fate. As the days rolled out—day into night into day—over the eight months, until the allied forces were evacuated at the end of 2015, 8,709 Australian and 2,701 New Zealand soldiers had died. While the Gallipoli campaign did not go to plan, the ANZAC legend was born and 25 April became the day on which Australians remember the sacrifice of those who died in the war.

Today, ANZAC Day has been broadened to include recognition of those who have lost their lives in all military and peacekeeping operations in which Australia has been involved. It has become a symbol of the sacrifice of all our service men and from all wars. To date, more than 9,000 South Australians have died as a result of Australia's involvement in military operations. Tuesday week is 25 April, ANZAC Day, a day on which we formally pay our respects to those people who sacrificed so much, a day of national remembrance.

When I attend ANZAC Day dawn services—as I have for most of my adult life—at the Gilles Plains and Hampstead RSL, at the Walkerville RSL, Prospect RSL, Adelaide and Port Elliott RSL, Darwin and Canberra, I remember those who lost their lives, those who were maimed and injured, and those who returned and had to live their lives with memories of the battlefields and what followed. I remember, too, their families, and the challenges they faced—in many cases, the loss of their loved ones or their loved one, as they knew them—the sacrifices made by those individuals and the sacrifices made by their families. The ANZAC memorial walk, which we now have, is a great tribute to all those who have served.

At the Gilles Plains and Hampstead RSL, which is in my electorate, is a framed photograph taken in October 1914. In this picture, there are so many young South Australian men who fought and died in that campaign and in other theatres of World War I. The photograph shows HMAT *Ascanius*, berthed at Outer Harbor, ready to depart Australian shores and carry the

South Australian volunteers of the 10th Battalion. These young men, climbing all over the ship for the best vantage points, and the people who came to wave them goodbye you can see in the photograph, had little idea of the horror they were to encounter on the battlefield, making this almost celebratory photograph even more poignant. The picture is an important part of the state's cultural and military history.

It is estimated that one in six Australian men who went to the Great War were killed and that as many as two in five were injured. The Gilles Plains and Hampstead RSL has veterans from the Korean and Vietnam wars and a transient membership of currently serving members who have been involved in campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq. While Australians recognise 25 April as a day of national remembrance, it is imperative that we educate future generations—not only our youth but also new citizens who are choosing to call Australia their home—on the service and sacrifice of our nation.

Following the passage of the ANZAC Day Commemoration (Veterans' Advisory Council) Amendment Bill 2017, the minister will revise the Veterans Advisory Council's terms of reference to include the additional functions of advising the Minister for Veterans' Affairs on the disbursement of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund and to carry out such other functions as may be assigned to the VAC by the minister. I am advised that the amendment to the ANZAC Day Commemoration Act will ensure that the work of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council will continue with a broader representation of use through the Veterans Advisory Council.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:39): I rise to speak on the ANZAC Day (Veterans' Advisory Council) Amendment Bill 2017 and indicate that I will be the lead speaker. We will be supporting the bill. There are a number of matters that I wish to raise. Firstly, members will recall that the Premier embarked on a program of disposing of boards and committees that he or his government felt were redundant or no longer appropriate in relation to the delivery of advice and services undertaken.

When this exercise was undertaken a few years ago, the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council, which we are about to abolish, was salvaged and put into the list of committees that were to have further consideration. The further consideration has occurred. It appears that the government has not asked the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council whether or not they want to continue, but they have clearly been briefed and told that they are going and that their services are no longer required, as I understand it, after 30 June this year.

I want to thank all those who have served on the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council for the work they have undertaken, for the advice they have given and for the consideration of the applications for grants, which has been quite a significant task. In relation to the abolition of this council, the options for the government are that the council's area of responsibility—namely the processing, the recommendations and the decisions on grants in respect of funds allocated—can be transferred to the Veterans Advisory Council, which continues to operate and has its advisory function, or, alternatively, it can be taken in-house, that is to Veterans SA, which is a small department that is accountable to a minister.

It seems that the government has chosen the latter option. I do not think that that is the best model, but we on this side of the house are reassured that the application of the funds, whilst after 30 June the sole determinant party will be the minister, at the very least, the Veterans Advisory Council will be required under statute to receive all grants, whether or not they are recommended so that they may at least have some input, if they wish, in advising the minister in respect of such claims. We are advised further that the Crown Solicitor has been consulted and that this second option, which has been taken up, is not only legitimate but avoids the statutory authority re-regulating for the purposes of the Veterans Advisory Council if it were to take up that responsibility.

In any event, the last of the four years of ANZAC Day commemorations in respect of conflicts and important events during World War I and the centenary of that conflict are drawing to a close. Obviously, the funding allocations to support events into 2018, which celebrate the cessation of that conflict 100 years ago, will be covered by grants now being considered on the recommendation and determination of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council.

The four years of 100 years of recognition since the World War I conflict period will remain essentially under the determination of this committee. We are told that thereafter, for the purposes of the 2018-19 financial year, for example, applications will be received early next year (as they usually are, in January) and will close in April. They will then be determined by whoever is the Minister for Veterans' Affairs post the March 2018 election. For that financial year, we are advised that the funding allocated will revert back to its previous level of \$100,000.

Obviously that reflects that the period of the centenary of World War I will have ceased, and I think everyone rightly acknowledges that this was an important period of four years on which considerable effort has been made and funds contributed by the Australian government and also state governments around the country to support the recognition of that centenary of World War I.

We on this side of the house may not have identified this as the preferred model but we are not going to be opposing this bill. The members will conclude their service; we thank them for it. I just mention one thing, and that is that the Veterans Advisory Council—this is the surviving council—has a representative on it from the RSL, as it should. In fact, the current President of the RSL is on that council. In the annual report of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council 2015-16, there is a list of fund allocations that were made in that financial year, and unsurprisingly this council, which we are about to abolish, lists all of the different parties that received grants. They might be \$500, they might be \$50,000.

Quite predictably, we see listed there On Flanders Fields Project Consortium, the Paracombe Primary School and the Peterborough History Group. This is a snapshot of people and organisations which have joined in the centenary and have sought either a small or reasonably large lick of money to celebrate that centenary. I note that not only have the local branches of the RSL received moneys, as they should, but in addition to that, the RSL SA Branch received \$10,000 for the ANZAC centenary commemorative event for remaining World War II veterans; \$30,000 for the *Centenary of Service* DVD and regional tour celebrating 100 years of RSL; and \$45,000 for a RSL Virtual War Memorial. Obviously, that is \$85,000 just to that one organisation.

I also note incidentally that they did not even allocate the whole amount of money. There was about \$15,500 left out of that fund which I assume will roll over to the next year's \$100,000. In any event, I make this point: everyone knows the RSL is in financial difficulty. I will not go into the reasons why at the moment, but they are facing some severe financial circumstances, so much so that they have announced that they are going to sell up the property at Linden Park currently occupied by the Royal Australian Regiment. I am very concerned about this as the local member because they need the money and they need the asset—indeed, Madam Deputy Speaker, as you would know as a member and regular attendee—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm their number one ticket holder, apparently.

Ms CHAPMAN: —at important events for that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Right below The Queen.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, and it even has a beautiful picture adorning the walls. They have a lot of Labor Party members in my electorate whose portraits are hung, but we are very happy to hang yours.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I'm an Independent now.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, now that we have an Independent—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm an Independent now.

Ms CHAPMAN: —we are even happier. We might elevate you even further. I want to say that the minister has also supported a reconsideration by the RSL of the sale of that site. I thank him for making that contribution because it is almost impossible to believe that what is clearly a premier organisation for returned service men and women now in Australia, particularly here in our state which has branches across the state, would sell off an asset that is high performing, well used and very much loved and not look at other assets and land in the South-East or other property that they could use to remedy their financial plight.

But what I do not want to see—and I am putting the minister on notice here—is recommendations of large licks of money going to the RSL in future allocations that may be used to help them prop up their budget. I do not want a situation where we are going to be putting money into any entities that are clearly in financial difficulty. I am not going to go into any further detail about their plight, but they are in a difficult financial plight, and I will be looking at the annual reports of the Veterans Advisory Council and the Veterans SA annual accounts to ensure that those grant funds, approved in the future by minister after 2017, are properly applied. With that, we support the bill.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:50): I speak in favour of this bill, but mostly I would like to spend some time thanking those people who have served our country and who have come from our state. There is quite a number. In World War I, 34,959 South Australians served in that conflict, winning four Victoria Crosses and innumerable other medals and commendations for their bravery, and 54,660 South Australians enlisted during World War II.

It is appropriate to remember them, as well as those who are still alive, because almost all those who returned from both those wars have now passed on. We are getting down to our very last World War II veterans, and our Korean veterans are not far behind them, that war having occurred so quickly after World War II. It is appropriate that we remember them, those who have served and who continue to serve, not forgetting that at this very time there are still people overseas in the service of our country.

When I was minister for veterans' affairs, my view—and it continues to be my view—was that pretty much everyone who goes into an active combat zone comes back home damaged in some way, not necessarily physically and it is not necessarily apparent in the early stages. We ask a lot of them and they give us a lot. Our obligation to them on their return is twofold: firstly, for their health, both physical and mental, and, secondly, in remembrance of their service. This bill contributes to that second obligation. The bill seeks to ensure that this recognition of our brave men and women continues.

It is proposed that the Veterans Advisory Council assume the role of providing advice to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs for the disbursement of grant funds from the ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund enshrined within the act. I have always found it very valuable to have the view of service men and women and ex-service men and women when you are talking about memorials, worthy projects and things that can be most valuable to veterans and their families that the government could assist with.

The Veterans Advisory Council was always very generous with its time; it contributed in a long and meaningful way over my time and it continues to do so. I would particularly like to thank Sir Eric Neal for his chairing that council. He was chair over a very long period of time and made an excellent contribution, being able to corral a group of people and come up with useful and practical advice to ministers over a long period of time. I particularly valued that when I was there. There were also a number of veterans on that committee, too numerous to name, but I was always taken by the fact that while I was minister there were two 'Mooses' on the council. There was Moose Dunlop—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two moose.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Well, I am not sure whether 'moose' is correct, because we are not talking about animals. However, there was Moose Dunlop and Moose Bennick, and they were both very big men physically. They were wonderful contributors, but they also stood out for me simply because of their nickname of 'Moose'. I wondered how two people could have that same nickname, but apparently it is possible.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It might mean something else in the Army.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Yes. They made a wonderful contribution, along with everyone else on the committee. Until recently, there were still veterans of World War II on the council, and now the council consists of representatives of Vietnam and subsequent conflicts. I always find that the veterans are very respectful of their heritage and of the legacy of World War I, World War II and Korean War veterans.

The bill proposes to rest the advisory responsibility in this august body, and that is fitting, given the many years of experience in combat the VAC's members bring. It is my view that the current

Minister for Veterans' Affairs and any future ministers in this portfolio will be extremely well served by the advice the council will provide. I know that every other minister in this portfolio has been well served in the past by those who have made a contribution to this committee, as I have been. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:55): I rise to make some brief comments on the ANZAC Day Commemoration (Veterans' Advisory Council) Amendment Bill. Firstly, I congratulate the state government on the increase from \$100,000 to \$350,000. I always think that credit should be given where it is due, and in my opinion that money has seen an increase in the level of activity around ANZAC Day. Every year, I hear comments that more and more younger people are showing an interest in ANZAC Day and what it means.

People need to realise that Australia had only been a federal commonwealth for 13 years when World War I broke out, so it was a very young nation and part of the commonwealth. ANZAC Day came to signify so much more than Gallipoli and that battle. It has captured all those who had gone to war prior to that, as well as World War II and since that time. I give credit to RSL President, Bob Sandow, who every year seems to outdo himself and seems to have a bigger and better ANZAC Day remembrance, in terms of not only the service but also the community involvement and the involvement of schoolchildren.

The community really comes together on that day, and it is really pleasing to see. In supporting this, it is coming about because of the abolition of the council. There have been concerns that previously there was no ministerial role in the administration of the fund. I think it has been a good thing to have it totally independent of political interests and a positive that those decisions were made by an independent board, but I think that will be lost going forward. One question that needs to be answered is whether the final round of funding will be administered by the commemoration council and not by the minister, but we will wait until committee stage to seek that. With those brief remarks, I conclude my comments.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:59): I rise to support the ANZAC Day Commemoration (Veterans' Advisory Council) Amendment Bill 2017 and note that it was introduced in the House of Assembly by the Minister for Veterans' Affairs to amend the ANZAC Day Commemoration Act 2005. The bill proposes to change the arrangements under which funds are allocated to community organisations from the ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund and to give the minister a greater role in the administration of the fund and final approval power for those grants. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

GLENELG POLICE STATION

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Presented a petition signed by 245 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to maintain current levels of police numbers and operating hours at the Glenelg Police Station.

Ministerial Statement

ADELAIDE BOTANIC HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Today, I announced that the state government's proposed name for the new CBD high school located on Frome Road is Adelaide Botanic High School. This is a great occasion for contemporary education in South Australia as we build a new school that offers the most modern of facilities for our children, delivering on the state government's commitment to build a second high school in the city.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank the member for Wright, the Hon. Jennifer Rankine, whose leadership and hard work on this project have led to this announcement. As minister for education and child development, Ms Rankine began the process to plan for and deliver this new school, which will serve our state so well into the future.

The new name reflects the school's location, close to the magnificent Adelaide Botanic Garden, and its specialisation in science and health. This central location, located in the Adelaide Parklands and next door to the Adelaide Zoo, will give easy access for students to universities, museums, the State Library, performing arts facilities and green space. It will allow students, parents and teachers to connect with the large walking, cycling and public transport network that surrounds the school. This will give many options for students to travel in and out of the area.

The school is due to open from term 1 in 2019 and will provide 1,250 students with greater access to high-quality secondary schooling. The school will have a single shared zone with Adelaide High School from 2019. The current zone for Adelaide High School has been made larger, and those within this zone will have a choice of nominating which school they would like their children to attend.

The new zone will be expanded to include Bowden, Brompton, Hindmarsh, Hilton, Kurralta Park, Glandore, Black Forest, Nailsworth, Medindie, Medindie Gardens, Gilberton, Walkerville and Collinswood, as well as eastern parts of Torrensville, Mile End, Richmond, Marleston and the section of Clarence Park zoned to Black Forest Primary School. This gives the people in this zone a choice of two excellent secondary schools.

The recent \$26 million expansion and redevelopment of Adelaide High set a new benchmark for public education in South Australia, with its modern facilities. The new Adelaide Botanic High School will have learning spaces designed to cater for a contemporary, multidisciplinary approach to learning, which mirrors what students can expect when they go on to tertiary study or the modern workplace. The new school will have a specialist health and sciences program, while Adelaide High School will retain the existing specialist programs in languages, cricket and rowing.

I am also delighted to announce that a recommendation has been made for the new school's principal. Alistair Brown, currently the Heathfield High School principal, is the recommended candidate to lead the state's new \$100 million school. Mr Brown has a strong background in public education and is a great choice to head up this new school. He has spent 35 years as a teacher and held leadership positions in numerous metropolitan and country locations, beginning his career at Croydon High School in 1982. Mr Brown has significant experience in leading school initiatives and driving strategic direction and school priorities.

I am delighted to announce this progress today on delivering our election promise of a second high school in the Adelaide CBD. In addition to other major capital works, including the \$250 million investment in STEM facilities in our schools across the state, this will ensure our children have the facilities they need to receive a high-quality education that sets them up for the future.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:06): I bring up the report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given that at 7pm last night all metropolitan emergency departments were operating over capacity, why is the government failing to provide capacity of emergency care for South Australians when they need it?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:06): As of this morning, all our hospitals, except for one, were on green, and this testament to the reforms we made and the fact that they are working. What we're seeing is

that our emergency departments are certainly very, very busy, and we are seeing lots and lots of presentations, a record number of presentations.

I can't stop people from presenting to our emergency departments, but what I can do is make sure that when we do experience those surges we get through them, we process them through the emergency department as quickly as possible, we admit patients who need to be admitted and we discharge patients who need to be discharged. Without doubt, given what I saw when I last looked, which was this morning (it might have changed a little bit in the last couple of hours), all our hospitals had done a magnificent job in clearing out those very busy emergency departments. All our EDs, when I checked this morning, except for one, were on green.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): Supplementary: what time did all the emergency departments convert to green?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:07): It was when I looked this morning, which was about 10 or 11 o'clock, I think, but I am more than happy to check.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): I have a further question to the Minister for Health. How does the minister explain the chronic overcrowding that occurred in the Lyell McEwin emergency department last month, which saw it as a Code White for, on average, more than eight hours each day?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:08): The Lyell McEwin emergency department is seeing, on occasions, as many presentations to the emergency department as the Royal Adelaide Hospital emergency department. We are seeing a significant number and growth in presentations to the Lyell McEwin ED. I know the opposition is going to jump on that and say they are all coming from Modbury. That's not the case because we are also seeing Modbury Hospital being very busy.

Without doubt, the growth in the population in our northern suburbs is causing significant demand for services for the Lyell McEwin Hospital. That is why the reforms we have made, which at every stage the Liberal Party has opposed—the \$300 million we have invested in the Lyell McEwin Hospital, the extra services we have put into the Lyell McEwin Hospital, the fact that the Lyell McEwin Hospital now has 24-hour, seven day a week orthopaedic cover—are absolutely critical to making sure that patients move through the emergency department as quickly as possible.

Of course, there's more to be done. We are not sitting on our hands. There's a lot more that needs to be done. I think in time that we will need to consider a significant expansion of the Lyell McEwin emergency department in terms of its space. As I say, in the last few weeks we have seen occasions when the Lyell McEwin emergency department has seen as many presentations as the Royal Adelaide Hospital emergency department. That is how busy it is. You can imagine what would have happened if we had not put the investment this government has proudly put into the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We recognised, from the very beginning when we came into office, that the Lyell McEwin Hospital was in need of significant investment. To the credit of previous health ministers, they recognised the need for that investment and they made that investment. That's why roughly \$300 million has been invested in the Lyell McEwin Hospital. That's why we have put in a significant increase in services to the Lyell McEwin Hospital so that it can deal with that increased demand. Having said that, there is still more to be done. There are still more services that need to be moved in there, and I think that in time we will need to look at a significant expansion of that ED.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Supplementary to the Minister for Health: why then will the Minister for Health insist on the downgrade at the Modbury Hospital before improving the service provision at the Lyell McEwin Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10): The Modbury Hospital is being upgraded: it is not being downgraded. There is a \$32 million investment in new rehabilitation facilities. The opposition might not consider that sexy, but if you have had a stroke or you have had an amputation and you need rehabilitation, I'll tell you now that it is very, very important.

On Saturday, I took great pleasure in visiting the open day we had at the Modbury Hospital, the new rehabilitation facility, and meeting people, meeting patients who are benefiting from those services and will continue to benefit from those services we are now able to offer at the Modbury Hospital. All at the same time, the Modbury Hospital continues to have a 24-hour, seven days a week specialist-led emergency department. It is absolutely wrong to suggest that Modbury Hospital in any way has been downgraded. It retains and, in fact if anything, improves the incredible and important services that it provides to the people of the northern and north-eastern suburbs.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): Supplementary to the Minister for Health: if there hasn't been a downgrade at the Modbury Hospital, why then, as reported by the head of the Modbury emergency department, are more than 3,600 patients now being transferred from Modbury Hospital to Lyell McEwin each year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:12): There have always been transfers from the Modbury Hospital to other hospitals, either to the Lyell McEwin or to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. There have always been significant numbers of transfers from the Modbury Hospital to other hospitals. There is nothing new in that.

The increase in the number of transfers has been minimal—absolutely minimal—and in fact it has been less than our modelling anticipated. As I said, it is roughly 10 a day. There have been times when it has been significantly lower than that. Modbury Hospital is dealing very well with the presentations it is receiving. It is transferring those patients where it is appropriate for them to be transferred, and that is well within and in fact significantly fewer than our modelling suggested when we made these reforms.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): A further question to the Minister for Health: how much did SA Health spend on the mass distribution of Transforming Health promotional material in March 2017, and would the minister agree that money would have been better spent on supporting the Modbury medical emergency team?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:13): Absolutely not. That work was worth every single dollar we have invested. When you have people in the Liberal Party telling lies, saying that the emergency department has been closed—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: 127. I object to the minister saying that people in the Liberal Party are telling lies.

The SPEAKER: The Liberal Party is not an entity that has a reputation to defend in the house. The house is concerned with individual members.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am trying to make a ruling and I have been interrupted by the member for MacKillop, whom I call to order, and the member for Adelaide and the member for Fisher.

There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:

The SPEAKER: There is to be no flash photography in the house, so could the attendants please remove the person who used flash photography in violation of the rules of the house. Would the minister be seated.

Just to catch up with calls to order, I notice the member for Adelaide had already been called to order, so she is warned. The members for Kavel, Hammond, Morphett and the deputy leader are called to order, and the member for Kavel is warned. Usually, the policy of the opposition is not relevant information to provide the house, so I would ask ministers only to provide small doses of that. I think the minister has already provided his dose.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Sorry, sir, but the question was: why is the Department of Health advertising information about the Modbury Hospital and about the services there? The fact that the individuals within the Liberal Party have been blatantly telling mistruths is germane is the answer to that question. Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Could the attendants just deal with the flash photography in the front row of the strangers' gallery. There is to be no artificial illumination in taking photographs. The minister makes a reasonable case; he has made his point, could he move on.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Certainly, sir. The fact that there have been individuals who have blatantly and recklessly told mistruths about the operation of the Modbury Hospital emergency department is the main reason why I have had my department undertake a campaign about the services that continue to be offered at the Modbury Hospital because it is important, and a matter of public safety, that people know that those mistruths are incorrect.

The truth is that the Modbury emergency department continues to run seven days a week, 24 hours a day, with specialist-led care. That is a very, very important matter. Just like any other public health advertising campaign—and my department undertakes to provide important information to residents—that is very, very important. If certain individuals (and they know who they are; it's on the public record) ceased providing reckless and dangerous mistruths all for base political purposes, then you would find that it may not be necessary to undertake such an advertising campaign.

Nonetheless, when you have individuals who are behaving so dangerously and so recklessly in putting out information that is not true, it is incumbent upon the Department of Health in this state to undertake a significant advertising campaign about the services that are offered. It is a matter of public safety, and I do not resile or apologise for it for one minute.

Ms CHAPMAN: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, which of course I will grant, I call to order the members for Mount Gambier and Hartley, and I warn the member for Hammond and the member for Mount Gambier. The deputy leader.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Health. If you know how much was spent in March 2017, will you tell us and, if you don't know, will you find out and report to the house?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:18): I would be happy to.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:18): My question is also to the Minister for Health. Why should the people of the north-east believe any promises your government makes given that prior to the last election the redeveloped Modbury Hospital emergency department was opened with 40 treatment and assessment bays, and as of today only 29 of the bays are operating, and the promised \$46 million budget for upgrades at Modbury has been cut by \$14 million to the \$32 million identified and bragged about by the minister earlier?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order, sir: the member has no leave to make an explanation to insert facts and figures.

The SPEAKER: Is this the member's new seat?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: Splendid.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The question is out of order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:19): We are very, very proud—

The SPEAKER: First, I had better rule on that point of order. I think the answer to the member for Wright is that the member for Morialta has cleverly woven all his comment, for which leave was not sought, into the main body of his question. It is a cunning plan.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We are always happy in this house to compare the Labor Party's record on Modbury Hospital with the Liberal Party's record on Modbury Hospital. What did we see with the Liberal Party? Privatisation, nurses sacked—that is their vision for the Modbury Hospital. What has this party delivered? A revitalised emergency department and investment.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: This is clearly debate by the Minister for Health. He was specifically asked about relying on the government, given the events of 2013—

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have got the question, and my ruling is that the minister is not out of order. The reason the minister is not out of order is that the question was tendentious and rhetorical, and I will allow a minister to answer such a question in the spirit in which it was asked. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am very happy to have comparisons drawn between the commitment the Labor Party has had to Modbury Hospital as opposed to the Liberal Party. They just saw it as something to be cut, as an opportunity for a disastrous privatisation experiment, and what a disaster it was! I tell you what: if the Liberal Party wants to go into the next election debating Modbury Hospital, bring it on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You were called to order during the pre-luncheon session. As a reward for that misbehaviour, the member for Wright has the next question.

EXPORT PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Minister, how has the Export Partnership Program assisted South Australian business?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:21): I thank the member for Wright for her question. The Export Partnership Program, which was launched on 5 March 2015, is very important to small business because it has as its goal to create jobs and investment in South Australia through exporting our goods and services. The program has been an overwhelming success, with 310 applications having been received. The first seven rounds involved almost \$3.27 million being offered to 149 successful applicants.

Building robust trade and export growth is a pathway to a strong economy and to jobs. Over 72,000 South Australians now take a meal home every night based on selling our goods and services. It is playing a very important role in the transformation that is underway through the replacement of automotive jobs in a new and reformed economy. We are committed to helping open global markets to South Australian businesses, and I remind the house that there are 3.5 billion customers to our north, our north-west and our north-east and only around 25 million here in Australia.

Through this program, local businesses can apply for up to \$50,000 for eligible projects and activities. The program helps companies access the right tools and supports them to grow and build international networks that can often be financially challenging to access. Grants may be used to support SA businesses to attend key international trade events as well as for preparation of written and electronic materials, websites, coaching, training, market intelligence and mentoring in order to plan for international opportunities and to build their export capabilities.

The government's international engagement program objectives are to boost exports, creating jobs and new opportunity for the state. International missions in 2016 created 1,500 business connections, more than 650 export leads, with a combined value of \$300 million. The scale of the response demonstrates a growing appetite in the small to medium enterprise sector to grasp the opportunities made available in our region—China, India, Europe and South-East Asia and other destinations. I congratulate the 19 successful applicants for round 7 and advise the house that round 8 of the program closed on 17 February 2017. The EPP panel met last month and I look forward to updating the house on their recommendations.

I can also advise today that I have approved changes to the Export Partnership Program to include access for grants to small business associations and industry groups. Having been national secretary of an industry association and state president, I know the good work they do. They are a gateway to their stakeholders, their members. They do important work. The associations should be able to work with their members to put together export plans and proposals that will carve a pathway for other similar businesses. Industry groups funding categories will shortly be rolled out to support the program and the state's efforts to grow jobs and investment through exports.

I congratulate the 19 successful companies. I would like to mention a few in the time remaining: Alpha Box & Dice winery, \$25,000; Ashton Valley Fresh Pty Ltd, \$45,000; Atkins Photo Lab, \$16,000; Bullet Cylinder Heads, \$8,500; Eldredge Vineyards, \$4,325; Goolwa PiPi Co, \$30,000; Hewitson, \$35,000; Kaesler Wines, \$25,000; Kirrihill Wines, \$23,250; KMS Conveyors, \$26,400; Kosmea Australia, \$5,559; Majestic Opals, \$15,000; Mayura Station, \$43,200; and many more. These people are building the future for the state.

The SPEAKER: The Liberal Party Whip has asked me to call the member for Florey in lieu of a Liberal Party question.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:26): My question is also to the Minister for Health. I know the house will be very concerned that this comes after a visit to emergency I had to make myself on the weekend.

The SPEAKER: Could the member ask a question?

Ms BEDFORD: The question is: can the minister inform the house what will be done to solve referral pressures at Modbury Hospital emergency department and whether acute bed capacity will be increased to ensure patient safety and reduce transfer rates, which I understand could be as high as one in 10 patients, well above the national average of one per 100.

The SPEAKER: Again, that is commentary, but out of order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:26): The transfer rates from Modbury Hospital ED are well within and in fact less than our modelling had originally anticipated. We expected there would be a certain number of transfers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned a second and final time, and the member for Stuart is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: As I said in an answer to an earlier question, there have always been a number of transfers long before any reforms we made to Modbury Hospital. There have always been a number of transfers.

Mr Bell interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There have always been a number of transfers from Modbury Hospital; indeed, late last year my son was one of them. He had appendicitis, he got excellent treatment at the Modbury Hospital but was transferred to the Women's and Children's Hospital to have his appendix out. That is something which existed long before I was health minister. There have been a significant number of patients who it has been appropriate to transfer out.

We are certainly working with the emergency department doctors. They are very keen to have a short stay unit at the Modbury Hospital so that patients who don't need a lengthy admission to hospital, but where it is appropriate to keep them in hospital for a certain period of time for observation, have an area where those patients can be admitted for a relatively short period of time, where they can be monitored by the emergency department, and the decision can then be made to transfer them on to hospital where they can be admitted or indeed to be discharged. That's an issue we are working through at the moment with the hospital and with the emergency department. It is not an unreasonable request.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It would certainly be a sensible approach to take. That is something that we are dealing with but, having said that, the transfers from Modbury Hospital emergency department are well within what our expectations were. They average about 10 a day, but of course they can be on days far fewer than that and on days somewhat greater than that, but on average, as to the latest information briefing I have received on where it was at, it was about 10 a day. That is 10 a day, transfers going to other hospitals. That is where it is at and that is how we are dealing with that issue.

Modbury Hospital's emergency department, as the member for Florey knows, provides an invaluable service to the people of the north-eastern suburbs and, certainly as long as I am Minister for Health, we will continue to support and do everything we can to see continual improvements in that ED.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is called to order and the member for Davenport is called to order.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:30): A supplementary: given that those discussions for that extended stay acute care have been going on for many months, is there any likelihood of that being resolved sooner rather than later?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:30): We are dealing with it. Obviously it would require a capital investment to make that happen, and we are examining how we might fund that particular project. It does require a capital investment and, like all capital investments, we have to measure it against other priorities.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

ADELAIDE CBD HIGH SCHOOLS ENROLMENT

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Will families living within the new shared zone for the two city high schools be the ones who decide which of those two schools their child goes to, or will the department allocate students based on specific enrolment criteria that are now being developed?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:31): Families will nominate which of the schools they would prefer their child to attend. Only in the event that one school is not full and one is over

capacity will enrolment criteria be used in order to determine an order. It is unknowable at this stage whether that will be necessary never, often or rarely. However, the criteria will be based on common sense. If a child already has a sibling at that school, then they ought to be first in the queue for the convenience of the family. It will be only in the event that there is an imbalance in the number of places available versus the number of children applying.

ADELAIDE CBD HIGH SCHOOLS ENROLMENT

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:32): Supplementary: in that event, who will make the determination as to which school the child will go to?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:32): The way that enrolment works at present in our schools—and the vast majority of our secondary schools are zoned and, increasingly, so too are our primary schools—is that a determination is made within the school about what criteria are to be applied, and then when the central process works its way through they are able to determine an orderly entrance.

Because we are dealing with new schools, now that the new principal has been appointed, which I obviously welcome, when he starts his position early in term 2 he will be working through the exact mechanics of the unusual circumstance of having two schools with a shared larger zone. We should be in a position to answer that question in more detail after that.

ADELAIDE CBD HIGH SCHOOLS ENROLMENT

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:33): Supplementary: given that the minister has identified that one of the principals of the two schools will be involved in the process and with the other school I am not aware of having a principal appointed past today, will the new principal of Adelaide High School have any involvement in that process when they are appointed? When we actually get to the point of children applying to go to one school or the other, who will determine who makes the decision which one they will go to?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:33): I think that last part was a reiteration of the question the honourable member just asked me. Yes, we are in a transition in Adelaide High School. There is leadership there, but we will be making a longer term appointment and, of course, the leadership of both high schools will be actively involved in determining the detail. We have time to do this. What is important is that parents understand that they have access to both schools, that they have access to two exceptionally good schools. As the two leadership positions—and I am sure their governing councils will be engaged—they will discuss the finer detail of exactly how the mechanics of this will work out. I will expect that to be based on common-sense principles and to facilitate the maximum choice for families while at the same time making sure that we are fully using both schools.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary, member for Morialta.

ADELAIDE CBD HIGH SCHOOLS ENROLMENT

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:34): In relation to those principles, which the minister describes as 'common-sense', one of the criteria in the announcement today is that preference might go to children of old scholars of presumably Adelaide High School at this stage. Are there any other DECD schools that have that criterion in their capacity management plan, and who suggested that it be part of the criteria?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:35): I would have to check each of the capacity management plans, but I believe family links to the school are not unique for Adelaide High School and, of course, there will develop family links with the new school before too long. Once the criteria are refined and an order of waiting is determined, then we can have these discussions in far more detail.

Mr GARDNER: A final supplementary, sir?

The SPEAKER: It's the fourth supplementary.

ADELAIDE BOTANIC HIGH SCHOOL

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:35): Thank you, sir. In relation to the name of the school, I note that the press release says that there is a process still to go through before the school actually receives the name. Has the government or the minister received any advice that this name won't be appropriate?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:35): The Surveyor-General is crucial in this process in determining what the name of the school can be. The Surveyor-General had initially some misgivings about having a school with the name 'Adelaide' attached, given that one of the reasons that the Surveyor-General is involved in the naming of schools is to be sure that it's clear where the school is and that it's not to be mixed up with other schools. However, the Surveyor-General has indicated that he is happy for us to advance with the process with this particular name. We do have other schools with the name 'Adelaide' in their title—in fact possibly two in the honourable member's electorate or nearby.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:36): My question is for the Minister for Health.

Mr Pengilly: Good luck!

Ms COOK: How are staff involved in the preparation for the move to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

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

Mr Williams: Are you going to read another answer, Jack?

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is warned. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:37): Planning for the move to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is clearly an incredibly important and complex process. Along with the critical patient move, we will be relocating 6,000 staff, 1,000 volunteers and students and over 60 clinical services and specialties, as well as 177 years of significant and valuable medical history. To give you an idea, it is like picking up a suburb and moving it down the road to another suburb, picking up—

Mr Pisoni: A bit like Florey?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —every man, woman and child—

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —every man, woman and child in a suburb and moving them to the next suburb. It is an extremely complex logistical exercise. Staff training is now underway with a great level of excitement from our doctors, nurses and allied health workers as they spend time at their new workplace. As of this week, more than 1,000 staff have already been through on-site training at the new RAH.

The most critical part of the move to the new hospital will be clinical leadership and engagement. Late last year, a call was put out through the Central Adelaide Local Health Network for staff to be a key part of the preparations for the move to the new RAH. In a fantastic response, over 160 staff members representing every clinical directorate and statewide service volunteered to be a part of this change leadership group. These include surgery, medicine, critical care, allied health, outpatients, mental health, EPAS, corporate services, renal, cancer, SA Pathology, SA Pharmacy and SA Medical Imaging.

Having such a multidisciplinary group, which includes administration staff, nurses, social workers, physiotherapists, senior radiographers and some of our most senior doctors, will make a big difference in ensuring the move is a success. These volunteers will help share information and provide feedback on communications, articulate the concerns of their colleagues, provide critical support during the move and, most importantly, spend time talking with colleagues about the issues most important to them.

The roles will support 10 recently appointed new RAH Clinical Champions—senior clinicians who are providing critical clinical leadership in the transition to the new RAH. I recently had the opportunity to meet a number of clinicians who have volunteered to be part of this group, and I have to say that I was impressed by their enthusiasm for the move to the new hospital and their willingness to take on such a critical role.

Can I express my thanks to each and every staff member involved in this very important work for taking the time out of their already busy roles and volunteering to support the change required to open the new RAH safely. There is no doubt that their contribution will go a long way in helping all staff prepare for the move to the new RAH.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What was the economic impact and attendance figure for this year's Tour Down Under?

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) (14:40): I thank the member for Reynell for that question and acknowledge her great work, along with the member for Ashford, in really promoting the women's race in South Australia, the Women's Tour Down Under.

Some great figures just in by independent research company McGregor Tan show that the 2017 Santos Tour Down Under broke all records. For the first time, we smashed through the 800,000 barrier in terms of the number of people who came out and watched the six stages of the Santos Tour Down Under, with the final figure being 840,000 fans lining the streets. That was up from 795,000 the previous year, so it's terrific.

In particular, we saw more than 42,750 cycling fans make the journey from interstate and overseas, compared with 39,000 visitors the previous year. This is why the Tourism Commission, through Major Events, runs the Santos Tour Down Under—because it is an event where we aim to attract people from around Australia and indeed around the world.

I want to pay tribute to all those people involved in the race. Of course, Mike Turtur—well known to everyone as a 1984 Olympic gold medallist on the track in Los Angeles—has done a fantastic job as the director of this race. He is the guy who came up with the idea for this race, dating back to the very first one back in 1999. Hitaf Rasheed heads up Major Events South Australia and Sally Heading completed her 15th and last Tour Down Under this year. We wish her well as she is going off to help run the Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast next year.

The economic benefit to the state—again, we crashed through another barrier of \$50 million—was up to \$56.5 million, which was a great improvement and \$6.9 million up on the previous year. That is testament to the fact that we put extra money into the Santos Tour Down Under as well. As part of that \$70 million we have added to the tourism portfolio—and I thank the Treasurer for that contribution—\$6 million has gone to making sure that we upgrade not just the men's race but the women's race as well and the whole festival around the cycling.

Birds of Tokyo played at the team presentation on the Saturday night this year and a terrific crowd came to see all the riders. Of course, Peter Sagan, the dual world champion, was there with his rainbow jersey. He was, no doubt, a very big drawcard. The media coverage has been valued at \$202 million and the potential audience reach was 738 million people. This is the biggest bike race outside Europe and it starts off the international season.

Of course, we had the head of the UCI and the Director of the Tour de France, Christian Prudhomme, here to watch this year's race. They were blown away not only by the organisation and the professionalism of the race but also by the knowledge of the crowds who line the route—840,000 people and they know so much about the sport. Next year will be the 20th edition of the Tour Down Under, and we are working on some big things to make sure it is the biggest and best.

As I said, we got 840,000 people out there this year; we would love to see us crack the million mark. There are not many sporting events in Australia's history that have had a million people turn up to them. For the 20th Tour Down Under next year, it would be great to have all South Australians,

particularly those who might have been to a stage over the past 19 years but haven't been back for a while, to get out, feel the excitement and see the very best men and women in world cycling compete in the beautiful regions around South Australia.

BOWDEN AND TONSLEY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Can the minister update the house on the recent developments at the Bowden precinct?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:44): I thank the member for Kaurna for his question and note your interest, Mr Speaker, in this part of your electorate. Members would be aware that the government purchased the Bowden site from Clipsal Australia in 2008 and a couple of years later, in 2010, bought the adjacent gasworks from Origin Energy. I understand that Clipsal had operated from the Bowden site since 1936 and that the gasworks were in operation from the second half of the 19th century.

Of course, after all this industrial activity, when the sites were transferred they were unfortunately some of the most contaminated and blighted parcels of land in the Adelaide metropolitan area. Because of the type of industry on both the sites, significant land remediation was going to be required for the land to be used for another purpose, let alone for residential purposes. But the location of this land, so close to the city and the Outer Harbor passenger train network and also, of course, being adjacent to the Adelaide Parklands, meant that there was a remarkable opportunity for re-use of this land for residential purposes.

It was unlikely that the land could have been bought by the private sector, the remediation task taken on and a development successfully delivered, given the burden in remediation that would have to be borne. That is where the government's role to step in and take this on was so necessary. Over the next 10 to 12 years, this will be a billion dollar project in total, with an estimated 3,500 residents living in 2,400 dwellings.

Mr Pengilly: They think it's a joke down the front there, Stephen.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Finniss calls the project a joke, but in fact there are approximately 500 people living in more than 300 dwellings on the site at the moment, and I am pleased—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am pleased to advise the house that, despite the knocker on the other side of the chamber, the 500th dwelling has now been sold at the Bowden redevelopment site. That is a fantastic achievement in the early stages of this marquee redevelopment opportunity so close to the city and it has not just been residential development that has been occurring there.

Mr Speaker, of course you would be aware of the very successful Bowden Town Square development, which is a central meeting point and area for recreation, not just for people who have already bought and continue to buy dwellings on this site but we have also seen people come in and establish their own businesses on the site as well.

We have seen the repurposing of the building called Plant 4, which has turned into a hive of activity, particularly on Wednesdays and Saturdays, when markets are set up, attracting people from the development and also around Adelaide to come in and sell their wares, particularly homemade foods, but also arts and crafts. Of course many people visit to eat there and to buy some of the goods on offer.

I understand that in total 20,000 square metres of commercial space will also be developed on the Bowden site, including those developments I have just mentioned. Of course, we have seen the successful IGA supermarket established there by a proud independent South Australian family

who have had a lot of success running supermarkets, including the IGA on Gilles Street, with a very strong commitment not just to South Australian employment but to stocking South Australian goods and services. That is just another way that this fantastic redevelopment is supporting the regeneration of this important part of the metropolitan area.

The SPEAKER: The thousands of people who will live there will be very keen to have access to North Adelaide.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: A slip of the redistribution pencil might put them in another electorate.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Has the minister had an opportunity to check her diary to identify the date on which she undertook her only visit to the Makk and McLeay wards at Oakden?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:49): Yes, I have had a chance. It was this year and I went there because I had concerns. I had instituted the independent review by the Chief Psychiatrist, and I believe that he was in the process of beginning his work interviewing numerous people on that site and talking to SA Health about his concerns. It was also an opportunity for me to walk around the other ward that the state runs on that site, and it was an interesting time that day. I outlined this to the house yesterday.

Mr Pisoni: It's called crisis management.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:49): Supplementary: can the minister recall that date earlier in the year and whether that visit was before or after the ABC News broadcast on 17 January 2017 on the experience of the late Mr Bob Spriggs at the facility?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:50): I would have to check my diary.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:50): Supplementary: when the minister checks her diary, can she confirm it was one of the 17 days between 1 January and 17 January that she attended that facility?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:50): As I stated earlier, I am happy to check my diary.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Can the minister advise the house whether the Chief Psychiatrist briefed or provided a draft report to her or to any of her ministerial staff in relation to the review of the Older Persons Mental Health Services at Oakden prior to the report being finalised?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:51): I receive regular updates from the Chief Psychiatrist on a number of issues. They are broad ranging. When we became aware of the issues late last year, and I instituted the independent review that the Chief Psychiatrist has been undertaking, we talked about intermediate steps to step into this space where we had caring concerns. I have outlined those in my ministerial statements, of which there have been two this year, to the parliament.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:51): Supplementary: in relation to the Older Persons Mental Health Services report, has the minister herself read the report or at least been briefed on it, and what does it say?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:51): As I stated yesterday, the report became available late Monday. My office team is working through that with the SA Health team to provide appropriate recommendations to my office. We continue to take this matter very seriously. We know that this is an important issue, and we will not be rushed in ensuring that the right clinical safety standards are met for the people who need our assistance and to meet the guidelines that we will set. They will be rigorous.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned, as is the member for Hartley, and the member for Schubert and the member for Unley are warned a second time. Deputy leader.

BOWERING HILL DAM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture. Has the Attorney-General provided you with the response to your constituent's complaint that you forwarded to him in February this year regarding the Bowering Hill dam and, if so, what did it say?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:53): No, I haven't received any correspondence back.

BOWERING HILL DAM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Supplementary: did you have the cup of tea that the Attorney-General indicated yesterday that he was going to have with you to brief you on the matter and find out more about it?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe the minister is responsible, or any member is responsible, to the house for matters of correspondence from their constituents to ministers; otherwise, individual members on the other side of the house could be interrogated about how they have dealt with their correspondence from constituents.

The SPEAKER: My recollection is that a minister told the house that a cup of tea was enjoyed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: 'Was to be' enjoyed? Well, in saying that in answer to a question, the minister brings the cup of tea into issue in question time.

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) (14:54): Mr Speaker, the opportunity to have a cup of tea with the minister is something that is very high on my list of things to do. It is a priority. He is a very busy man, though, he has lots on, and I have been detained, as my duty requires, in this chamber for a great deal of time. As soon as our diaries can be brought into a moment of coincidence, this will be certainly a priority for me, and I hope it will be a priority for the minister, because I would look forward to it.

BOWERING HILL DAM

The SPEAKER: A further question about the tea?

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): No, I will skip over the tea. Hopefully they will have it within the next 24 hours. To the Minister for Agriculture: is the minister satisfied that the community consultation in respect of the Bowering Hill dam proposal has

been adequate and is consistent with his statement in his parliamentary report dated May 2011, which said:

Bowering Hill has now been left as a blank canvas to be developed, with community input, in ways that best allow our region and our state to benefit from tourism and agricultural pursuits.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: On a further point of order, the question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not pertain to what the minister has done as minister, for which, undoubtedly, he is responsible to the house.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will not interject. She is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is about actions he has taken as a local member on behalf of his constituents and with regard to issues. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is quoting from the member's electorate newsletter, I presume, that he distributes to his electorate, more to my point. If we came to the point—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am listening.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: If this question is allowed as being in order, then it would be well within the rights of the government to ask questions of the opposition backbench about actions they have taken on behalf of their constituents.

The SPEAKER: What I will do is I will ask the deputy leader to give me the written copy of the question and I will read it. We will move on to another opposition question.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am happy to do that.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley.

SOUTH ROAD TRAM OVERPASS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:57): Thank you very much, sir. I am glad you stipulated that it's the next opposition question. My question is to the Minister for Transport. When will the bikeway attached to the South Road tramway reopen?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:57): When the tramway shared path has been made safe for it to do so.

SOUTH ROAD TRAM OVERPASS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:57): Supplementary: can the minister advise if the final design for the bikeway was signed off by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:57): I'm sorry, could you repeat that?

Mr PISONI: Can you advise whether the final design was signed off by your department?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My understanding is that the department has been involved in discussions with Aurecon, which is the independent firm we briefed to do a number of pieces of work on the South Road tram overpass. The first piece, of course, was an examination of what went wrong, and we have released that report. The second report that has been commissioned is to design a fix and then work out what needs to be done to implement that fix. As for the status of that, I would be confident to say that the department has been involved in those discussions the whole way through.

Whether it has been signed off or not, I'm not sure that's the case, but I will check. It certainly hasn't been presented to me by the department so that I am in a position to go out and let people know what the solution is and what will be involved in installing it because, of course, we are concerned with what I think the member for Unley was alluding to, and that is not just getting the

bikeway back open but making sure the entirety of the bridge is safe, and also what is going to be the impact on traffic on South Road when we go about installing whatever the fix is.

BOWERING HILL DAM

The SPEAKER: Before the member for Unley's supplementary, I uphold the Minister for Health's point of order. The question was: how many complaints or letters of concern has the member for Mawson received from his local electorate?

Ms Chapman: I didn't ask that question, sir. That was not the question I asked. I asked the first question.

The SPEAKER: No? Well, it's on the sheet that I have been given.

Ms Chapman: I understand that, but what I am telling you is that I gave only the first question.

The SPEAKER: On the first question, I do not uphold the Minister for Health's point of order. The first question is in order. The supplementary, which appears on the sheet that was handed up, is most—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the deputy leader had asked that supplementary, it would have been out of order.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: This question is directed—

Ms Chapman: To the Minister for Agriculture.

The SPEAKER: It really should be directed, I would have thought, to the Deputy Premier, but that's a matter for the government:

Is the minister satisfied that the community consultation in respect of the proposed Bowering Hill dam proposal has been adequate and consistent with his statement in the parliamentary report dated May 2011, which said, 'Bowering Hill has now been left as a blank canvas to be developed, with community input, in ways that best allow our region and our state to benefit from tourism and agricultural pursuits.'

If I am not mistaken, you are asking whether the government's action is consistent with something that the minister contributed to writing when he was a backbencher.

Ms Chapman: He is now the Minister for Agriculture and the parliamentary secretary.

The SPEAKER: Yes, well, it's up to the government who answers the question. The minister is not responsible to the house for something he wrote as a backbencher in a parliamentary report, but any minister may answer the question.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can I answer it, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Of course you can.

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) (15:01): Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Bowering Hill story, we have already dealt with the cup of tea aspect of it, and can I say through the Chair, if I might, that I would like to invite the Minister for Agriculture to compare his diary with mine because I'm keen to have a cup of tea with him and I'm hopeful that we might get around to talking about the Bowering Hill story—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —because that's something I'm sure we're both interested in talking about. Bowering Hill is an interesting story because it goes back some time.

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

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: She has been doing that all day.

The SPEAKER: She has. As the member for Newland says, the member for Wright has been interjecting all day.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Some years ago, people who lived in the two areas relatively adjacent to the City of Adelaide, who felt their agricultural way of life was most threatened by the potential sprawl of the City of Adelaide, were agitating and using the good services of the then backbencher, the member for Mawson—in particular those in the southern part of the city—to advocate for a protection of those zones from the unrestrained and unrequired, unhelpful intrusion of suburbia into what is a unique high-value vineyard area very close to the city. In fact, I was only talking at a group—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I was at a function the other evening with the Minister for Agriculture, where there were people sitting around a table remarking—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, we didn't have tea; we didn't get a chance because we were expected to answer questions, which is what I'm doing now. Anyway, one of the people who was there was a person who is normally domiciled in Queensland. That person said what a pleasure it was to be in Adelaide because you only have to go for a very short drive and you were into these most beautiful wine districts. You can go south or you can go north, and it's an hour or so. You can go a little bit farther and you wind up in Clare. Or you can go a little bit farther in the other direction and you wind up in the member for MacKillop's part of the world or the member for Mount Gambier's part of the world—what a fantastic thing.

That gets us back to the point that this area so close to the city needed to be protected. Bowering Hill at the time that we were looking at the preservation zones for McLaren Vale and the Barossa Valley was that part immediately south of Adelaide where the encroachment of greenfield development housing had not yet cut a swathe between the coast and the inland. It was a place where it was still possible to walk basically from the vineyards to the sea.

An honourable member: Hearing the birds call.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Hearing the birds, indeed. Of course, a lot of stuff about vines to the sea goes on down there: that is one of the themes. That is why Bowering Hill was part and parcel of the conversation we had at that time. We were all very concerned that there should be a halt to this unrestrained destruction of vineyards and a way of life so close to the city. Since that time, I have not to my recollection become aware of any particular proposal concerning Bowering Hill.

Ms Chapman: Don't you read your mail?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I do. I do, as a matter of fact, and I take home a big bag of it every night. What I am saying is that I do not recall having in my very large bag—sometimes it is many bags, not just one—anything about Bowering Hill, but I am going to—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: What a shame!

The SPEAKER: And the 26th opposition question for the day goes to the member for Unley.

SOUTH ROAD TRAM OVERPASS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:05): Thank you, sir. I am not quite sure that the minister understood my question, and I'm not blaming him, but it may be—

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley will not make an impromptu speech: he will ask a question from this moment on.

Mr PISONI: Certainly. I shall try it again. Can the minister advise if the final design for the original bikeway was signed off by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, the original design?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:06): As the member for Unley would know, all capital projects with a value above \$4 million go through a particular process. It obviously has to be approved by cabinet and then it goes to the parliamentary works committee. The design was not only included within the government's internal documentation but the design was specifically included in the documentation that was considered and endorsed by the parliament's Public Works Committee in September 2008.

Grievance Debate

TEA TREE GULLY COUNCIL, VEHICLE REMOVAL

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:07): Today, I wish to bring to members' attention some information that has been presented to me by Mayor Kevin Knight of the City of Tea Tree Gully in relation to the issue of removal of vehicles. Mayor Knight wrote to me last week, and I assume that he has also written to a number of other members of parliament representing constituents in the Tea Tree Gully area. Either way, for the benefit of the house, I will quote his letter to ensure that his message is accurately represented and so that all members may consider his point of view:

Dear Mr Gardner

I write to you regarding Section 32 of the Local Government (Accountability and Governance) Amendment Act 2015. This amended section 237(3) to include:

(3a) To avoid doubt, a vehicle parked or left standing on a public road in a manner that does not contravene a law regulating the parking or standing of vehicles on public roads will be taken not to have been left on a public road for the purposes of subsection (1), unless the vehicle has, in the opinion of an authorised person, been abandoned.

This change to the Local Government Act which commenced on 31 March 2016 has restricted Council's ability to remove vehicles left on public roads. In effect, if the vehicle is not contravening a law regulating the parking or standing of vehicles on a public road (for example leaving an unregistered vehicle on a road), an authorised person is not empowered to have the vehicle removed unless they form the opinion that the vehicle has been abandoned.

I wonder if you were aware, when this legislation was passed, that the outcome would be that Council's ability to remove registered vehicles left on public roads would be greatly reduced?

I ask for your support to have this legislation reviewed and the problem addressed for the benefit of our community.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Knight

Of course, members may have their own point of view on this matter. Indeed, I know that there was extensive consultation particularly with the local government sector in our consideration as a house of this legislation. I am interested to know what local councils think when we pass legislation that is going to impact on their operations. The councils have to work with the legislation we pass, so sometimes the way things work in practice needs to be considered.

There of course also may well be a policy point which the parliament wishes to pursue which might override the objections of council, or indeed different councils may have different points of view, but at the very least council's point of view should be taken into account. In this case, as it turns out, the same council might have multiple points of view depending on when they are asked.

Today, I have written to Mayor Knight to thank him for sharing his current point of view and to advise him that, as per his request for my support for this legislation to be reviewed, I would be happy to advise the house of the matter, which I am doing in this speech. For accuracy, I am happy to advise the house of the exact terms of my correspondence to him, as follows:

Dear Mayor Knight

Thank you for your correspondence in relation to the issue of Section 32 of the Local Government Act—and in particular amendments made as a result of the Local Government (Accountability and Governance) Amendment Bill 2015.

I note your question: 'I wonder if you were aware, when this legislation was passed, that the outcome would be that Council's ability to remove registered vehicles left on public roads would be greatly reduced?' Further I note your request for my support in having this legislation reviewed.

I can advise that the Liberal Opposition in South Australia takes seriously any concerns raised by Councils in relation to the Local Government Act. That is why, when Minister Brock and the Government introduced the Local Government (Accountability and Governance) Amendment Bill, we sought to consult with local government on whether or not they welcomed or opposed the proposed measures. I understand that the Local Government Association consulted directly with all Councils and they provided us with their feedback.

You may be interested to know that the Local Government Association supported the passage of many measures including the reform that you have raised in your correspondence to me.

Further, you may recall yourself that your own Council considered this matter on 26 May 2015 and resolved to support the proposal with which you now have raised concerns. I have attached the relevant section of the minutes of your meeting below to assist.

For members' benefit, the minutes of the meeting of the day in question identify a schedule, entitled 'Local Government (Accountability and Governance) Amendment Bill 2015', with topics such as clause 32, amendment of section 237, removal of vehicles. Under the heading of Proposal is written that this clarifies that vehicles that are merely legally parked on a road are not subject to removal under this section unless they have been abandoned. Under the heading of Comment is written that the City of Tea Tree Gully supports the proposal. To continue with my letter:

Given your request for my support in having this legislation reviewed, I am happy to provide advice to the House of your changed position on this matter—and will endeavour to do so this afternoon so that my colleagues may take these issues on board.

However, given the extensive work the Local Government Association did prior to the Bill's passage in consulting with Councils such as yours, as well as providing their own analysis and advocacy, I suspect Members would be interested in whether the Tea Tree Gully Council as a whole, and indeed the Local Government Association in representing all Councils, have also withdrawn their support for this measure.

Yours sincerely

John Gardner

I am always interested in the points of view that the Local Government Association and member councils put forward in relation to their legislation. If those bodies have different points of view now to that which they put forward to two years ago, then I am sure we shall consider it. I note that Mayor Knight has since responded to my email, thanking me for pointing this out.

ARRIUM

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:12): I rise today, at least initially, to talk again about Arrium and administration. It was great to see both the Premier and Treasurer visit Whyalla last week to meet with the administrators and also to have a look at some of the other projects that have been happening in Whyalla. It has just been over one year since Arrium went into administration, and it has been a period of uncertainty and concern within the community.

As of just before Christmas, there was an increase in confidence in the Whyalla community about the future, given the number of bids that appeared to be on the table when it came to securing the steelworks, the mines and the other elements interstate that make up the Arrium operation. When we had the meeting with the administrators, they provided a bit of clarity about closure to this stage of the process. The community might well know who the successful bidder is by 31 May. Currently, there are two bidders still in the process.

The administrators have done what I think has been a sterling job in very difficult circumstances, but over and above that the workforce at Whyalla has performed in an amazing fashion in what have been very difficult circumstances. Many workers lost their benefits through the changes in shifts and allowances, and on top of that voted to accept a 10 per cent pay cut in order to make the sale process an easy one. We are all now looking at a date of about 31 May for a decision on the ultimate successful bidder and hoping that by the end of this financial year this stage of the sale process will have been resolved.

Both the state and federal governments need to engage in negotiations with the successful bidder over what the final package of assistance is going to be. I am sincerely hoping that the federal government will not be missing in action, that it will be there to provide the support necessary for the community of Whyalla and for the new owner of Arrium. All the way through this process I have had absolutely no doubt that the state government will be there ready to do whatever is necessary.

Indeed, and unusually in circumstances like these, the state government has provided leadership not just directly in relation to the steelworks and the mine sites here in South Australia but also in support of the contractor base that has provided services to the steelworks and the mines for so many years. Many of those contractors are family-owned businesses that have been built up over the years, and they were seriously caught out when Arrium went into administration and they were exposed to very serious cash flow issues. The state government, to its credit, and to the credit of the Premier and Treasurer, stepped in and provided a \$10 million package to assist those contractors get through a very difficult period.

The state government's \$50 million that was on the table was used in a strategic way during the lead-up to the federal election to try to induce both the opposition at the time and the federal government to come to the party. That had some success. If there had been a change of government, we would have had a starting package of \$150 million; as it is, we have a starting package with the state government of \$50 million and a \$49 million essentially commercial loan from the federal government. The process is rolling to an end. Australia does need the capacity to produce structural steel, and we are hoping we are all going to get a great result for the community, for the state and the nation.

DAVENPORT ELECTORATE

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:17): I rise today to speak about my wonderful community and electorate—

The Hon. P. Caica: Your new one or the last one, the one you—

Mr DULUK: They are pretty much one and the same, so I will talk about all of them, how about that, member for Colton? It has been a busy period for celebration, commemoration and acknowledgement. First, I would like to congratulate the joint recipients of the City of Mitcham Citizen of the Year Award, Mr Rhys Roberts and Ms Rosemary Fisher. Both were recognised at Mitcham council's Australia Day ceremony for their outstanding contribution to our local community.

Rhys is well known to many locals for his tireless work with Lions, the Blackwood Recreation Centre and the Blackwood Memorial Hall. Rosemary has been a dedicated volunteer with Mitcham Meals on Wheels for over 18 years. Their ongoing service and longstanding commitment to help others is very much valued not only by those they help but also by the broader community.

Local residents who also received Australia Day honours include Emeritus Professor John Bowie OAM, Ms Jillian Bartlett OAM, Mr Walter Beale OAM, Ms Jean Evans OAM, Mr Matthew Linn OAM and Mr Trevor Conlon OAM. Trevor, as well as all those other people, epitomises the generous spirit and commitment to others that embodies the Mitcham Hills. The Order of Australia awarded to Trevor was in recognition of 50 years of service to the Coromandel Valley community and to the service of heritage preservation.

Some other fantastic local celebrations have included the Blackwood Meals on Wheels' 25th birthday. Over the years, hundreds of volunteers have delivered tens of thousands of meals, assisting many in the community to continue to live independently in their own home. Of course, this vision is shared by Meals on Wheels all across South Australia.

I would like to acknowledge today the chairman, Cheryl Gray, for her outstanding services to Meals on Wheels, for all that she does and also for the way that she motivates her team. I would also like to acknowledge the founding member and chairman of Blackwood Meals on Wheels, Dr John Jackson, who to this day is still a regular volunteer with the service.

In March, the Probus Club of Eden Hills celebrated their 20th birthday. Probus clubs are truly a vital part of local communities, particularly as more and more baby boomers move into retirement. They provide members with an opportunity to remain active and involved at a time of life when opportunities to make new friends can be limited.

At the Mitcham Hills Combined Probus Club AGM just a couple weeks ago, I had the privilege of helping to honour the service of members Millie Neville and Bill Donaldson. Millie has been a key member of the club since its inception in 1993 and has served on the committee for 20 consecutive years, having been elected in 1997. Bill has been a committee member for a total of 18 years, holding various positions, and was membership officer for more than a decade. It really was a pleasure to

share this occasion with both Millie and Bill and to be present at their celebration. They are both true treasures who are held in very high esteem by their friends and our community. I thank them for their service and wish them the best in their so-called retirement.

Recently, I also had the pleasure of attending the Blackwood Football Club for the opening of their new coach's box, and that was together with the federal member for Boothby because the funding for the box was part of federal government grant funding. Blackwood Football Club is a fantastic team in my electorate. This year, they are entering three junior girls teams in the football competition, and they provide an opportunity for hundreds of juniors to participate in local sports. I wish the Blackwood Football Club all the best for 2017.

This year is a year of commemoration of the 75th anniversaries of so many important battles of World War II. Earlier in the year, at the South Australian Women's Memorial Playing Fields on Shepherds Hill Road, I attended the 75th anniversary of the 1942 Bangka Strait massacre and I also attended the 75th annual commemoration of the first bombing of Darwin on 19 February 1942, which was recognised at a special event at the Repat—the spiritual home of our veterans. As I said in a contribution earlier in the week, it is such a shame that this facility is being closed.

I would also like to recognise Mr Barry Presgrave OAM of Eden Hills. Barry has been a driving force behind the National Servicemen's Association memorial dedication to the 287,000 young Australian men who were conscripted in the armed forces. It was a privilege to attend that dedication service. I know that the member for Ashford was there as well. Congratulations to Barry for all that he has done to recognise Nashos and their sacrifice for this nation. As we are on the eve of ANZAC Day, I would encourage every one of my constituents to attend a local ANZAC Day service. There are quite a few in my community and, as we go into that ANZAC Day period, we should always remember the sacrifice that South Australians and Australians made for all of us.

YOUTH PARLIAMENT

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:22): Last night, I had the privilege and pleasure of hosting in parliament a group of young people from some local schools in my electorate and also from schools that service the electorate. These young people have been selected for the Youth Parliament for 2017 run by the YMCA. All nine of the young polliies came along as my guests to have a meal at Parliament House and also to undertake a tour.

The team I sponsor in conjunction with the three participating councils—the City of Playford, Town of Gawler and the Light Regional Council—is named the Enlightened team of course, coming from the electorate of Light. I am pleased to say that, as a firm believer in the philosophy that it takes a community to educate a child, the three mayors, the six participating schools and myself are jointly sponsoring the team to ensure that young people can participate in the Youth Parliament.

Light Regional Council Mayor Bill O'Brien said that he believes that the opportunity for young people within our communities to learn about and take part in the Youth Parliament is an excellent initiative and provides young people with a wonderful opportunity to learn more about all forms of government and the operation of our government. Mayor O'Brien has been a strong supporter of the program, and he strongly supported the initiative, which was supported by his council in the process.

The way this came about was that secondary schools in the electorate of Light, as well as those schools just outside the electorate that have a significant number of students who live in the electorate, were invited to nominate students to be a part of the team. As I said, six schools have nominated a total of nine students to be part of the Youth Parliament program this year. The YMCA SA Youth Parliament is a nonpartisan program that seeks to empower young people to be advocates for their community.

The program is focused on personal development, youth leadership and connecting parliamentarians and decision-makers with youth voices and opinions. Young leaders come together in this place every year to learn about public speaking, parliamentary procedure, the development of bills for debate and advocacy. It is interesting to note that one of the bills that was debated in the Youth Parliament last year dealt with the topic of euthanasia.

I read the report put together by the office of the Minister for Youth, which is sent to MPs, and the vote on the euthanasia debate by the young people was actually fifty-fifty; they split right

down the middle. I thought, 'Isn't that interesting?', because essentially the same thing happened in the grown-up version of the parliament last year when the house divided fifty-fifty and the Speaker used his casting vote to break the deadlock. So, these young people clearly are a broad reflection of their community.

The team will spend the weekend of 6 and 7 May training for the Youth Parliament. They will then be in this place between 9 and 14 July when they undertake their activities. The Youth Parliament decisions are then referred to the state government for its consideration. I look forward to working with my team of young parliamentarians and supporting them through the process.

I would like to mention the names and schools participating in the program: from St Columba College, Arek Mel and Brianna Hartwell; from Gawler and District College, Crystal Christie-Golding and Sebastian Trudgen; from Kapunda High School, Elijah Smith; from Xavier College, Finnian Whisson; from Trinity College, Gawler, Ryen Archer; and, from Mark Oliphant College, Tyson Thomson and Atiu Madut.

Atiu, who is a refugee from South Sudan, came along last night with her dad. Her father made the observation at dinner that, 'It's one thing for politicians and leaders to have views,' he talked about the situation between South Sudan and Sudan, 'but it's important that leaders actually bring the community along with them'. In his opinion, the ongoing conflicts in that country are a result of their making a political decision that is not actually supported by the whole community and so the conflict occurs. Having said that, though, he has also noticed that we resolve our conflict through words and parliaments, but unfortunately in a lot of places throughout the world they still use the gun. I would like to wish my Youth Parliament team every success.

REMARK POLICE STATION

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:27): I rise today to raise serious community concerns from the people in the Riverland about the future of Renmark Police Station. Renmark Police Station is operating on bare bones or on stand-by until there is an available patrol, and it is only open when particular patrols are not out on the beat. The Renmark-Paringa district is home to 9,000 people and the closest station is at Berri, which is about 20 minutes away.

Renmark Police Station is servicing not just the town of Renmark. Renmark has neighbouring communities, whether it be out at Chaffey, Paringa, Renmark North or Renmark West. It is quite a widespread area to service. I recently anonymously received an internal leaked email about the refurbishment of Berri Police Station. Clearly, internally, questions had been asked by local staff about why Berri Police Station front services are being relocated to Barmera and not Renmark. There was a question and an answer in that one email. The internal correspondence states:

Barmera was chosen as it reduces the risk of [the] Renmark community becoming accustomed to front station services alike previous services.

It goes on:

Renmark may be a bigger office space, however from customer service, impact will be easier to return to normal services once Berri Police Station re-opens.

In no way do I want to criticise SAPOL. I think SAPOL does an outstanding job upholding the law, making their presence felt, keeping our streets safe and keeping our communities much safer.

What concerns me is the lack of transparency about the future of Renmark Police Station. The minister has stated that it is not his responsibility to make the decisions or to make the call on what happens and that it is actually the commissioner's responsibility. I would say that surely the state government or the minister would never close it because they could not afford the public backlash from the Renmark community.

Let everyone be assured that the Renmark community is concerned. They do not want to see what happened to the Renmark hospital happen to Renmark Police Station. Has the state government consulted with the community on how they feel they will be best served to keep our community as safe as possible? As I understand it, the refurbishment of the Berri Police Station complex will take seven months. When will that refurbishment take place? When will those renovations be finished? What is important is when it will begin and what budget that money will be coming from.

We were told that the police station at Berri and police services will remain open to the Berri community throughout the refurbishment work and that other Riverland towns in the area will not be impacted. It is becoming increasingly clearer to me that the state government has no intention of changing the current set-up of Renmark Police Station for the betterment of its local community. It is a sad indictment to find out, when we have the truth through internal correspondence, what is going on for the future of Renmark Police Station.

Every community deserves the right to be a safe community upheld by the great work of SAPOL. We have an internal leaked email with concerns about why they do not want to put any front-line services or front-line administration in a police station and that they would rather leave it largely unattended so that people in that community do not become accustomed to having a SAPOL presence. I think it is outrageous that SAPOL, the minister and the commissioner are not making transparency available to a community of 9,000 people.

I want to make sure that the people of Renmark are kept in the light about what is going on with their police station. For too long at Renmark, we have seen relocated administration services that have positions that have not been filled. As I understand it, that administration service moved down to Murray Bridge—again, a sad indictment for a large community that is quite isolated and that feels as though they have been gypped, that they have been ripped off by a government that does not give a damn about what happens in the regions. What happens in the regions is almost a second priority.

This is about me sticking up for my community at Renmark, Paringa, Chaffey and those outlying areas around the Renmark district. Renmark deserves a police service. It deserves a front-line service in a police station for their safety and for their concerns.

TENNYSON DUNES

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:32): I rise to speak about something that is of great interest to my community, that is, the coastal environment in the seat of Lee. One of the things that I have been most proud of as a first-time MP, and one of the things that we have worked together to achieve with the community, is the protection of the Tennyson Dunes. The Tennyson Dunes, for those people who are not familiar with them, are the last tertiary dune system that we have in metropolitan Adelaide and it is also the home to some unique flora and fauna within that dune system.

There are a number of volunteer groups that work actively to protect the Tennyson Dunes, and for many years they have been seeking that the dunes have a high level of protection from the Minister for the Environment. I am very pleased that, after lobbying the minister, the Tennyson Dunes area is now declared a conservation reserve under the Crown Land Management Act.

The Tennyson Dunes area is located in one of the last parts of the Adelaide metropolitan area's coastline where the Coast Park project has not been completed. The Coast Park project is to provide a 70-kilometre shared walking and cycling path for people to come and visit the coastal environment that runs between North Haven and Sellicks and the area we have in the seat of Lee. Those areas in Semaphore Park, Tennyson and Grange are nearly the last part of the Coast Park to be completed, 25 years after this project started.

It has always been difficult and contentious because, unlike many other parts of the coastline, houses have been built right up to and including the sand dune environment. There has been a lot of concern by some residents—not all residents, but just by some residents—about having that path in front of their houses on land, which is public land, which they have had nearly exclusive access to and use of for many years.

I am really pleased to report to the house that after the Minister for the Environment declared the Tennyson Dunes area a conservation reserve he asked Professor Chris Daniels, the Chair of the Adelaide Mount Lofty Natural Resources Committee Board, to convene a group to plot the completion of the Coast Park path through this sensitive dune environment, and they have succeeded in doing that. They have picked the right alignment to respect the local ecology and they have picked the right surface treatments for the path. It shows me and the rest of the community that it is possible to complete the Coast Park path in our part of the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The state government has contributed \$4 million and the local council has contributed another \$4 million to fund the \$8 million cost to finish this path and give the community access to this beautiful part of Adelaide's coastline. Just about everybody in the community supports it. Even a lot of residents in Tennyson, who have properties right up on the coastline, agree that there is a need for the path to give the rest of the community access to this wonderful part of the coastline. Unfortunately, a very, very small number of people in the community, particularly some of those people who live along this part of the coast, are doing everything they can to block this path. They are currently taking the council, as well as the state government, to court to try to stop this path being built.

Of course, I am on the record as always supporting the Coast Park path. I wrote a letter to the local Messenger to make absolutely clear that I think this path needs to be completed. Since then, we have seen the shadow minister for the environment come out and say that the completion of the Coast Park path will be a key election issue between me, as the Labor candidate, and the Liberal candidate that they have preselected down there—me as the local member, who supports completing this path for the benefit of the whole community, and the Liberal Party, which wants to block this path, helping that small number of residents stop this path being completed so that they can continue having access to publicly owned land and stop members of the community accessing it en masse.

Well, I can tell you, Deputy Speaker, that I did not become a member of parliament or seek to be a representative in this place to protect the small number of people trying to assert private rights over public land. This land has always been owned by the public of South Australia because all the public of South Australia should have access to it. I strongly believe that, if we complete this coast path, this will give all the community access to what they should be able to enjoy forever and a day.

The money is there, the plans are there and we are talking with the residents to make sure that we can deliver the right path. If this is going to be an election issue, then bring it on, because I will do the right thing by my community and I will stand up to those people who try to block my community from having access to the coast.

Bills

PARLIAMENT (JOINT SERVICES) (STAFFING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:38): Obtained leave on behalf of the Premier and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Parliament (Joint Services) (Staffing) Amendment Bill 2017* will amend the *Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985* to remove the role of the Governor in approving staffing matters for the Joint Parliamentary Service, or JPS.

As Members would know, the JPS is established to provide services to both Houses of Parliament. The JPS is responsible to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee (JPSC), which is comprised of the Speaker, the President, and two members from each House, one government and one opposition. The JPS currently consists of 64 FTE.

Staffing matters within the JPS are largely a matter for the JPSC, but there are three matters that currently require the approval of the Governor:

- creating or abolishing offices within the JPS
- determining salary classifications, and
- approval special leave of more than 3 days.

The Parliament (Joint Services) Act was enacted following a Joint Select Committee Report on the Administration of Parliament in 1985, but it is not clear from the report or from *Hansard* why the Governor was given

the role of overseeing staffing matters in the JPS. It is possible that this was done to ensure consistency with public sector classifications, or to ensure that Executive Council was kept abreast of Parliament's potential expenditure.

In the government's view, it is not appropriate that the Governor be required to approve staffing matters for the JPS. Under the current system, the Governor is asked to reclassify, create, and abolish positions at the administrative services level. This is inconsistent with broader public sector practices in which the power to manage staffing matters is delegated to agencies to create a flexible and responsive workforce. To involve the Governor in staffing matters creates unnecessary delays and an unnecessary administrative burden on the Governor and his staff.

The Amendment Bill will transfer to the JPSC the power to create or abolish positions, determine salary classifications, and approve special leave of greater than 3 days' duration. It will also update a number of obsolete references to industrial relations legislation. It does not affect the rights of JPS employees or their ability to access industrial processes under the *Return to Work Act 2014* or the *Fair Work Act 1994*.

In preparing the Bill, the government consulted with the JPS through the Speaker, who is the current chair of the JPS. The government has also consulted with the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. No concerns have been raised.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985*

4—Amendment of section 10—Creation and abolition of offices

5—Amendment of section 11—Classification of offices

6—Amendment of section 21—Special leave

These clauses remove the role of the Governor in relation to staffing issues.

7—Amendment of section 24—Application of certain Acts

This clause updates some references to legislation and removes obsolete references.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT ONLINE TRANSACTIONS AND OTHER MATTERS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:39): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993, the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013, the Highways Act 1926, the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Government introduces the Statutes Amendment (Transport Online Transactions and Other Matters) Bill 2017 with the aim of making small but important changes to multiple South Australian laws so they work more effectively for our community. The Bill makes a number of changes, including to the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*, *Road Traffic Act 1961*, *Highways Act 1926* and the *Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013*. The

Schedule also amends transport legislation, including the *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993*, to remove gender specific language, reflecting the government's policy on gender identity and equality.

Motor Vehicles Act

Proposed changes to the Motor Vehicles Act support the Government's Digital by Default agenda in order to further modernise the ways in which customers are able to transact with government. The community wants to transact with government online; indeed the 2016 state *Customer Satisfaction Measurement Survey* showed that people are significantly more satisfied with government services when they are able to access them online. This also complements recent initiatives, such as the changes to the Act proposed in the *Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Bill 2016* which provide capacity for driver's licences to be in a digital form, to keep pace with contemporary society and expectations.

At present there are around 20 or so online services which already operate for the public in relation to the Act, mostly via the EzyReg website. However, of high frequency transactions such as transfers of vehicle registration, particularly after vehicle sales, and acknowledging licence disqualifications, customers are still required to mail or lodge paper-based forms and personally attend at service centre counters.

The Bill alleviates this situation by removing legislative barriers in the Motor Vehicles Act to the use of electronic 'online' processes so that vehicle registration transfers and notices of vehicle sales may be recorded online, instead of requiring lodgement of physical forms. Either or both parties may choose to use the existing methods, or the new online services via secure EzyReg online accounts. To provide flexibility, the legislation requires provision of information in an application, form or notice in a 'manner determined by the Minister'.

As amended by the Bill, section 139BD of the Motor Vehicles Act will enable the option for a notice of licence disqualification issued by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to be acknowledged by the recipient online. The recipient will follow an online procedure via their EzyReg account, which includes a number of verification steps, much like an internet banking transaction, and payment of the requisite fees. The Bill also provides a presumption that the notice has been given on the day that the person acknowledges it electronically.

Each year around 430,000 registration transfers and associated transactions are processed and around 17,000 transactions connected to licence disqualification acknowledgements. These amendments will allow for this almost half a million additional transactions to take place online each year. These changes have the potential to positively impact large numbers of our community, resulting in a significant saving of time and inconvenience for the public by providing an alternative to physically attending at service centres in business hours. To ensure all members of our community are catered for, online methods will be optional, and existing methods for customer transactions, primarily focussed on the lodgement of paper forms, will also remain.

The Bill will also give members of the public the option to receive the communications by 'electronic means of a kind determined by the Minister', such as an EzyReg account, rather than by post.

With the goal of assisting the public and promote efficiencies, further changes to the Act contained in the Bill include changes to enable licence renewal applications to be made by telephone, and a power for the Minister to delegate his or her powers and functions under the Act. To cut red tape across government, provisions relating to the recovery and refund of small monetary amounts is deleted as this is managed across government by the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1987*.

The Bill also amends the Act's provisions for the accident towing roster scheme. To optimise health and safety for the holders of towtruck certificates, the requirement for certification to be fixed to clothing is removed.

Heavy Vehicle National Law Associated Amendments

Further amendments in the Bill involve changes to the *Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013*, the Road Traffic Act, and the Motor Vehicles Act, consequential upon the introduction and operation of the Heavy Vehicle National Law (National Law) on 10 February 2014. The National Law establishes a national heavy vehicle regulator and a national regulatory scheme for all heavy vehicles (over 4.5 tonnes gross vehicle mass) for participating Australian jurisdictions.

For the more efficient operation of the National Law in South Australia, the Bill introduces a power of delegation for the powers and/or functions conferred on road managers and road authorities in the local application Act.

Changes proposed to various sections of the Road Traffic Act will clarify that there are now separate legislative frameworks for light and heavy vehicles, clarify definitions and terminology consistent with the National Law, and make other minor amendments.

Bicycle Definition – Road Traffic Act

Other miscellaneous amendments in the Bill include updating the definition of a *bicycle* in the Road Traffic Act to remove unicycles and scooters from this category. This will achieve consistency with the more up to date definition in the Australian Road Rules. To avoid future inconsistencies, amendments to the Act are also made so that the definitions of a wheeled recreational device and a wheeled toy will now be dealt with by regulation.

To optimise the operation of the provision, the Bill also amends section 175A of the Road Traffic Act to clarify that an average speed Gazette notice made under that section may be varied or revoked.

Highways Act

The *Statutes Amendment and Repeal Act 2012* (2012 Budget Act) incorporated amendments to the Highways Act that provided for certain roads to vest in the Commissioner of Highways so as to enable the Commissioner to enter into contracts to promote commercial activities on these roads.

A degree of ambiguity has however arisen as to how these roads are to be treated as a 'road' or a 'public road'. The proposed amendment to section 26 of the Highways Act clarifies beyond any doubt that the powers under Part 2 of Chapter 11 of the Local Government Act 1999 will apply to roads vested in the Commissioner as if such roads were public roads.

This change makes clear that the Commissioner has the same powers with regard to these roads as councils, as was intended by the 2012 Budget Act.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013*

4—Insertion of sections 22A and 22B

This clause will insert new sections 22A and 22B at the beginning of Part 2 Division 6 (Miscellaneous) of the local application provisions of the Act.

22A—Delegation by road authority

Proposed new section 22A empowers the road authority (that is, the Minister to whom the administration of the *Road Traffic Act 1961* is committed) to delegate the powers and functions of the road authority under the Act to a particular person or a person for the time being occupying a particular position (other than a road manager or a delegate of a road manager).

22B—Delegation by road manager

Proposed new section 22B empowers a road manager to delegate the powers and functions of a road manager under the Act (that is, an authority, person or body responsible for the care, control or management of a road) to a particular person or a person for the time being occupying a particular position (other than a road authority or a delegate of a road authority).

Part 3—Amendment of *Highways Act 1926*

5—Amendment of section 26—Powers of the Commissioner to carry out roadwork etc

This clause amends section 26 to ensure that Part 2 of Chapter 11 of the *Local Government Act 1999* applies to roads vested in or under the care, control and management of the Commissioner of Highways as if those roads were public roads.

Part 4—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

6—Insertion of section 6A

This clause inserts a new section to allow delegations by the Minister.

6A—Delegation by Minister

Proposed section 6A empowers the Minister to delegate powers and functions of the Minister under the Act.

7—Amendment of section 16—Permits to drive vehicles without registration

This clause amends section 16 so that an application for a permit to drive an unregistered motor vehicle can be made online, and so that notice to the holder of a permit under that section can be given by the Registrar online.

8—Amendment of section 20—Application for registration

This clause amends section 20 so that an application for registration of a motor vehicle can be made online and so that the particulars to be included in an application for renewal of registration can be prescribed by the regulations.

9—Amendment of section 21—Power of Registrar to decline application

This clause amends section 21 so that the Registrar can decline an application for registration made online.

10—Amendment of section 24A—Registrar may accept periodic renewal payments

This clause amends section 24A to make a minor amendment that is consequential on the amendments to section 56 proposed by this measure.

11—Amendment of section 43—Short payment etc

This clause amends section 43 so that notice to the registered owner or registered operator of a motor vehicle demanding payment of an amount for registration or insurance can be given by the Registrar online.

12—Amendment of section 47C—Return or recovery of number plates

This clause amends section 47C so that notice to the registered owner or registered operator of a motor vehicle requiring the return of number plates can be given by the Registrar online.

13—Substitution of section 56

This clause substitutes section 56 which sets out the obligations of the transferor upon transfer of the ownership of a motor vehicle.

56—Duty of transferor on transfer of vehicle

This section requires a person who transfers the ownership of a motor vehicle to another person to lodge an application for cancellation of the registration of the vehicle within 7 days of the transfer, or to give the transferee the prescribed documents in respect of the vehicle and complete and sign notice of the transfer of ownership within 7 days after the transfer, and within 14 days after the transfer lodge the notice of transfer of ownership. The maximum penalty for non-compliance is a \$1,250 fine.

14—Amendment of section 57—Duty of transferee on transfer of vehicle

This clause amends section 57 to enable an application for the transfer of registration of a motor vehicle and the prescribed documents in respect of the vehicle to be lodged online.

15—Substitution of section 57A

This clause substitutes section 57A.

57A—Power of Registrar to record change of ownership of motor vehicle

This section allows the Registrar to record a change of ownership on the register without registering the name of the new owner if a notice of transfer of ownership has been lodged under section 56, or the Registrar is satisfied on the basis of other evidence that the ownership of the vehicle has been transferred to another person.

16—Amendment of section 58—Transfer of registration

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 58 which is consequential on the amendments to other sections which allow for online lodgement of applications and documents.

17—Amendment of section 60—Cancellation of registration where failure to transfer after change of ownership

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 60 which is consequential on the amendments to other sections which allow for online lodgement of applications and documents.

18—Insertion of section 60A

This clause inserts section 60A.

60A—Lodgement of applications, notices etc

This section provides that for the purposes of sections 56, 57, 57A, 58 and 60, a requirement to lodge an application, notice or other document with the Registrar will be taken to have been met if all the information required to be included in the application, notice or other document is provided to the Registrar in a manner determined by the Minister.

19—Amendment of section 75—Issue and renewal of licences

This clause amends section 75 to enable applications for the issue or renewal of driver's licences to be made online.

20—Amendment of section 75AA—Only one licence to be held at any time

This clause amends section 75AA to enable notice requiring a person to surrender a licence or permit to be given by the Registrar online.

21—Amendment of section 81F—Mandatory alcohol interlock scheme conditions

This clause amends section 81F so that a notice to produce a vehicle for inspection by an approved alcohol interlock provider can be given by the Registrar online.

22—Amendment of section 85—Procedures for suspension, cancellation or variation of licence or permit

This clause amends section 85 so that notice of a suspension, cancellation or variation of a licence or permit can be given by the Registrar online.

23—Substitution of section 98ML

This clause substitutes section 98ML.

98ML—Towtruck driver to carry and produce certificate

This section requires the holder of a towtruck certificate or temporary towtruck certificate to carry the certificate in accordance with the regulations. Currently section 98ML provides that the certificate must be fixed to the holder's clothing in accordance with the regulations.

24—Amendment of section 98V—Cancellation of permit

This clause amends section 98V to enable notice to be given to the holder of a disabled person's parking permit by the Registrar online.

25—Amendment of section 138B—Effect of dishonoured cheques etc on transactions under the Act

This clause amends section 138B to enable notices under that section to be given by the Registrar online.

26—Repeal of section 138C

This clause repeals section 138C which provides that if for any reason a fee payable under the Act is overpaid and the amount overpaid does not exceed \$3 (indexed), the Registrar is not required to refund the amount overpaid unless the person who paid the fee demands a refund.

27—Amendment of section 139BA—Power to require production of licence etc

This clause amends section 139BA to enable a notice requiring the production of a licence or permit to be given to a person online.

28—Amendment of section 139BD—Service and commencement of notices of disqualification

This clause amends section 139BD to allow for the acknowledgement of the receipt of a notice of disqualification to be recorded by electronic means of a kind determined by the Minister.

29—Amendment of section 139C—Service of other notices and documents

This clause amends section 139C to enable the service of documents by electronic means of a kind determined by the Minister.

30—Amendment of section 139D—Confidentiality

This clause amends section 139D to enable information obtained in the administration of the Act to be disclosed in connection with the administration of the *Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013*, the *Heavy Vehicle Regulations (South Australia)*, and the regulations made under that Act.

31—Amendment of section 141—Evidence by certificate etc

This clause amends section 141 so that, in the absence of proof to the contrary, in proceedings under the Act, a notice of disqualification will be taken to have been given to a person, in the case of a notice receipt of which is personally acknowledged by the person recording the acknowledgement, within the period specified in the notice, by electronic means of a kind determined by the Minister, on the day on which receipt of the notice is so acknowledged.

32—Amendment of section 142A—Evidence of ownership of motor vehicle

This clause amends section 142A to alter a cross-reference.

33—Amendment of section 145—Regulations

This clause amends section 145 to empower the Registrar to divide the declared area into zones for the purposes of the accident towing roster scheme, to enable regulations of savings or transitional nature to be made, and to make a minor consequential amendment.

Part 5—Amendment of *Road Traffic Act 1961*

34—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause amends definitions of words and phrases used in the Act. Among the changes are the following:

- Australian Road Rules: The current definition, which is a reference to section 80 of the Act, is deleted. A new definition is inserted by proposed new section 8.
- Journey documentation: The current definition is amended to replace 'log book' with 'work diary'.
- Bicycle: The current definition is amended to exclude unicycles and scooters, as is the case in the Australian Road Rules.
- Wheeled recreational device, wheeled toy: The current definitions of wheeled recreational device and wheeled toy are amended to enable their respective meanings to be prescribed by regulation.

The amendments also substitute a new definition of *legal entitlements* and insert a definition of *quad-axle group*.

35—Insertion of section 8

This clause inserts section 8.

8—References to *Australian Road Rules*

This clause inserts a new definition of *Australian Road Rules* in place of the definition deleted from section 5. The proposed new definition applies (unless the contrary intention appears) not just to the *Road Traffic Act 1961* but to references to the *Australian Road Rules* in other Acts or laws and makes it clear that such references are to the Rules as they apply in this State.

36—Amendment of section 40P—Notice of removal of vehicle and disposal of vehicle if unclaimed

This clause amends section 40P to make a minor amendment to the definition of *relevant authority*.

37—Amendment of section 79B—Provisions applying where certain offences are detected by photographic detection devices

This clause amends section 79B so that offences against the *Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013* prescribed by the regulations can be included in the offences to which the section applies.

38—Amendment of section 82—Speed limit while passing school bus

This clause amends section 82 to substitute the definition of *vehicle standards* for the purposes of the section.

39—Amendment of heading to Part 4 Division 4 Subdivision 1

This clause amends the heading to Subdivision 1 of Part 4 Division 4 to make it clear that it applies only in relation to light vehicles.

40—Amendment of section 145—Defect notices

This clause amends section 145 of the Act to so that references to vehicle standards in the section are references to the vehicle standards for light vehicles.

41—Amendment of section 175A—Average speed evidence

This clause amends section 175A to make it clear that notices in the Gazette by the Minister specifying locations, routes and distances relating to average speed camera locations can be varied or revoked by subsequent notices in the Gazette by the Minister.

Schedule 1—Statute law revision amendments

The Schedule replaces gender-specific language with gender-neutral language in the *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993*, the *Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013*, the *Highways Act 1926*, the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* and the *Road Traffic Act 1961*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION (VETERANS' ADVISORY COUNCIL) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is on his feet and has a maximum of 19 more minutes. You have almost started again, haven't you?

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:41): It's all my time. I rise to continue my remarks in regard to the ANZAC Day Commemoration (Veterans' Advisory Council) Amendment Bill 2017. The

ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund has operated since 2005 and provides up to \$100,000 annually in grants towards projects that commemorate ANZAC Day. For the ANZAC centenary period 2014-16, the state has increased the fund to \$350,000 annually. The fund can also take on gifts and bequests. Since its inception, the fund has been administered by the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council. The council has both received applications for funding and been solely responsible for the allocation of grants with that funding.

There has been no ministerial role in the administration of the fund, including decisions about successful applicants. The ANZAC Day Commemoration Council will be abolished from 30 June 2017, with its functions folded into the Veterans Advisory Council, which has a wider role in providing advice to the government on the welfare of veterans. The commemoration council's abolition has been set in train following the passage of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015.

In the minister's second reading speech, he explained that, following the abolition of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council, applications for funding will have to be made to the minister, and referred to the Veterans Advisory Council for its consideration and recommendation back to the minister. The minister will then make the final decision. The director of Veterans SA has explained that the Veterans Advisory Council would have to be reconstituted as a statutory authority if it were to be solely responsible for administration of the commemoration fund. He has further advised that the applications for the last funding round for \$350,000 have closed, and the commemoration council will determine these applications before its abolition and not the minister, but we certainly need that confirmed in the debate today.

Certainly, we owe a lot to all our past and present service men and women, and I want to reflect on a ceremony I attended the other day. I do not want to cause any distress, but I think we certainly need to further acknowledge Private Miller Mack, who was one of 21 Raukkan Aboriginal Ngarrindjeri community members who served in World War I. He served at a time when he was not even recognised as a citizen, and he served at a time when he could not even vote in elections in this country, so I take my hat off to him and to his brothers.

Private Miller Mack was born at Point McLeay in 1894. He enlisted in 1916 and fought in the First World War, serving in the 50th Battalion. He took part in the Battle of Messines, which precipitated the detonation of 19 large mines underneath German front lines, and he said that some of these explosions were felt on the English mainland.

Messines is an interesting place. It is one of the places I visited years ago, at the end of 2010. I was fortunate enough to get a guided tour through the battlefields of Belgium and France, and I think it is something that everyone needs to do. Certainly, with most of these battles, where the Australians and allies were attacking, they were literally fighting uphill, and it is fascinating to see. There is one location where there is a farmhouse and barn, with many tonnes of explosives still underneath it, and people just think, 'Well, it hasn't gone off yet, so it probably won't.' These large mines were used to devastating effect.

Something else that was used with devastating effect back in World War I was gas. Miller Mack suffered from tuberculosis, which he contracted during the battle because of a gas attack. He was repatriated to Australia, but he passed away in 1919 and was buried in an unmarked grave in Adelaide's West Terrace Cemetery in 1919. When the military section of that cemetery at West Terrace was created in 1920, Private Mack was not moved from his resting place.

As a local member, I was proud to attend the ceremony along with many brothers, cousins, aunts, uncles, family members and others. Many hundreds of people attended the event of the reinterment of Private Miller Mack's remains at Raukkan on 24 March this year, and I want to congratulate everyone involved because the reinterment would have taken a lot of organisation. I want to congratulate the RSL on their excellent work, and I want to congratulate the soldiers who took part in the ceremony on the day, and it was an extended ceremony.

Miller Mack was only exhumed that morning from West Terrace and brought down to Raukkan by Fulham Funerals, from memory, with an accompanying guard of honour. Those of us on foot met him at the gates of Raukkan, and we had a very nice service for him in the chapel that is on the \$50 bill of our Australian currency. When it came time to leave the chapel, he had full gun

carriage transportation up to the cemetery at Raukkan, and then Miller Mack was laid to rest between his fellow World War I brothers with whom he had served.

As I said, it was a very moving ceremony 98 years after he died from illness contracted on the battlefield at Messines, and I was very pleased to be part of it, along with the Hon. Terry Stephens and the Hon. Kyam Maher from the other place. It really hit me that he was one of 21 who could not vote yet was prepared to fight and die for his country. As we know, many hundreds of thousands of people from Australia have gone to war for us and, as much as we dislike war, our people have served valiantly.

A great-uncle of mine served in World War I on the Somme, and three uncles served in World War II at Tobruk on Sunderland flying boats or on the *Shropshire* for the Australian Navy. It is amazing what you learn when you go to a family funeral. I did not realise that one of my uncles served not only with the Navy on the *Shropshire* but also with the Australian Army in Korea. Sadly, I did not know that until he passed away.

In more recent times, as I have mentioned in this place before, my brother served for 23 years. He was in the infantry, then he joined the engineering section, with service in Rwanda and Iraq. He is very proud and I am very proud of his service for this country, as we all should be of anyone who has served or is serving, and this is so whether or not they have been overseas.

We commemorate terrible battles, such as the ongoing bombing of Darwin, which was kept quiet at the time so that it did not spook the Australian public. Many were killed, not just servicemen and servicewomen but also civilians. The sad thing about sending people away, as has been stated here recently, is not the damage you may be able to see: it is the damage that happens to these people that you cannot see.

I do commend everything our forces do. I hope that they do not have to go to any big escalation anytime soon or in the future, for that matter. They train well and they train hard. A lot of new armaments are being made for them to work with, including ships and submarines, and plans for projects like the LAND 400 for our Army and the F-45 project for the Air Force as well as other improvements are moving ahead to make sure that our defence forces are right up there with any in the world.

We certainly support this legislation. I think it is very important that we make sure that we appropriately commemorate all those who have served or who are serving for us and that we always do so in a very respectful way. Lest we forget.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:52): I rise to speak on the ANZAC Day Commemoration (Veterans' Advisory Council) Amendment Bill. The bill has been introduced in the House of Assembly by the Minister for Veterans' Affairs to amend the ANZAC Day Commemoration Act 2005. It proposes to change the arrangements under which funds are allocated to community organisations from the ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund to give the minister a greater role in the administration of the fund and a final approval power for grants.

By way of background, the ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund has operated since 2005, providing up to \$100,000 in grant funds annually to projects that commemorate ANZAC Day. For the ANZAC centenary period from 2014-18, the state has increased funds to \$350,000 annually. The fund can also receive gifts and bequests. Since its inception, the fund has been administered by the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council. The council has both received applications for funding and been solely responsible for the allocation of grants. There has been no ministerial role in the administration of the fund, including decisions about successful applicants.

The ANZAC Day Commemoration Council will be abolished from 30 June 2017, with its functions folded into the Veterans Advisory Council, which has a wider role in providing advice to the government on the welfare of veterans. The commemoration council's abolition has been set in train following passage of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2015.

The minister's second reading explanation states that following the abolition of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council, applications for funding will have to be made to the minister

and referred to the Veterans Advisory Council for its consideration and recommendation back to the minister. The minister then makes the final decision. The Director of Veterans SA has explained that the Veterans Advisory Council would have to be reconstituted as a statutory authority if it were to be solely responsible for the administration of the commemoration fund.

He has further advised that the applications for the last funding round for \$350,000 have closed and the commemoration council, not the minister, will determine these applications before its abolition. Obviously there will be some questions around the decision-making process ongoing without the commemoration council. The fund is popular among South Australian schools, community groups, ex-service organisations, local councils and individuals, and it includes a wide range of projects such as restoration and upgrading of memorials, documentaries, musical productions, publications and community events.

Previously, these applications were assessed by the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council, an independent statutory authority consisting of nine members, chaired by former South Australian police commissioner Mr Malcolm Hyde AO, APM. While I will support this bill to ensure we continue to see the community funding awarded to worthy recipients, I am sure questions will be raised about the process going forward. Having the projects assessed through an independent group makes sense to me, but since the first round of the fund in 2007-08, more than 300 South Australian projects have been supported. Highlights include the *Bravest of the Brave* travelling exhibition, the RSL Virtual War Memorial and *The First Anzac Day* documentary film.

In the electorate of Chaffey in the Riverland and Mallee, we have had several successful funding projects. They include the \$10,000 to the Karoonda East Murray Council for the supply and installation of a combined District of Karoonda East Murray War Memorial Honour Roll located at the Memorial Gates at Karoonda Oval. The honour roll recognises and acknowledges local men and women who have served Australia in a time of war or armed conflict or international peacekeeping operation in which Australia has been involved.

The Loxton Mardi Gras Committee has received funding for the project detailing military based family street names in Loxton, and essentially this involved the installation of a plaque on the World War I Memorial Rotunda and the creation of a self-guided audio tour with access to biographical accounts of military personnel commemorated in the 54 streets of Loxton. The Berri War Memorial Community Centre undertook a project to upgrade the memorial grandstand on the Memorial Oval to include the District Honour Roll. The Pinnaroo Primary School utilised funding to develop an existing war memorial garden on the school grounds, adding a memorial plaque, flagpole and a life-size soldier's silhouette. The Waikerie RSL sub-branch received funding for a project to refurbish and repair their replica cannon field gun on display in the Memorial Garden.

Overall, I support the passage of the bill, and I am sure clarification will be provided on the process of assessing projects going forward. In closing, I look forward to all the ANZAC Day services in the region and the low pass by one of my local constituents in his warbird. He does a low pass over Renmark during the ANZAC Day service. It really is a site to behold.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:58): I thank honourable members for their contributions during this debate. I have listened very carefully to each of them. I thank the deputy leader for her initial contribution and also the members for Hammond, Chaffey and Newland and various other members. Quite a few have contributed. Their contributions are very welcome, not only by the government but I am sure by veterans themselves.

In closing, I will make a couple of points before we go into committee. The Premier announced in July 2014 a review of boards and committees, and the scope of the review included 429 government boards and committees. What came out of that was that we had these two committees, the Veterans Advisory Council and the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council, effectively doing quite similar things.

As the Minister for Veterans' Affairs, on advice from the agency in consultation with the Veterans Advisory Council, we are already dispensing grants to numerous bodies around the state. Of course, the same thing was happening under the statutory arrangements of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council, so we effectively had two committees, if you like, both dispensing funds to

veterans groups. Sometimes there was some doubling up, and I had to institute arrangements to make sure there was no duplication or double dipping, accidental double dipping in most cases, that had not been communicated or coordinated clearly.

It became very clear that we needed to bring these two together, that that would lead to better governance and better services for veterans and the more efficient disbursement of public funds, remembering that this is their money. The ANZAC Day Commemoration Council, since its inaugural meeting in 2007, has distributed about 400 grants to organisations totalling over \$1.5 million. These grants have assisted in the education of Australians and ensured that their service and sacrifice has been commemorated now and in the future. Members have poignantly noted the sound impact of that throughout the community, in their electorates and across the state.

The council had these two functions: to administer the ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund and to carry out such other functions as may be assigned to the council by the Minister for Veterans Affairs. So, the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council was, in effect, responsible to the minister anyway. This is another important point, because I know members have raised concerns that this might be some sort of change in arrangements. In effect, both were responsible to the minister, and appropriately so, given that this is ultimately taxpayers' money that is being disbursed.

Essentially, when questions are asked about it they always come to the minister, and if there is any problem with the way funds are being managed the responsible minister is always the one who is held to account. It is always good that ministers require due diligence and sound management of the funds for which they are, obviously, responsible to the house and to the people of South Australia.

Under its current establishment, the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council is a stand-alone council with the primary task of administering the fund. It does not advocate on behalf of veterans, nor does it provide policy advice to government, although to a degree it answers to the minister. The Veterans Advisory Council is an advisory council assuming the functions of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council. It retains its functions, and that includes providing policy advice. In other words, by making this change we are bringing together into one responsible, well-represented group the role of both advice and the disbursement of funds.

The VAC comprises 16 members plus a chair. It is representative across rank, gender, service and conflict. Its current structure also includes current serving personnel from all three services, recognising that many of our veterans are young and still serving. Under the chairmanship of Vice-Marshal Brent Espeland AM, a former deputy chief of the Royal Australian Air Force, the VAC focus is now firmly on the next 50 years, ensuring the needs of our contemporary working age veterans and those who are still in uniform are catered for in South Australia.

In doing so, the VAC has not lost sight of the origins and the legacy of service in the ADF. keeps a very close eye on the needs of our veterans from earlier conflicts and ensures that they are commemorated respectfully and that their deeds addressed appropriately. I will not go into all the details about the VAC and how it operates because I note that those opposite are supporting the bill. I thank them for that on behalf of all veterans. We did seek crown law advice on the preparation of these arrangements and consulted fairly thoroughly with the veterans community, which is generally in agreement that this is the right thing to be doing.

I want to take some time to talk about some of the individuals who have been involved in helping us with our work. I have mentioned the VAC. There have been some new appointments recently: Group Captain Darren James Goldie, Mr James Terence O'Hanlon, Mr Francis Henry Lampard, Lieutenant Colonel Paul William Graham, Commander Andrew John Burnett ADC RAN and Mrs Helen Meyer.

There have been some reappointments: Brigadier Laurie Lewis AM (retired), Mr Leon George Eddy, Mr Michael Gunther Baron von Berg MC, Brigadier Tim James Hanna AM, Christopher Mark Burns CSC (former colonel), Pamela Dorothy Hendrika Schulz OAM, Mr Bronson Leon Horan, who served in my former regiment 1st Commando, Mr Raymond John Kemp, Ms Chantelle Julia Graham, Ms Paula Anne Dabovich, and Dr Sharon Lorraine Mascall-Dare.

This is a pretty representative group. I think the house can take some comfort from the fact that this group will serve us well. They will make recommendations to government through the agency

on how grants should be disbursed, and those considerations will be given great thought and great care. The arrangements that will apply are not dissimilar to those that apply for certain other acts.

For example, I draw members' attention to the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 for which the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation is responsible. It is a fund established and administered by the minister with no consultation required by the minister in applying the fund. There is the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Act 2005 for which the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation is responsible. The Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Fund is one for which the minister must, before applying money belonging to the fund and furthering its objects and objectives, have regard to any advice provided by the Parks and Wilderness Council in relation to the matter.

There is the Export Partnership Program, which is one I manage as the Minister for Investment and Trade. Again, this funding goes through a due process administered by the Department of State Development without particular reference to any statutory fund. The details are available on the DSD website. They do not include any reference to the board making recommendations to the minister; however, the program may be an initiative of the Economic Development Board established under the Economic Development Act.

In other words, these recommendations come to me about what should be approved or not, and generally the minister approves those recommendations. It would be extraordinary really for me as minister or any minister not to concur with the recommendations given to me by the relevant committee, which now would be the Veterans Advisory Council. Of course, the agency chief sits at VAC meetings and is there observing the decisions that are made.

It is hard to imagine circumstances where a minister might be advised not to agree with a VAC recommendation. It would have to involve some concern that the agency might have about probity, the way the fund was applied for or perhaps some duplication of effort, but it is more than likely that that would be drawn to the VAC's attention at the time. They are very thorough, and I am superbly confident that, under Air Vice-Marshal Espeland and the group we have put together here with the guidance of the agency, recommendations that come to me will be concurred with.

I would not want members to feel that the minister will somehow be sitting back there making calls on where money will be deposited. It will come through the VAC, and there is a process of accountability, because the VAC will know if for some reason or another a minister has not accepted their recommendation and, no doubt, questions would be asked on that basis, but I am happy to answer questions about that in committee.

Finally, could I just take a moment to thank the current and past members of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council. The terms of that council have been for a number of members to be serving. There have been changeovers recently, with many of those terms due to expire around the middle of this year, hence the timing of this move lined up fairly smoothly with the expiry of a number of terms on 23 June 2017, including those of Mr Malcolm Hyde AO APM, who has done a wonderful job as presiding member; Mr Keith Bleechmore; Ms Candida D'arcy; Mr Bill Denny AM, BM; Dr Felicity-Ann Lewis; and Mr Malcolm McInerney.

The terms of two members are due to expire on 22 April 2018—those of Mr Rob Manton, who is head of the agency, and Mr Benjamin Flink—but I think we have accommodated this act of parliament with those expiry dates. It lines up neatly because Mr Manton will continue in a role with the VAC and Mr Flink has been advised of what is going on and concurs with the arrangements being made.

I want to identify that group of people as people who have served South Australia proudly and well. I want to thank them for the work they have done; they have been extraordinarily successful. I could go through some examples of the sorts of grants that have been made: the District Council of Karoonda East Murray, \$10,000 for a Karoonda East Murray District honour roll. I noted the member for Hammond's comments earlier and I would have thought Karoonda would be in his electorate.

Mr Pederick: It is coming back with redistribution; it's in Chaffey.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Is it? Then you have the Loxton Museum of Agricultural Technology that got \$10,000 for the World War II RAAF aircraft hangar relocation, as

well as Athelstone Primary School. There is a very long list here of grants that have been managed successfully by this particular committee over a long period of time. Those grants will continue to be managed by veterans through a committee process over a long period of time. The quantum of money has actually been increasing in recent years, not decreasing, as the government and those opposite recognise that veterans need support.

Thank you to all those who have contributed. In particular, I thank the member for Morphett for his service as shadow minister for veterans. He has been terrific to work with and I know the veterans' community have great respect and regard for him. I wish the Leader of the Opposition well in his role, having recently taken that responsibility upon himself. I am sure he will exercise that responsibility enthusiastically. I thank the deputy leader for leading the debate and the professional way both she and the opposition have dealt with the matter. I am sure that veterans will be very pleased with the outcome.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (16:12): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL 2017

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 March 2017.)

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:13): I am not the lead speaker; indeed, this will be my final speech in this place on the Supply Bill.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Shame!

Mr PENGILLY: Maybe. I will take the opportunity to indicate from the outset that the Liberal Party will be supporting this bill, as it always has as the Liberal opposition. We will also take the opportunity to put out a number of things about the state of South Australia under the current Labor regime and put a few things on the record. It may be somewhat rhetorical from time to time, but it is important that these things are recognised.

It is interesting to note that the amount that is needed in the Supply Bill has gone from \$3.941 billion to \$5.9 billion in the space of only three years. You question just what is happening. Unfortunately, this government has the capacity and the propensity to spend an enormous amount of money, more than they are bringing in. It is a tragedy of the modern era that South Australia is going down the gurgler at a rate of knots and that our best and brightest would appear in many cases to be leaving the state and going farther afield to continue their careers and to raise their families. Out of our three children, one has already gone with her husband and family and another is leaving on 21 April for Darwin. I do not like that. I would much rather—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: No, they can get plenty of work up there and they can have a lot more money. They can do pretty well up there and have a positive attitude. That is the reality of the Northern Territory. Sadly, that will probably change under the Labor government up there as well. I thought I would whack that one in.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: The minister can interject if she wants to, but she can also get up here. She will have her turn to speak. I very much doubt whether she will, but I am speaking at—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: She surely is not interjecting and you are surely not taking any notice of her.

Mr PENGILLY: I am not really, no. I am not fussed in the slightest. In the number of years that we have stood up to speak on this bill, we have always supported it, but there are a number of issues I want to raise about my electorate that are critical and that need addressing, but the government just seems to conveniently put them on the backburner fairly regularly.

Let me just put one issue that is a very, very, very hot issue on the north-western side of my electorate at the moment, that is, Main South Road and the need for duplication. It has probably been the hottest issue in the Aldinga/Sellicks Beach/Seaford area for a number of years. With the increasing number of people who are commuting and the increasing traffic that goes up and down that road, they have brought the speed limit back to 90 km/h. There is a bit of work going on around Aldinga, but the sheer volume demands that the road be duplicated.

This would be a good thing and I would laud the current government if they announced the duplication of Main South Road in the budget in a few short weeks. It would go down particularly well. It would save countless lives in the future, I would hope. It is sad to say, but unfortunately that is the reality of the situation. It would be a good thing. May I also add, while I am on the subject of roads, that we still have had no announcement or any indication from the current government of when the Cut Hill section of the Adelaide to Victor Harbor Road is likely to be upgraded.

Without doubt, that is now the worst section of the road, from about Mosquito Hill Road down to Hindmarsh Road. It is badly in need of upgrade. I noticed that the federal member for Mayo has jumped on the bandwagon on yet another state issue she could not keep her nose out of, but it is something that is badly needed. I look forward to hearing, in due course, that the funding will come forward for that road and that it will be improved substantially.

The downgrading of country hospitals and services, etc. in South Australia is criminal—criminal. You only have to look at the latest debacle at the Kalimna unit at Strathalbyn and what is happening on Yorke Peninsula. It is all being carried out because of the government's total lack of capacity to run the health system and the crazy Transforming Health, which is progressively making things worse and worse instead of better and better, particularly in rural areas.

Another issue that needs a substantial amount of funding in my electorate—and which I will wait and see what comes again—is special needs schools. People who are in the game can explain this much better than I can, but I do not know why the amount of money required to fund special needs in schools seems to be an enormous growth industry. I am staggered by the rise in autism. Why we seem to be dealing with increasing number of autism cases is beyond me.

The behaviour of many students is an issue; whether they are coming out of homes where things are just not working properly or they have mental health issues, I am not sure. A number of schools in my electorate are battling the odds of special needs. Their units are full to overflowing, and the principals and staff are struggling to cope. This current government has failed to come to grips with this, and I suggest that, in the event of a change of government, the next government will have to deal with exactly the same problem.

I want to speak briefly on a few of these issues. Another thing the government has not done in relation to the electorate of Finniss is deal with in any way, shape or form with the issue of getting across the water between Cape Jervis and Penneshaw, between the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island, or between the mainland and Kangaroo Island; I do not care which terminology they use. I have gone on and on about this over a number of years and I will continue to do so as long as I can draw breath, in whatever capacity I happen to be in the future, but this issue has to be fixed.

We have the ludicrous situation of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island. We voted against it in the KI commissioner bill couple of years ago. The Attorney-General in his infinite wisdom decided that we needed a commissioner for Kangaroo Island. Well, what a complete and utter waste of money that has been. The well over \$1 million a year that is used there can be much better spent on other projects or it could go towards a solution to the problem of getting back and forth across the water.

With all the bureaucrats and spin doctors in the world, you cannot sell something like that role when the commissioner has absolutely no power to do anything. The person, whoever that may

be, or the current one, for that matter, has no power to do anything. They are a public servant. They are completely beholden to state government policy. They cannot move. I find it an absurd waste of money. They have their own little empire and it is producing absolutely little of any substance for Kangaroo Island in any way, shape or form.

Deputy Speaker, I say to the house for the last time in a supply speech that you have to fix the issue. I do not care what else you do, but until you fix the cost of getting across the water, in tandem with the federal government of the day, you will have zilch effect on the capacity to push forward the economy of Kangaroo Island. It is just a simple fact. You do not fix it by fluffing around the edges with all this other mickey mouse activity. You fix it by fixing up the cost of getting across the water. Until that happens, you may as well sit back and watch because nothing much is going to change.

Last year, the budget was listed as a jobs budget, as was the 2015 budget. The fact that South Australia's employment rate remains the second highest in the nation shows that the budgets and government have failed. They have failed spectacularly year after year. If you go back to the good old days of Rann and Foley, when they had record revenues coming in from GST and mining royalties, they spent and spent. They did not put anything aside for a rainy day, and now we have this disastrous situation in South Australia, where we have the Treasurer announcing in his budget speeches and from time to time that we have a budget surplus from last year. It was principally due to the sale of the MAC. It was absolutely ridiculous.

Anyone who runs business knows that if you keep selling off your assets you end up with absolutely nothing in the long run. We are selling off assets to survive. I have seen it happen with farmers who have sold off bits and pieces of their farms over the years just to maintain them. They get down to their house and a few acres and they have nothing left. You cannot keep selling off everything and expect to run an economy.

As I have said before, I seriously wonder where this is all going to end up as far as South Australia goes. We are in a diabolical state. The good people of South Australia have such intense pressure on their household budgets that many of them cannot see daylight. They are distressed over it. They cannot pay their power bills, they cannot pay their water bills, they cannot pay their emergency services levy and the list goes on. Where is it going to stop? I am sure that members on the other side of the house are hearing these things and that people are coming in to their electorate offices. I am sure they are hearing it, but there is no fix to it under the current regime.

My view is that the Treasurer just does not know where to go on it. He has no idea, and the government has simply run out of puff. It will be something of a revelation if the government comes up with a budget in the near future that in any way, shape or form will fix a lot of this up because I just cannot see it happening. At the moment, 15 years have been completely wasted, without us going forward at all. I know there are others who want to speak in this place, and I know we want to get through the Supply Bill, but I repeat that there are many areas in my electorate that have received little or no funding in years. Things have not been improved.

I will return to where I started, that is, the issue of Main South Road. This morning, representatives of the Buddhist community came to see me. There is a massive structure being built at Sellicks Beach, a Buddhist temple. It is massive and will be the biggest Buddhist temple in the Southern Hemisphere; it is going to be huge. It is going to attract tens of thousands of visitors a year. They have been trying to get through to the government on an integrated plan on where they can go. The government are not giving them any answers. They have contacted Jim Hallion; he is not giving any answers.

They simply want to know where the government is with an integrated approach to what is going to happen when that facility opens in 18 months' or two years' time and where they are going to accommodate everything. There will be people going there in their thousands who want to spend money. We welcome it down the length and breadth of the Fleurieu Peninsula, from Adelaide the whole way down. They will go further afield. The current Main South Road will in no way, shape or form accommodate those tens of thousands of people and tens of thousands of vehicles as well. They want some surety of what is going to happen. They simply cannot get answers.

Here they are, investing \$50 million of their own money in this facility. They have not asked for help from anybody. They have spent \$1 million on just the entrance. They have spent their own money there, with no help from anybody to do that. They are not asking a lot. We have various ministers, premiers and whatnot who are very quick to come in here, puff and blow and tell us what a wonderful thing is the connection with China and trade. A lot of the Chinese community, those of Chinese background and the Asian community in South Australia are connected with Buddhism—that is their right—but the organisers of this facility are getting no answers from the government.

This morning, in addition to representatives from the Sellicks temple, the senior abbot in Australia came to see us as well. He does not speak a lot of English, I might add, but he smiled a lot. He had an interpreter and he knew exactly what was going on. I could see just from his body language the frustration he was feeling. Fortunately, there was a federal government minister in the building this morning and I was able to take that person in on a few of these matters.

If an organisation like that—one that is spending \$50 million and is going to add to the economy of South Australia, bring visitation to the Fleurieu Peninsula and, indeed, bring them into South Australia to see this facility—cannot get answers from the government on the integration of the whole plan surrounding what they are putting in, there is something very wrong in the bureaucracy in South Australia and something very wrong in the leadership of the government, which is failing. They are not doing their homework on this.

I hope that some opposite may pick up on this and get some action happening. I hope that Mr Jim Hallion may get word of this and do something because it is not good enough. It is not good enough for these people to be treated in such a way. I think it is outrageous, and I go back to 2007 when I was invited down by the then local member for Kaurana, Mr John Hill, a Labor minister, and the minister for planning at the time, Paul Holloway, who was an excellent minister for planning. We went down there, and I was invited to go along because it was actually in my electorate at the time, but since then I have taken on Sellicks.

We went down there and we met with them, and we all expressed support. It was given a great run through analysis and application, and we had meetings at Sellicks Beach to appease the locals. Those poor beggars have been continuing to plod along without any help from this state government—apart from the help from Paul Holloway—to where they plan to be finished in 18 months or two years and they are still waiting on answers to where things are going.

I urge the government to pick up on that point and that, indeed, it is enough of a catalyst for Main South Road to be duplicated. I challenge the government to duplicate Main South Road in the forthcoming budget, to announce and to get on with it. I look forward to hearing other speakers in this place on this bill.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:31): I rise to make my contribution on the Supply Bill 2017. I want to start by talking about some broader concepts and broader things that I think are at play here within our South Australian economy, before going on to talk a little bit more closely about some specific issues within my shadow portfolio areas and within the electorate that are going on at the moment.

Essentially, the South Australia economy is at a crossroads. It is at a juncture at which, collectively, as a government, as a parliament and as the people of South Australia, we need to make a decision on how we want to move forward with our state. It is symptomatic of the current position that we are in that we need to make this choice. I think that in South Australia we suffer from many things.

We suffer from a bad government, we suffer from a poor set of economic conditions, a poor set of economic levers that lead to poor outcomes and we also suffer from the tyranny of low expectation. The current electricity debate is a classic case in point. The unemployment rate is a case in point where it seems that, whilst there is a certain level of anger within the community, there is also a tacit acceptance that this is as good as it is going to get. I think that is where South Australia lets itself down, and it is exacerbated by a government that meets those low expectations.

The tyranny of these low expectations has consequences. It means that incompetence becomes passé. We see that in this chamber where questions are asked and answers are not given,

or answers are so poorly answered that 'incompetence' is the main word that needs to be used. But that is not remarkable. In fact, I often have discussions with people of the fourth estate and with people in the community who are almost resigned to the fact that their government is incompetent. I find that frustrating as somebody who hungers for a better South Australia, and who is angered by the fact that we do not have a better South Australia, that this is something that we have come to expect.

I look at the fact that we have the highest unemployment rate in the nation at 6.6 per cent—it is the highest in seasonal terms and the second highest in trend terms—but somehow this is unremarkable because this is how it has been for a long time. I look, for instance, at our net interstate migration, which has topped over 6,000 in the last year. Again, that is something we have come to be used to and come to accept, and it is not good enough. We have had lacklustre growth in our economy for decades, and again it is just something we have come to expect.

One of the most important reforms we have made in this term of parliament, if not the most important, is to amend our Return to Work Act. It was heralded as a great driver of new business growth in our economy. It took us from having the most expensive WorkCover system in the country to having the second most expensive WorkCover system in the country. We were excited that we finally got off the bottom of something.

One of the biggest messages to come out of the nuclear waste dump debate, especially from the nuclear citizens' jury, is the fact that people may have been agnostic or even positive about the idea of a waste dump, but they did not trust their government to deliver it. One of the key messages from one of the seven people who reported back at the final stages of the citizens' jury was the fact that they could not trust their government to deliver.

I look at, for instance, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital—a \$1.7 billion project that will now cost in excess of \$2.3 billion. People say, 'Hang on, if the government can't even build a hospital, how are we going to expect them to build a waste dump that is going to need to be looked after for tens of thousands of years?' That was one of the key messages that came out of that debate and one of the key reasons why South Australians did not support it. More than in any other way, this tyranny of low expectations has manifested itself in the latest BankSA consumer confidence survey, which shows that confidence is at a 20-year low in South Australia. South Australians think so little of their state and think so little of their government and potentially they think that this is the norm that we should be accepting.

More needs to be done, and the electricity debate we are having at the moment is helping to drive this state of malaise that we see ourselves in. The fact that we cannot even keep the lights on in South Australia is symbolic of these low expectations and of our government meeting the extremely low expectations that we have of them. If we are to restore South Australia to its full glory, to restore it to greatness, the first thing we need to do is raise expectations. Until we do that, we are not going to want more from ourselves than we are currently getting.

I have had the good fortune to live in other states in Australia and have had limited opportunity to go and see the rest of the world, so I have seen what raised expectations look like. That is the first thing a government needs to do in order to restore so many other key things in South Australia. We are taught as children that, before we can ask others to like us, we have to first like ourselves. In order to make friends with others, in order to be warm and inviting to others, we first need to be comfortable in ourselves and see the worth that is within ourselves in order to project that externally. That is holding South Australia back.

I see articles in the paper on both sides of this debate. I see people trying to talk up South Australia to counter the tyranny of our low expectations and I see articles that, from time to time, seek to reinforce it. We need to move past this debate. We need to become comfortable in our skin. We need to celebrate our strengths. We need to acknowledge and feel comfortable in our place within Australia as South Australia and as Adelaide, not as an adjunct to Sydney and Melbourne. In doing so and in becoming comfortable with the good things we have around us, we need to raise our expectations, so that we can continue to further this great state we live in.

Raising expectations is important in and of itself, but it leads to some other very serious flow-on effects that, over time, will actually change South Australia for the better. The man who was

best able to achieve this, and whose results are, I think, unimpeachable, stares down upon us every single day—Sir Thomas Playford. At the time he was leading South Australia, there was no question about the greatness of South Australia. It stood third in the population stakes in the size of our economy. It was amongst the leading economies in Australia when it came to growth, when it came to job creation, when it came to the bringing of new industries to South Australia.

We were at the forefront of the post Second World War economic recovery in Australia. At that time in our history, nobody questioned our place within this commonwealth. It has been a steady genteel decline since 1965 that leads us to the situation we have today. But what do raised expectations lead to? When we meet those expectations, when our government meets those expectations, it leads to a raising of confidence. The reason that confidence is important is because it inspires investment from a business point of view. It inspires business leaders and large businesses, smaller businesses and household businesses to invest.

When you feel confident and strong about the future potential of the state you live in, you are willing to put your money on the line to help further that. I think it is something that governments grapple with all the time, and I think that raising and meeting expectations leading to a growth in business confidence can see business investment grow in South Australia. What it will also have the effect of doing is raising consumer confidence, and when consumers feel confident, they spend money. That money is spent in hospitality, retail and a whole host of areas that help to grow our economy.

When you have raised expectations and met expectations, and you have raised confidence and that leads to raised investment levels and spending levels, what does that mean? Jobs growth. That is first and foremost the key failing of this government—its inability to put the right settings in place to ensure growth in our economy that leads to new and ever-increasing numbers of jobs. Interestingly, if we were to raise and meet expectations, raise confidence, raise investment and spending, and raise jobs growth, that would have the effect of keeping our young people here. The failure to do this is a key source of shame for South Australians. They do not leave because of the lifestyle, because our lifestyle is unenviable. They leave for job opportunities, and the only way we are going to get those job opportunities here is to ensure that our economy is booming as it should.

I know that in the Barossa Valley we have a challenge keeping our young people, but we certainly do a whole lot better than most other regional areas because in the Barossa our unemployment rate sits at about 4 per cent. As a young person, if you want a job, there is one there for you. Fair enough, most of those are concentrated in the wine industry, but it is one of the key reasons why in the Barossa we are able to keep our young people more so than other areas in regional South Australia.

The added flow-on effect of keeping more of our young people here is that they in turn consume. What happens when they consume is that they create more jobs growth themselves, and it becomes a virtuous cycle, and if it is allowed to germinate and continue it will change the face of South Australia. This has to be the most important work that this government does, that any government does. In fact, I believe that this next election is going to be a referendum on who has a better plan for restoring state pride.

Who has the better plan for allowing South Australia to come out from under the rock that it has been hiding under and, in the words of our leader, the member for Dunstan, for South Australia to shine again? I think that when South Australians look towards this next election, they need not simply succumb to the malaise, the incompetence and the tyranny of low expectations. Rather, South Australians should raise their eyes above the horizon and want more for themselves and want more from their government and look to vote for somebody who is going to deliver on that promise.

There will only be one party at the next election that will be able to make that promise, and that will be the South Australian Liberal Party, because the Labor Party has presided over some of the worst conditions in our state's history. This next election will definitely be a referendum on 16 years of mess versus the promise of a better future. One of the other ways in which I think the government and a future Liberal government can help to cement that renewed confidence in South Australia is by getting some of the fundamentals right. Whilst raised expectations and raised

confidence are one thing, we need to ensure that when these decisions to spend and invest are made the settings that underpin those decisions are right.

I am talking about taxation and about the fact that on this side of the house we have committed to returning \$360 million to the pockets of South Australian households, businesses and community groups. I am talking about electricity pricing where, if South Australians had confidence and the market had confidence in the future direction of our electricity market—and there is, indeed, growth in our electricity market—that would help to stabilise electricity prices in South Australia. I am talking about other utility prices and about the fact that we have the highest water prices in the country.

I am also talking about red tape reduction. We know that new business growth in this state has been stagnant for way too long, but it is only through the generation and germination of new businesses that we will see job growth come about, again people making that decision to invest. That is only going to happen when the fundamentals are there to allow it to happen; not to pick winners and not to pick losers, as is the wont of this Labor government, but to fix it so that everybody can thrive and that individual business owners making that decision can do so with the best set of circumstances in mind.

I would like to talk about debt. It is an issue this government tries to run away from on a regular basis. There is good debt and there is bad debt. Good debt is investing in infrastructure, helping to grow the productive areas of our economy. Good debt is investing in ideas like Globe Link, an idea to help improve the productive capacity of our economy by making it easier for our exporters to get fresh produce out of this state. Good debt is about investing in our road network and our transport network to make it easier for people to get around.

Bad debt is what we have seen since 2010 here in South Australia. Bad debt is when the government has to borrow money to fund recurrent spending deficits in state government spending. That is what bad debt looks like. This year the Treasurer stood up and boldly said, 'I've finally delivered a surplus.' South Australians could be forgiven for thinking that finally we have stopped investing in bad debt, but the truth is that we had to sell assets in order to make that figure look the way it did. So the bad debt train still continues here in South Australia, and that needs to change in order for us to get off the mat and start to return to the beautiful promise that is South Australia.

In my shadow portfolio area, we have seen some difficulty. We see that in Corrections the rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em experiment has failed. Has it made South Australia safer? That has to be the first priority of any correctional services system in South Australia. The answer is no. ABS statistics released a few months ago show that we have the highest rate of offending on record in relation to the ABS statistics as they have been collected. This is against the backdrop of the fact that we have the highest number of police per capita in the nation. We are investing more in our police system per capita than anywhere else in the country but, behind the Northern Territory, we are actually getting the worst results in the nation. That is not a good return on investment for community safety.

When it comes to our prison system, we have seen our rate of reoffending go from, as Peggy Hora put in her report of 2008, 32 per cent up to now, as the government calls it, 46 per cent. This means that when people go through our gaol system and come back into our community they are much more likely to reoffend. Not only does that make our community less safe, it also costs us more money because every prisoner sitting in prison costs about \$100,000 a year.

Costs have increased. In only the last two years, the 2014-15 actual result saw us spend \$254 million in the area of corrections and this year's budget has us at \$313 million. That is money that could otherwise be used to do good in South Australia; instead, it is being used to pay for the failed policies this Labor government has perpetrated over the past decade. This is an area where we must do better, because we are currently failing our community.

I look at our emergency services, where emergency services bills keep going up and up and up. Again, South Australians could be forgiven for thinking that this money was going towards improving emergency services. The truth is it is not. What it is doing is displacing general government expenditure. There is no extra money for emergency services. There is only extra money for the

general government sector to pay for the mismanagement and waste that exists across our government.

The other sick thing that I think this government has done is use tragedies—bushfires—as a way to increase emergency services levies off the back of the goodwill of South Australians. We have had the Pinery bushfire and the Sampson Flat bushfire in the last couple of years, both of which affected my electorate. The Sampson Flat bushfire was an expensive exercise costing somewhere in the order of \$6 million or \$7 million.

Understandably, the government sought to recover that amount of money as a one-off increase in the emergency services levy from South Australians. I think that every South Australian was willing to do their bit to help pay for that crisis and that tragedy, but did the government come back the next year and take that portion of the emergency services levy cost off the bill? No, they built that increase into the emergency services levy revenue collection, and we are essentially going to be paying for the Sampson Flat bushfire not once but every single year into eternity.

The Pinery fire that happened last year was a shorter and cheaper tragedy which only cost a couple of million dollars, and I will be looking forward to seeing what the government brings to us this year to see whether again they are going to attempt to take extra taxation off South Australians on the back of what is otherwise a sad tragedy.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Schubert's time has expired. The member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:51): Thank you, the Independent Madam Deputy Speaker. I rise to speak to the Supply Bill 2017 and note that I think it is the 12th time I have made a contribution to supply. If we do not pass the Supply Bill, it will not allow the continued payment of public servants and public services until the Appropriation Bill (budget bill) is passed by parliament later this year, so we obviously need to pass the Supply Bill because it finances the pay of public servants and ourselves as representatives of the state.

I want to note that the appropriation for the Supply Bill this year is \$5.907 billion, but in 2016 the Supply Bill sought an amount of \$3.444 billion, while in 2015 the appropriation for supply was \$3.291 billion. In 2014, the appropriation was \$3.941 billion, so it is to be noted that there was a drop between 2014 and 2015, a slight increase in 2016, but then a significant jump from the \$3.444 billion in 2016 to this year when \$5.907 billion is being sought. This is a significant jump, especially when you compare it with what has happened in the previous three years, so it will be interesting to hear, in any government contribution, how they explain this massive jump in what is required for the Supply Bill.

We have seen over time budgets being listed as jobs budgets. We have heard about the 100,000 jobs the Premier is seeking for this state. I think they may have been lucky to get in the very low 2,000s or 3,000s. As the member for Schubert identified in his contribution, South Australia's unemployment rate remains the highest in the nation and shows that the state budgets that this government has presided over have failed and failed miserably. Not only are we not giving our people jobs in this state but these people are leaving by the thousands to go either interstate or overseas to find work.

In last year's budget, I note that there was predicted jobs growth in South Australia of only 0.75 per cent, and reaffirmed in the Mid-Year Budget Review, which is less than half the national jobs growth rate of 1.8 per cent in the federal budget. In the Mid-Year Budget Review, GST revenue for this year will be \$512 million more than in 2015-16 and in the 2017-18 financial year GST revenue is estimated to increase by another \$410 million. So, the full GST revenue for next year will be \$922 million more than was collected in 2015-16. That is nearly a billion dollars of extra revenue that this state was not expecting to get in the current financial year moving forward into 2017-18.

That brings to mind a bit of history. Since I have been in this place, there have been many times when hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of GST revenue that has not been budgeted for has come into the state government coffers, yet it has been washed away, frittered away, and what do we have to show for it? That is a very good question.

Another part of the Mid-Year Budget Review shows that total returns from the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission is now estimated to be at about \$2.5 billion. Of this amount, \$1.16 billion assisted the net operating balance of the budgets in the years 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17. The MAC dividend in 2016-17 of \$298 million compares with the estimated net operating surplus of \$300 million.

I want to make some comments about the ongoing privatisations that have happened over time. We saw that the former treasurer and member for Port Adelaide tried to sell a building in Adelaide, but the state did not even own the land underneath, so that was quite a failure to say the least. We have seen issues over Gillman where a very dodgy deal was drawn up. It was supposed to be an oil and gas hub for this state, yet we have seen all that drift away because there was no due process taken into account to make sure that there was an open and transparent arrangement in the case of Gillman.

We do need an oil and gas hub in this state to service our Cooper Basin and I have spoken about it many times. I worked up there over 30 years ago. There may be a few kilometres of unsealed road, but between Brisbane and the Queensland border, only 24 kilometres from Innamincka, there is a bitumen road. The last time I drove it there was probably 30 or 40 kilometres that was dirt, but I think it has been bitumised since.

You have to ask the question: why does our state not take the lead? If the government wants to do something for the oil and gas industry in this state, they need to make sure that they fund the full upgrade of the Strzelecki Track. If they are serious about getting more gas supplies, increasing gas exploration and making sure those dividends come back to South Australia so that the service companies that operate the wells—not just the operators like Santos and others, but the service companies—will keep their trucks and their supplies coming up from Adelaide and not out of Brisbane so that we can have those jobs in South Australia.

We could get that just over 400 kilometres of road to the Cooper Basin bitumised so that we can get that freight up there without destroying trucks and destroying vehicles. As we have seen elsewhere across the state, people are making a business decision and saying, 'Why would I destroy my freight and my vehicles and come up from Adelaide when I could do it on a far better road out of Brisbane?' That is vital, especially when we are seeing so many problems with electricity supply in this state and we need to open up more gas in the Cooper to make that happen. I want to talk about a few local issues that need to be raised.

In regard to health, we see that it will look like about \$2.3 billion being spent on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. We heard today that there is a plan for clinicians to be trained on how they are going to do the move to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. I will be very surprised if it comes at the forecast time of the upcoming winter because I cannot think of a worse time to try to move hospital patients from one part of North Terrace right up to the corner of West Terrace where the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is. I cannot think of a worse time not just for the risk of illness but for the likely unsettled weather we will have at the time. I would be surprised if it happened before spring, quite frankly.

We have seen tens of thousands of problems with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital having to be rectified before a deal was cut so that the government could finally have access to the building. It is going through pre-handover stages at the moment, but it will be interesting to see how it operates after all this time and all these budget blowouts. Sadly, for many decades to come we will see the cost of that deal—\$1 million a day just to operate it before you put the staff in the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

On a local issue—and I do not directly represent Strathalbyn; I represent over 100 addresses around Strathalbyn and I used to represent Strathalbyn when I first came into this place—I want to talk about what has happened with Kalimna, a nursing home for locals that has been shut down. I believe that it has been shut down by a short-sighted government that could have had a proper engineering look at the building to get it compliant.

I have some problems (and I mentioned this at the public meeting at Strathalbyn when well over 200, and probably close to 300, people were attendance in the hall) about the fact that these compliance measures came in. I talked about the CFS—and I am not talking about the local CFS,

the local volunteers, but the statewide bureaucracy, and I want to note my position as a CFS volunteer at Coomandook—and their fire safety regime that was brought in to Kalimna. This was stated as a factor in why it was closing down.

What I have learnt is the simple fact that all the rooms had direct access outside and that people could be taken out very quickly in case of an emergency, such as a fire. Beyond that, I think it would have been cheaper in the long run because this is going to turn out to be a very expensive exercise over time. The government could have had a really good look at the engineering and the nursing home could have been brought up to spec. I still wonder why so many hurdles were put in place when this place has been operating for so long, keeping people in their local community.

People had to be moved out to places as far afield as Gumeracha—a long way from what they called home. I think it is just disgraceful. I know from personal experience with my father that, even though people might be a bit reluctant going into these places, once they are there for a while they call them home, so what has happened there is disgraceful.

I look at the road network around the place. It was interesting to ask some questions the other day of the transport minister in regard to some roads that were damaged in flooding and storms about seven months ago at Langhorne Creek. They had not been patched up at all and, coming into vintage only a few weeks ago, a few good Langhorne Creek residents got hold of me to go up and have a look. I said, 'Yes, this is no good.'

Thankfully, the Alexandrina council had taken some emergency measures to fill in some potholes to get those roads at least passable. From what I understand, most of them were finally dealt with once I asked the minister in this place what was going on with the emergency repairs so that the vital vintage of that excellent Langhorne Creek wine could take place safely.

Areas of the Mallee that have not been in my electorate for the last three years because of redistribution are coming back into Hammond next year at the election. When I look at the Karoonda Highway and the Mallee Highway through Lameroo and Pinnaroo, both those roads urgently need overtaking lanes, especially the Mallee Highway out through Pinnaroo which, quite frankly, has more bends in it than any other road I have seen in the world.

It is a really interesting piece of road engineering. I note and commend the trial of road trains coming out of Pinnaroo into Tailem Bend. I think that is a good move. However, it also exacerbates the issue that people will be behind a longer vehicle with not many options to overtake. I urge the government to look to at least some overtaking lanes on both the Mallee Highway and the Karoonda-Loxton road.

An issue I need to raise in regard to health in my area is the Murray Bridge Hospital emergency department, which urgently needs up to \$3½ million spent on revamping it. It has been something like 30 or 40 years since any real work was done in that field. We have positive population growth, and not just in Murray Bridge. The surrounding area has a regional centre that services people from all the way down to Keith, all the way down to Pinnaroo, right up into the Hills and also down towards Meningie. It is a hub where a lot is happening.

The Gifford Hill proposal for the racing club is slowly taking shape. The Shahin Group, the Peregrine group, is building the grandstand section for the new motorsport park at Tailem Bend. If that goes to plan, there will be many events, and there will be a need for emergency care, whether for people competing in events or people going there as spectators. We certainly need some work done on the emergency department to get it up to speed for challenges that will come in the future.

In regard to other issues of education, Murray Bridge High School is vitally in need of new buildings, as growth at Murray Bridge is phenomenal. They are doing some great work—I had the minister out there to have a look at what is going on at Murray Bridge—but it certainly needs a new build program, especially if year 7 comes into that school.

As to water issues, I look at what the government has done about the River Murray. We hear long and loud at times how the Premier and his government believe that they have saved the River Murray. Well, they were not thinking about saving the River Murray or my electorate, or the member for Chaffey's electorate, or the other electorates that touch on the River Murray, when they knocked

back \$25 million of diversification funding that would have done so much for both the Riverland and the Lower Murray and put more confidence back into the community.

But why would the Premier and Treasurer do that? Why would they? Well, that is a very good question to ask. It is because they are conservative electorates and that is exactly where they do not go. I have always said that it is an absolute disgrace that the money was not brought into our communities for local projects—some for industry, some for tourism ventures and some for making town interests better and more appealing—so that people could see the good things that happen in not just my area but up through the Riverland as well. It galls me every time I hear, 'The government have done so much for the River Murray,' yet those very communities that are reliant on the River Murray and its surrounds just get left out in the cold.

Part of the issue of getting left out in the cold is what happens with the new NRM water levy, which is part of the levy regime that is paying a fair whack of the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resource's staff wages. Sporting clubs write to me because they have to pay a \$200 water levy because they have a water licence to water their oval. That is a lot of money for a small cricket club, and I have multiple cases like that. We also have issues we need to sort out about giving people tenure in shacks.

We have seen legislation introduced in this place that has not been well organised, such as legislation on planning and child protection, and which has had to be amended multiple times. The child protection bill was rushed into this place and all of a sudden went out again because it was not organised. There was a big fanfare when it came in, but it had to be amended before we started the debate. But the biggest issue hitting this state is electricity prices, the reason that so many companies are failing or choosing to invest elsewhere. It is a disgrace.

Because of this government's ideological zeal to get into green power, I see companies facing price rises of 142 per cent in their power bills directly linked to the Hazelwood closure. They have stated that to me. This government is quite happy to take, as they are today, 600 megawatts of coal-fired power in from Victoria, but they are too one-eyed to see the simple fact that we need reliable power supplies in this state so that we can bring this state back to the prosperous place it once was.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (17:11): I also would like to make a contribution on the Supply Bill 2017. I think we all know that it is a pretty important bit of machinery that keeps us ticking along and keeps us paying our bills and debts, which is most important. The Supply Bill is also an annual marker that gives us an opportunity to reflect on the previous 12 months, a chance to stop and consider the work of the state government and government expenditure over this period.

The first observation I would like to make is that the government's request for supply under this 2017 bill is for \$5.9 billion from the Consolidated Account. In recent years, the appropriation requested under the Supply Bill has been quite a bit less: in 2014, it was \$3.94 billion; in 2015, it was \$3.291 billion; and in 2016 it was \$3.44 billion. We have jumped to \$5.9 billion under appropriation, and I would be keen to hear from those opposite as to why this increase in appropriation of \$2.5 billion is on the table.

This is my third opportunity to speak on supply in this house. As I said, it is another opportunity to reflect on past achievements, or part thereof, to consider the wellbeing of South Australians and to see whether there has been an improvement for them over the past 12 months. Unfortunately, there has been very little improvement in the economic life of the average South Australian. As the member for Hammond so rightly pointed out, energy and electricity is one of the biggest issues facing our state right now.

In the last 12 months, we have seen unprecedented power blackouts, including the statewide blackout in September that has caused huge economic distress to South Australians, small businesses and individuals alike. Decreasing reliability on South Australia's energy market is pushing up the price of electricity for individuals and small, medium and large businesses alike. The price of electricity affects businesses, from mum-and-dad businesses to our huge manufacturers and energy users, such as Adelaide Brighton Cement.

If we do not improve and do something soon about the cost of electricity in South Australia, we will see more financial distress for individuals and we will see more businesses leaving the state

as they just cannot compete. The state of our state has been deteriorating. South Australia's gross state product grew by only 1.9 per cent in 2015-16, compared with 2.8 per cent nationally, and only Tasmania and Western Australia recorded slower growth rates.

To the year ended September 2016, South Australia lost 6,484 people. One of the biggest issues causing so much economic hardship and structural inefficiencies in our economy is people leaving our state year on year, and especially young people leaving our state year on year. I know that this is something I bang on about so often, and I know that it is an issue we talk about on this side of the house so often, but if young people cannot stay in Adelaide they leave. It is a simple matter of fact, and this government has done very little to reverse that fortune.

Back in February 2010, Labor promised that they would create 100,000 new jobs. The reality is that only about 20,000 new jobs have been created since February 2010, and the vast majority of those increases have been in the Public Service. Very few private sector jobs have been created since 2010 when former premier Rann got up and promised 100,000 jobs.

The 2015-16 state budget was earmarked as the jobs budget, yet current trend unemployment is sitting at 6.6 per cent, the highest in the nation, and our seasonally adjusted unemployment is sitting at the second highest in the nation. For the last two years, the Treasurer has come out and banged on about the importance of his jobs budget and how it would improve the unemployment rate in South Australia. The reality is that today, two years after the 2015 state budget, we have the highest trend unemployment in the nation, and unemployment is a huge scourge.

The scourge of unemployment—the scourge of not having a job, the scourge of not having full-time work and the scourge of unemployment and the isolation that it brings, the frustration that it brings, the dislocation that it brings and the disunity and harm that it brings to families—is possibly the biggest single issue that faces an individual. So many people, especially long-term unemployed, feel that they cannot participate in society. If you cannot participate in society, you are increasingly led to isolation, and increasing isolation has so many detrimental effects on you as an individual and the community you live in. To fix the scourge of unemployment, together with energy, should be the absolute number one priority for this government.

We need to fix this issue of unemployment. We need to do more than we are doing at the moment. We need to do more, and we also need to acknowledge that this government set its goal for its jobs program and its jobs budget, but it has failed. Because of that, our economy is stagnant. As I said, young people are deserting our state. They are young and talented future leaders, entrepreneurs and innovators. They are all leaving our state, and it is unlikely that they will return. Unfortunately, there has not been a lot to celebrate in recent years on the job front.

To highlight that point, I would like to read out some of the well-known South Australian companies that have either closed or downsized since the last election in 2014. Penrice has lost close to 200 jobs in South Australia, ForestrySA has lost about 66 jobs and Pacific Services Group, about 100 job losses.

Mr Gardner: The Florey sub-branch.

Mr DULUK: The Florey sub-branch has probably lost quite a few members as well. Nyrstar has seen constant job losses in Port Pirie. Arnott's has seen the loss of about 120 jobs; Pacific Brands, a loss of over 100 jobs; Ingham's Aldinga Turkeys, about 79 jobs; ACI, 60; Caroma, about 76; Treasury Wine, close to 50; and ABC Adelaide has seen huge reductions. Holden, of course, has seen hundreds of job losses, and the closure of Holden will have a huge impact on the community in our northern suburbs.

Arrium has lost 500 jobs; Santos continues to shed jobs; BHP, of course, has seen a lot of retrenchment and job losses; Monroe's; SA Outreach, about 400 jobs; Fairfax in South Australia; Beach Energy; Unibooks, about 100 jobs; University of Adelaide; Australia Post; Alinta; Arrium; Tagara; Schweppes in Payneham, an iconic South Australian brand; and yesterday we heard that News Limited was also downsizing in South Australia.

These are some of the big employers who have shed their workforce in South Australia over time. There are some really big structural issues that we need to look at. The majority of jobs that have been lost have been well-paid jobs, so there is the whole issue of taxation revenue affecting

the state and, of course, the people's ability to spend and consume in our economy, which is so important.

The latest NAB Monthly Business Survey shows a downturn in business conditions and business confidence in South Australia. We are the only state in the country to record a fall in business conditions in March this year, and we are one of only two states to record a reduction in business confidence. The CommSec State of the States report ranks South Australia seventh out of eight states in terms of economic performance. They include the territories in their measurement. Our leading banks and our leading economists all point to serious issues in the South Australian economy.

At the same time that state government expenditure has increased by almost \$2.5 billion, which has been requested through appropriation, our state has been in sharp decline. The ineptitude of this Labor government is exemplified by the blatant waste of taxpayer money we see across the board. The government's PR juggernaut continues on a daily basis. The government has spent almost a million dollars to make the public more enthusiastic about the opening of the NRAH and half a million dollars to spruik its half a billion dollar energy plan. The government is wasting your money to make you feel good about an energy crisis the government has created. It is very Orwellian.

Hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars were spent last year on the Premier's eight-week spin campaign to make us feel good about the state's jobless rate. It is one of the greatest ironies that we are going to spruik South Australian economic conditions and how poor they are with a jobless campaign. In my letterbox the other day, I received an advertising flyer spruiking changes to Noarlunga Hospital—taxpayers being told about a cut to services in their own hospital.

This government is wasting about \$2.6 million on public servants' car parks that are not used and about \$2 million on office sites that sit empty. It goes on and on. We see about \$300,000 being spent on minister Bignell's travel, which goes on and on, and we are paying for his Argentinian wine. South Australians have to pay for chief executives to commute from out of town every weekend. We constantly see government waste and spin. We see South Australia wasting money on rebranding of child protection.

We constantly see waste upon waste upon waste because this government has no solution. It does not believe in the private sector. It wants to be the only corporation in town. We are a one company town. Living in South Australia is almost like living in North Korea at the moment. The government, being the only company in town, needs to tell everyone that it is the only company in town and does everything in its power to push out private investment as it is doing in the energy market at the moment. It says, 'We want to be in charge and we will waste your taxpayer money to let you know we are in charge.'

We do not see money being invested in South Australia businesses. I would much prefer to see the millions of dollars spent on government advertising being put back into local businesses. It is certainly not being spent on our hospitals because we know we are closing hospital beds and because Transforming Health is all about saving money. We know it is not being spent on our roads—certainly not the roads in my community.

My constituents are very angry about the government's performance. They are very angry about high unemployment. My older residents are particularly angry about the need for their children and grandchildren to move interstate. They are angry about the closure of services such as the Repat in their community. More than anything, they are angry at the arrogance of this government, with their lack of consultation and the tin ear of this government. The small businesses in my electorate are angry that they do not have a reliable energy supply.

They are disgusted that child protection is an ongoing issue. On my office window I have the front pages of *The Advertiser* regarding child protection available for people to see—the number of people who come past my office and stop to read about the disgrace that is child protection in this state. It really irks South Australians, and I do not know if the government knows about that. As I said, they do not like to listen to the real concerns of South Australians.

On a daily basis, I hear about the detrimental effects of Transforming Health from my local residents and medical practitioners. They are dismayed at the way this government is going about that. They are pretty disappointed with road funding throughout my area. As everyone in this house

knows, I constantly bang on about the roads in the Mitcham Hills, including the Blackwood roundabout. I had the opportunity yesterday to ask the Minister for Transport some questions about the Blackwood roundabout funding, and in his answer to one of my questions the minister confirmed that the Blackwood roundabout falls outside what he considers to be 'incredibly important upgrades'.

Minister, for those people in my community, and even as reported by AAMI, fixing the Blackwood roundabout is indeed an incredibly important priority. However, it is not a priority for this Labor government and it is not a priority for anyone who supports this Labor government, whether or not they purport to be a member of the government. The Blackwood roundabout is a key road for daily commuters and it is simply dismissed as not important enough by this government.

I say to my residents in Blackwood, Coromandel Valley, Craighburn Farm, Eden Hills, Bellevue Heights, Hawthorndene and beyond into Happy Valley and Aberfoyle Park: this government does not care about you. They know that you use this roundabout every day on the way to work, school and the shops, but for 15 years this government has ignored your interests. They have drawn a line through the infrastructure needs of your community, and I think that is an absolute disgrace.

Residents and passengers on the Belair train line are frustrated that the government has failed to invest in infrastructure that facilitates and encourages the use of this passenger service. Park-and-ride facilities have long been promised by this government, but with so much spin and waste they cannot find any funds to deliver on their 2014 election promise. They cannot find funds to purchase the ARTC site adjacent to the Eden Hills train station which has been used as an unofficial car park by Belair passengers for many years until its recent closure.

To build a strong, prosperous South Australia we must improve business conditions and business confidence. We must increase business profitability and induce investment into our state. We must be committed to building a pro business climate. The South Australian Liberal team is the team that can build that environment. We are committed to lowering costs and reducing the tax burden on businesses and households.

We are committed to cutting red tape and unnecessary regulation. It is red tape that is one of those evils that lurks in our economy, and it is red tape that makes businesses less competitive. It is red tape that forces mum-and-dad small business owners to stay up late on weeknights and weekends filling out paperwork, ensuring that compliance is undertaken. It means that they are not spending time with their family and it means they are not spending time reinvesting in their businesses because they are dealing with business red tape.

On this side of the house, as a future Liberal government we will be investing in projects that drive economic activity in South Australia, and Globe Link will be one of those drivers of economic activity. We know that over the last 15 years South Australia's share of national merchandise exports has shrunk from 7.3 per cent to 4.3 per cent. If we are to be a prosperous state again, if we are to be a state with low unemployment, an efficient state where our farmers and manufacturers and exporters do the very best they can, we really need to improve our share of exports. We need to have efficient transport whether it be road, rail or air. Globe Link will lead to those efficiencies.

We know that by 2030 the freight line that goes through metropolitan Adelaide in the Mitcham Hills in my community through the Adelaide Hills will be at its capacity. We know we need to do something to fix that up. By increasing infrastructure efficiencies in our export and freight networks, we will improve supply chain efficiencies and we will improve market competitiveness, and ultimately this will lead to lower costs to consumers at the retail point of the market. Efficient and effective transport networks are also fundamental to deepening markets. They bring businesses closer to new markets, creating more opportunities, and closer to existing markets, improving accessibility and competitiveness. They also promote innovation and a more active economy.

Improving exports and investing in infrastructure is actually one of the best things you can do to reduce unemployment. That is why the South Australian Liberal team is committed to Globe Link and that is why I will support it every step of the way. Globe Link will transform our economic capacity. It will provide that generational upgrade for our freight infrastructure that will last us for decades to come. As I said, it will help our farmers and our industrial, agricultural and food sectors. We need to compete, and we are in a highly competitive environment.

The reality is that our existing infrastructure is simply not up to scratch. The government's plan, in terms of road freight, includes having heavy rigid trucks and B-doubles going down Cross Road. It wants to ensure that double-stack trains 1.9 kilometres long keep going through the Mitcham Hills. This is not efficient public infrastructure. This is not infrastructure that will lead to export growth and lower unemployment. We need alternative routes when it comes to export opportunities, and the South Australian Liberal Party is committed to improving the economic conditions of this state.

Mr PICTON (Karna) (17:31): It is a pleasure to rise to support the Supply Bill this year. As we know, every year the Supply Bill is introduced as a measure in which we enable funding for all the important things the government does until the state budget and its bills are passed by this parliament.

It is a pleasure to again talk about some of the very important things that were in the 2016-17 state budget that are now in the process of being rolled out across the state. Certainly, it was a pleasure and a career highlight of mine to work with the Treasurer on that 2016-17 state budget, in which we really delivered on the key priorities for South Australia, the first and foremost of which was jobs for South Australians. We could deliver a lot of the things in the 2016-17 state budget because we have delivered budget surpluses in this state. That is a very important thing that the parliament should be reminded of at every opportunity, that we have delivered surpluses.

The 2015-16 budget was in surplus and we are projecting surpluses throughout the forward years of estimates. That is important, first, because we were able to invest in a number of important programs for jobs and infrastructure in the last budget and, secondly, because when it comes to this coming budget, the 2017-18 budget, we will be able to invest in very important elements of our state energy plan, which has been announced. We are able to fund those things because we took the prudent decisions, the careful financial management decisions, to make sure that our state budget is in surplus.

I will just go through some of the important elements in the budget. As I said, first and foremost it is about jobs. We have introduced into South Australia what is called the Job Accelerator Grants Scheme. This is something where we have looked at the evidence interstate, and in particular the success of jobs grants in New South Wales, and adapted it to the South Australian context. Through these job grants, every small and medium-size business in South Australia is able to employ extra people and receive support from the state government to do so.

If you are a business paying payroll tax, we will give a grant of \$10,000 over two years for each employee a business hires. If you are a small, very small or a start-up business that is not paying any payroll tax at the moment, we will give a grant of \$4,000 over two years. The reaction to this has been very positive. All the key interest groups have been very supportive of this scheme. Of course, the proof is in the pudding, and we have seen that businesses have been relishing the chance to take up these grants and to employ extra people in South Australia.

Off the top of my head, I believe over 7,000 South Australian jobs have been applied for through this program, and it is great to see that those smaller and medium-sized businesses, which are of course the vast majority of South Australian employers, are taking up the opportunity to hire extra staff. Through this, we have now seen both a reduction in our unemployment rate but also, very importantly, I think now 18 months of consecutive jobs growth in South Australia. So, for 18 months there have been more people employed than in the month before.

We now have a record number of South Australians working, and that is a great sign for our economy. Only the other day, we saw the NAB Monthly Business Survey show that we have the second highest business confidence in the country. South Australian businesses are relishing these opportunities to hire extra staff.

That is not the only thing we have done on the jobs front though in the budget. We have of course continued our tax relief for South Australian businesses. We believe we now have the most competitive business tax rates of any state or territory in the commonwealth, and that makes South Australia a very attractive place to invest and run a business in. We have seen a number of different studies, including the KPMG survey, showing that South Australia, compared with other states, is a very attractive place to run a business in.

We have eliminated a lot of the stamp duties that applied to businesses, particularly involving non-real property assets. If we wanted to change the shareholding of a business, we would take our slice of that in stamp duty. We no longer do that in South Australia. We have reduced by a third the stamp duty on commercial property transactions. That is set to be reduced by another third from the middle of this year, and then it is poised to be reduced to zero. So, if you buy or sell a commercial property in South Australia, there is no stamp duty on that transaction anymore. That is a massive advantage for people involved in the property industry in South Australia and for people owning properties through their businesses in South Australia.

We have also invested heavily in this budget in innovation because we know that we not only need the jobs we have now in South Australia, but we need the jobs of the future. This is something that Kyam Maher has been working towards, and we are very keen that we make sure that we develop new businesses, particularly using a lot of the great capabilities we have through our university sector.

We really need to work better and harder at commercialising the technology that our researchers are coming up with to develop new products and new services that we can export around the world, so there is a very significant element of this budget that involves innovation, including making sure that we have the support for venture capital that is needed so those people who are starting up businesses or expanding their commercialisation base will want to stay in South Australia rather than go either interstate or overseas to do that work.

Another key element in this budget is our defence industries, making sure that we are prepared in South Australia to take up the opportunities that lie ahead for us as the defence state. We have seen the benefits of our successful lobbying for not only submarines but also the frigates and the offshore patrol vessels, at least initially, which will all be built in South Australia. None of that was going to happen. It took a lot of hard work, a lot of lobbying and a lot of campaigning to make sure that that was going to happen in South Australia.

As people will remember, we had a defence minister who said that the ASC could not build a canoe. We have turned that around to the point where we now have the French coming here to build 12 new submarines. That is not just going to be great for that project, but it is really going to make South Australia a key element of Australia's defence industries.

We saw the benefit of that just in the last week or so when Boeing announced that they are going to move and establish a new centre here in South Australia with 250 jobs for their defence element and their research and development. I expect that we will see many more companies doing the same thing. We are investing the money that we need to engage with France and to make sure that the facilities are right at Osborne but also to do that work with suppliers to make sure that we get as much of that work that is going to be happening in these massive projects in South Australia.

The other element connected to that is the work that we have been doing on investment in South Australia. We have our new body, Investment Attraction SA, which has been doing great work in terms of attracting new businesses to South Australia. Often, for very small amounts of money, relatively, we have been able to attract businesses to start up and move things here in South Australia and create thousands and thousands of jobs for South Australia, which is very positive. This new body has had tremendous success over the last couple of years. There is money in the budget to continue that and I am sure that we will see more and more success stories coming out of that body.

A very important point the member for Giles spoke about in the parliament earlier today was that we need to make sure that we keep our steel industry here in South Australia, and he has certainly been at the forefront of campaigning on that issue. We do have money in the budget to make sure that we work with the new buyers of Arrium to ensure that steel has a long and successful future of being produced in South Australia and, indeed, in Australia.

This is an industry that we think is of critical national importance. We want to make sure this industry has a long future in South Australia. The steel industry is obviously very important not only for Whyalla but also for the whole state and the whole country. The Treasurer has been doing a huge amount of work to make sure that we have that future for this industry in South Australia and I am confident, hopefully in partnership with the commonwealth government, that we will be able to secure that future here for a long time to come.

Another very critical element not only for jobs but also for important services in South Australia is what we are doing on infrastructure. We know that spending on infrastructure in South Australia employs some 6,000 people per year, and there are a number of reasons for that. First, we are guaranteeing our spending over the forward estimates at \$1.5 billion a year in infrastructure, which is a huge amount when you look at it historically. For instance, there was a very small amount being spent on infrastructure per year when we came to government; I think it something like \$200 million per year. We are now spending \$1.5 billion per year on infrastructure.

Secondly, we are doing a lot of work on making sure that, as much as possible, we can get the benefit of those infrastructure projects delivered to South Australian employees and South Australian companies. I give credit for that to our Industry Advocate, Ian Nightingale, in particular. We will be bringing some legislation to the parliament later this year to cement his position. I think we have the best system of doing that anywhere in the country and we are seeing the benefits for all of our supply chain in South Australia.

Obviously, the largest project in our infrastructure delivery is South Road. There are now three major projects underway on South Road, namely, Darlington, which affects people in the southern suburbs such as myself; the Torrens to Torrens project, which we have seen reach some critical points in recent months; and the Northern Connector, which is very important for employment in the northern suburbs. I give credit to the member for Little Para for his work in the jobs task force out on the Northern Connector project, making sure that we get the full benefit of that for people seeking work in the northern suburbs.

All those elements are underway and they really form the backbone of what will be our road traffic network link through Adelaide, the north-south motorway, for the future of South Australia. That is critically important when you are talking about future industries in South Australia, not only defence but also industries, such as our food and wine industry, that need good access to the ports and good access to the Airport.

The alternative, as has been talked about by the member Davenport, is the bizarre Globe Link proposal which, as we know, is really just about shoring up some seats in the Hills to say to people that the noise from the trains is going to be less. However, it would involve an airport that nobody wants, a road that nobody wants and apparently this is all going to be funded with zero funding from South Australian taxpayers, which I find slightly remarkable. I am not sure that would get past some independent costing analysis on whether spending zero to deliver this probably tens of billions of dollars' worth of folly investments is really going to pass any independent analysis.

But we are actually investing, together with the Liberal Coalition government in Canberra, on South Road, which is universally acknowledged as infrastructure in South Australia which should be invested in Australia and which has been through all the Infrastructure Australia processes, unlike Globe Link, sadly.

Another very important thing that we are investing in in capital works in this budget is STEM (science, technology, engineering and maths), which we are rolling out across primary schools and high schools in South Australia. We know that these particular skills are going to be so important for the next generation to be able to secure the jobs of tomorrow. Look at what I was talking about in relation to the defence industries: so many of those jobs will need a significant basis in those STEM skills. We need to be working now to make sure that our young people are both (a) interested and (b) skilled in those very important skills. Having those science labs, not just in high schools but also in primary schools, we think is going to be critically important.

I remember that when we announced this policy the member for Adelaide came out quite clearly questioning whether we should be investing this money in primary schools at all and whether we needed science labs in schools. I think that just really shows the future versus the past debate we are having in the political circle on so many fronts in South Australia. We actually think that our primary school students should be exposed to science, technology, engineering and maths from a very early age. We make no apologies for that at all, and that is why we are going completely into investing very significantly in our primary schools to make sure this happens.

We are also, of course, investing in our non-government schools in South Australia. We are allowing them to access loans to upgrade their facilities, particularly with a focus on STEM and early

childhood development projects, so a lot of Catholic and other non-government schools are being able to upgrade their facilities. We know that so many of our students attend those schools, and we want to make sure that they have access to good facilities as well. Those education infrastructure elements of our budget are critically important.

We are also investing in our hospitals. I know that in the southern suburbs we are just about to complete the Noarlunga Hospital \$12 million upgrade, which is going to produce two extra state-of-the-art operating theatres. I was talking to a nurse from Noarlunga Hospital the other day who works in the peri-op procedures there, and she is very excited about what has now been delivered. They have said that their facilities are amazing, so I personally cannot wait to see them in a couple of weeks' time when we have the open day at Noarlunga Hospital.

I have also had the opportunity to see the work that is underway at Flinders Medical Centre. Not only are we building new rehabilitation, palliative care and mental health facilities at Flinders, but we are also building what you would have to describe as a massive car park, which will address what is constantly an issue at Flinders in terms of finding a car park. That will be an issue no longer once this brand-new enormous car park opens that will provide a lot more access to services at that hospital.

We are also doing a lot of work in the housing space. There is a very significant project underway to build 1,000 houses in 1,000 days that is being progressed through the budget and the spending in this supply bill—

Mr Duluk: On target?

Mr PICTON: It is going very well, member for Davenport, and these are jobs that are being delivered in South Australia right now. Many of them might be in your electorate, so this might be a program you would be keen to support. This is building houses for people who need them, but it is also supplying jobs for builders, electricians and plumbers across the state. It is something I am very supportive of, and I am glad to see that it is doing so well.

I am also very supportive of the work we are doing on sporting upgrades across the state. There are two really critical elements of this in the budget; one is to upgrade a number of our soccer facilities across the state. We know that soccer is growing in popularity every year, but a lot of our soccer facilities are out of date and need upgrading. They particularly need artificial pitches, which will enable more and more teams to play and use them. In my electorate, the Seaford Soccer Club is the beneficiary of a new artificial pitch as well as help with upgrading their change rooms, facilities and lighting. It will make a really big difference to that club because a lot more people will be able to play there.

Another element is to make sure that we are upgrading facilities for women's sport. Women's sport is growing, and not just traditional women's sports. A lot more women are playing AFL, rugby, soccer and hockey in places where women's change room facilities have not always been available, and they have had to change in car parks, toilets and other places. We want to make sure they have facilities that encourage women to get involved in sport. That is a very important part of the money that we are spending on grassroots sport in South Australia.

Another element is the work we are doing in public transport. I have seen the benefit of spending on public transport in my electorate on the Seaford rail extension and electrification. We can see now that there will be additional benefits for public transport with the extension of the tramline through the city, which I think is going to be really positive and as popular as all the other tramline extensions we have had so far. We would like to see some help for that from the commonwealth so that we can go even further in extending our tramlines through South Australia.

A lot of fantastic projects are underway in South Australia and they have been done in a responsible manner. The benefit of being in surplus is that we will be able to now invest in our energy program, which we have talked about at length. We are doing it in a responsible way while looking after the critical needs of South Australia and keeping South Australians in jobs.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (17:51): I rise today to

support the Supply Bill. When I think about the economy in South Australia and the budget we put forward last year, I am reminded of our plan. The plan that our Premier puts forward is that South Australia is the place where people and businesses thrive.

While I know that we have had some economic transition, and we continue to go through that transition, we have been through times when there has been a decrease in commodity prices and closures in manufacturing, not helped at all by the high Australian dollar. We are in transition. The Labor Party is best placed to lead that transition because our Premier is a leader and a thinker. It is through his economic priorities that we continue to see through the lens of what is the future.

I have a particular interest in this area. Although Holden is not in my electorate, I can virtually touch it from the border. We know that it will close in October, and we have taken this time, with our Northern Economic Plan, to make changes. I want to touch on a few of the areas that we have in our budget, looking forward, to make those changes.

First and foremost is the Northern Connector, 43 kilometres of freeway from Gawler through to Regency Park. This will create efficiencies for people in the transport area. It comes at a critical time when we will employ people, many from Holden but more specifically from the local area. We want to upskill people, we want to use the skills that are already there to keep them modernised and contemporary. I thank the government for its focus on the northern suburbs and their needs. This is a really exciting project. It will be the first concrete road, and that will be a really interesting stimulus. We have already seen people who were previously employed by Holden be employed in that project.

Just the other day, on International Women's Day, I went along to see the great outcomes for women in construction. If I remember accurately, about 21 per cent of people employed on that project were women. They are from engineering backgrounds and they are people who have broader experience in the construction industry. That is about double the number of women traditionally employed on construction projects. It is a really exciting project, and about 480 people a year will be employed on that project, which will continue for about four years.

Another area, of course, is the disability hub. We are going through a fundamental change in Australia. What we are seeing here is that for the first time we as a nation are looking at how we truly support people who have disabilities. We know that the families who support people with disabilities have had to fight for a long time. They fight to make sure they get the best health care. They fight to get recognition about the best way to help their child, their partner or their loved one, but they also need support for themselves to have respite, for the schooling they can do and the work they can do into the future.

We have some great organisations in South Australia, but we know that this is going to change. As people have that individualised support, their packages and their advocate to support them, they will have choice in what they do. That choice will stimulate a need for people to work in the disability sector. Because of that, we have set up the disability hub in Elizabeth, run by Northern Futures, to help people who are interested in working in this area, and who are curious about how you get the qualifications, and to support them to get those qualifications and to work in the industry.

An area we talked about just yesterday was the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme. I am particularly interested in this because, while we are often talking about very high-end manufacturing and that is the future for our state, we also need a diversity of jobs, jobs that need some training but perhaps less than a university degree and experience. We have an excellent opportunity to sell our premium food and wine to the world. I have just seen that our international exports have increased by 11 per cent over the last year. Compared with the national average of 6.7 per cent, that is something for us to be really proud of in South Australia.

If we have this water supplied, we will know that we have growth within that region. We have talked about Two Wells to Whyalla. This is an opportunity for us to continue to produce that premium, export quality food and to sell it. We know that we are considered one of the most livable cities in the world, and this helps us with our marketing. While it was an announcement that we look forward to the commonwealth partnering with us, we know that this is a fundamental area of growth for South Australia in the northern region.

As we look to the future, we look at the 12 submarines that we know will employ nearly 3,000 people, but we have to be ready for this employment and we have to know what those jobs

are going to be. Last year, in the budget we announced \$250 million to go to STEM in schools, and 139 schools are going to get upgrades impacting 75,000 students. I am really delighted about this because schools in my electorate—Parafield Gardens High School, Parafield Gardens R-7, Paralowie and Salisbury High School—will benefit in that area. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (MENTAL IMPAIRMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 6, page 5, line 37 [clause 6(3), inserted subsection (2)]—

Delete 'caused (either wholly or in part)' and substitute 'substantially caused'

No. 2. Clause 6, page 5, after line 41—Insert:

(3) However, despite the fact that the judge is satisfied that the person's mental impairment at the time of the conduct alleged to give rise to the offence was substantially caused by self-induced intoxication, the judge may nevertheless make an order that the person be dealt with under this Part after taking into account—

- (a) the time and circumstances of when and how the intoxication caused the mental impairment; and
- (b) the interests of justice; and
- (c) whether the making of such an order would affect public confidence in the administration of justice.

No. 3. Clause 11, page 9, after line 25 —After inserted section 269ND insert:

269NDA—Revision of Division 3A orders

- (1) If a person who has been released on licence under this Division contravenes or is likely to contravene a condition of the licence, the court by which the Division 3A order was made may, on application by the Crown (which may be made, in a case of urgency, by telephone), review the order.
- (2) On an application for a review being made, the court may make an interim order in such terms as the court thinks appropriate in the circumstances, including an order that the person be detained in a specified place for a specified period pending the determination of the review.
- (3) After allowing the Crown and the person subject to the order a reasonable opportunity to be heard on the application for review, the court may do 1 or more of the following:
 - (a) confirm the present terms of the Division 3A order;
 - (b) amend the order by varying the conditions of the licence;
 - (c) revoke the order and declare the defendant to be liable to supervision under Division 4 Subdivision 2;
 - (d) make any further order or direction that may be appropriate in the circumstances.

No. 4. Clause 11, page 9, line 31 [clause 11, inserted section 269NE(1)]—

Delete 'has breached, or is likely to breach, a condition of the order' and substitute:

contravenes or is likely to contravene a condition of the licence

No. 5. Clause 11, page 9, after line 42 [clause 11, inserted section 269NE]—After subsection (3) insert:

- (4) The progress and circumstances of a person detained under an administrative detention order must be reviewed as soon as reasonably practicable after the person is so detained—
 - (a) to determine whether an application should be made to the court for a review of the Division 3A order to which the person is subject; and

- (b) for any other purpose as the prescribed authority thinks fit in the circumstances.
- (5) Despite subsection (1), a person who has been detained under an administrative detention order cannot be detained under another such order unless a period of at least 14 days has elapsed since the expiry of the previous administrative detention order.
- No. 6. Clause 17, page 13, after line 8—Before subclause (1) insert:
- (a1) Section 269P(1)—after 'the Public Advocate' insert:
, the Commissioner for Victims' Rights
- No. 7. Clause 22, page 14, after line 15—Before inserted subsection (2) insert:
- (1a) On an application for a review being made, the court may make an interim order in such terms as the court thinks appropriate in the circumstances, including an order that the person be detained in a specified place for a specified period pending the determination of the review.
- No. 8. Clause 23, page 15, after line 17 [clause 23, inserted section 269UA(5)]—After paragraph (b) insert:
- (ba) the Commissioner for Victims' Rights;
- No. 9. Clause 23, page 17, lines 34 and 35 [clause 23, inserted section 269UE(1)]—
Delete 'has breached, or is likely to breach, a condition of the order' and substitute:
contravenes or is likely to contravene a condition of the licence
- No. 10. Clause 23, page 18, after line 8 [clause 23, inserted section 269UE]—After subsection (3) insert:
- (4) The progress and circumstances of a person detained under an administrative detention order must be reviewed as soon as reasonably practicable after the person is so detained—
- (a) to determine whether an application should be made to the court for a review of the supervision order or continuing supervision order to which the person is subject; and
- (b) for any other purpose as the prescribed authority thinks fit in the circumstances.
- (5) Despite subsection (1), a person who has been detained under an administrative detention order cannot be detained under another such order unless a period of at least 14 days has elapsed since the expiry of the previous administrative detention order.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (ELECTRICITY SUPPLY EMERGENCIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Thursday 13 April 2017 at 10:30.